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Editorial

IAN DAVIES, University of York, UK and Deputy Director of citizED

Citizenship and Teacher Education - a journal of the citizED project (www.citized.info) - provides a platform for discussion by, and for, leading figures from around the world. This discussion will not be conducted exclusively but rather will be open to all who wish to read published articles and contribute their own work. The Journal will help to clarify key issues and develop further a network of academics and professionals who are engaged in the search for better thinking and practice. The title – Citizenship and Teacher Education – has been chosen to provide a clear focus on significant matters but also to allow for the possibility of wide, dynamic debate that draws from a range of academic traditions and professional practice. It is vitally important that there is in the pages of this Journal a full and proper consideration of matters that are so closely bound up with the development of democratic, pluralistic and just societies.

This Journal will help find a way through the tensions that affect citizenship and teacher education. First, citizenship and teacher education are simultaneously said to be of high significance and yet, in practice, are often accorded only low status. Second, policy makers around the world are currently developing high profile initiatives relevant to the central concerns of this Journal, and yet it is easy to find huge uncertainty on the part of academics and professionals as to precisely how these grand ambitions can be made real. Third, there is a desire for greater consensus (politically; in relation to economic well-being; and, concerning systems that will ensure educational quality) but also a need for dynamic diversity in thinking and practice. Through the pages of this high quality, high status journal in which discussions occur to clarify thinking and to draw attention to good practice, Citizenship and Teacher Education has a real contribution to make.

In this first issue there are 6 articles as well as reviews of recent key publications. The first two articles provide carefully argued cases for ways of being appropriately professional. Kerry Kennedy draws attention to the need for what he calls ‘civic professionalism’ and Alan Sears and Andrew Hughes point towards forms of international collaboration that are appropriate for citizenship education. The third article, by Judith Torney-Purta, Wendy Klandl Richardson and Carolyn Henry Barber, draws attention to issues arising from an international research project and so provides very valuable insights into what is happening and perhaps what needs to happen across countries. Following these reflections based on international comparative data, we have then included a national case study of Singapore written by Jasmine Boon-Yee Sim and Murray Print. Finally there are two articles about young people based on data gathered in England. The first by David Kerr is drawn from the National Foundation for Education Research’s longitudinal evaluation of citizenship education in the National Curriculum, while the second, by Don Rowe, emerges from a smaller scale study that clarifies the nature of student thinking. The variety of articles (from authors based in different countries, exploring policy and...
practice through wide ranging discussion and showing use of different empirical methods) shows an intensity of purpose and intellectual vibrancy that is of great value. Whilst it is not possible (nor desirable) to see in these articles an agreed base around which policies could be simplistically built, each of the 6 pieces adds timely, coherent and perhaps provocative stimuli to us all. The challenge for readers is to use these insights in the development of policy, practice and research for forms of teacher education for teachers and learners of citizenship.

A series of book reviews follows the articles. Our book reviews editor, Mark Evans, has worked with an international team to produce summaries of, and analytical reflections upon, some of the many recent publications that are relevant to our readership. It is a sign of the increased recent acceptance of the significance of the fields of citizenship and teacher education that there has been such an explosion of publications. We look forward to an expansion of this section of the journal in future issues and welcome submissions from publishers and recommendations from readers about titles that could be reviewed.

A dedicated and highly skilled team of people have worked together for a considerable period of time to make the publication of this first issue a reality. They deserve many thanks for what they have done so far. That team is now focused on continuing to look for ways to make significant contributions to the development of high quality citizenship and teacher education. They will only be able to continue to work in that drive to explore, clarify and promote effective forms of citizenship and teacher education if the readers of this journal take seriously the call that I am now making for inclusive collaborative enterprise. Details of how to submit articles to the journal are shown in the inside back page of this issue and contributions are encouraged. Citizenship and teacher education are already accepted around the world: this Journal aims to contribute to a process that deepens our understanding and improves academic and professional practice still further.

Correspondence: IAN DAVIES, Department of Educational Studies, University of York, YO10 5DD, UK

Articles to be submitted electronically to: Roma Woodward (rlw8@cant.ac.uk)
Rethinking Teachers’ Professional Responsibilities: Towards A Civic Professionalism

KERRY J KENNEDY, The Hong Kong Institute of Education

ABSTRACT Current constructions of teacher professionalism lack any perspective that assumes teachers have responsibilities outside of classroom instruction. Yet if students are to develop any sense of their own agency and their ability to make a difference in the world at large then their experiences need to transcend the classroom. These broader objectives for students are a clear responsibility for the whole of society, but it is a special responsibility of teachers. – it is what this paper will refer to as teachers’ civic responsibility – educating future citizens for engagement with the real world. It is a distinctive aspect of professionalism that extends beyond the private world of the classroom to the public sphere. It focuses on contributing to the sustainability of democracy in a unique way through the education of future citizens. In terms of teacher professionalism, this paper will argue that the civic responsibilities of teachers should be part of a broader ‘civic professionalism’ required of the teaching profession.

Introduction

I want to make the schools the great instrument of democracy.[1]

So spoke Ella Flagg Young, the Superintendent of the Chicago School District from 1909-1915 and one of the first women in the United States “to become a superintendent of schools in a large city” (Tyack and Hansot, 1982, p.195). She may have been echoing her mentor, John Dewey, the Professor of Philosophy at Teachers’ College, Columbia University. He argued eloquently about the relationship between democracy and education:

The two points selected by which to measure the worth of a form of social life are the extent in which the interests of a group are shared by all its members, and the fullness and freedom with which it interacts with other groups. An undesirable society, in other words, is one which internally and externally sets up barriers to free intercourse and communication of experience. A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a
personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of
mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder.

Dewey and Young were writing in the first decades of the twentieth century and
their concept of democracy may not match traditional liberal democratic
conceptions. Yet in these early years of the twenty first century it is instructive to be
reminded that schools and democracy are linked. It often seems that the work of
people like Dewey and Young, with their vision for ‘democratic schools’, has been
forgotten. In recent years more instrumental visions have dominated the discourse of
schooling, visions that have linked schools to economic rather than social purposes.

Instrumental discourses, however, often mask an important social reality: teachers,
have a very special responsibility in relation to democracy – its institutions,
its principles and its capacity to continue and provide the kind of life that can benefit
all citizens. It has been argued, for example, that ‘teacher democrats’ are needed,
teachers who understand, value and teach both about and for democracy (Kennedy,
1998). This notion needs to be expanded, because teachers have responsibilities both
as democratic citizens, as well as for democratic citizens. It is a unique set of
responsibilities in the public sphere and deserves much more recognition than it
currently receives. This broader conception of teachers’ civic responsibilities will be
the focus of this article.

The remainder of this article will locate teachers’ civic responsibilities in their
social and political contexts including current geo-political realities as well as those
national contexts that have specifically attempted to shape notions of teacher
professionalism. Based on this analysis, the article will then suggest how teachers
can enact their civic responsibilities and how this will best be achieved within a
broad vision for the future of schooling. Throughout the article, examples will be
drawn largely from Australia, but the issues that are raised will hopefully have
resonance in other national jurisdictions.

Teachers’ Civic Responsibilities - Why Now?

There is little doubt that the destruction of The World Trade Centre in New York
on 11 September 2001, the Bali bombings on 12 October 2002 and subsequent
terrorist activity in Saudi Arabia and other parts of the world have created a global
context that is fearful, mistrusting and suspicious. This atmosphere has led to actions
on the part of democratic governments that have also caused some concern. In
Australia, for example, the Security Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill led one
newspaper columnist, Margot Kingston, to comment:

*It's the climate of fear since September 11 that's letting the government
do this to us, but it's running the mood for all it's worth to get itself
incredible, unaccountable power which in the wrong hands could
virtually destroy our democracy. (Kingston, 2002, 26 April)*

and:

*Is it really about changing the law to help it stamp out terrorism, or is it
in part using the present climate of fear as a cover for massive
extension of its powers to control citizen's political freedoms?
(Kingston, 2002, 26 April)*
This is pretty strong commentary to find in an Australian newspaper but it reflects the climate of fear that is now common in many societies across the globe – fear inspired by the action of democratic governments. It is important to note that such action falls well within the ambit of institutional democracy since it uses established legislative processes to pass laws - but they are laws that are seen to limit the rights of individual citizens. The Security Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Act is not the only example. The Migration Legislation Amendment (Judicial Review) Act 2001 sought to limit judicial review of immigration tribunal decisions and in its original form the ASIO Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002, invested the Australian Security Intelligence Agency (ASIO) with "the power to detain and interrogate children as young as 14" (Nicoloson, 2002, 18 August). These are examples of the nation state seeking to defend itself against perceived enemies – terrorists and refugees. Yet the question for all democracies is how far should the state be allowed to go? What are the lines of demarcation between protection of democratic values and their subversion?

This is not an easy question for governments or for citizens. Recent terrorism is a complex phenomenon and cannot be easily understood outside of its distinctive social and political contexts. Simplistic explanations need to be avoided, especially those that demonize particular religious groups. Overtly, terrorist attacks of any kind may strike at material objects but in reality such attacks are directed at values that are seen to be in opposition to those of the terrorists. Governments are expected to take action to protect their citizens – but how much action? Do citizens, for example, expect governments to go to war to protect them from terrorism? Large numbers of citizens from many countries did not think so in the case of the war with Iraq, although the majority probably did. How should democracy work in these new contexts?

These twin threats to democracy - threats from outside and threats from within - highlight new pressures that democracy has to face. On the one hand the external threat abrogates the very principles on which democracy is built – freedom, the rule of law, social justice and respect for individuals. On the other hand, the response to this extraordinary abrogation is to seek measures that threaten democracy in other ways. Citizens need to be able to make judgements about the extent to which democracy is able to defend itself without damaging its own principles. This is an important point since Fukuyama has argued that despite September 11 democracy remains the only option as the international political system:

*We remain at the end of history because there is only one system that will continue to dominate world politics, that of the liberal-democratic west. This does not imply a world free from conflict, nor the disappearance of culture. But the struggle we face is not the clash of several distinct and equal cultures fighting amongst one another like the great powers of 19th-century Europe. The clash consists of a series of rearguard actions from societies whose traditional existence is indeed threatened by modernisation. The strength of the backlash reflects the severity of this threat.* (Fukuyama, 2001, 11 October, para 13)

In such a turbulent environment, therefore, democracy still remains central. Yet it is democracy under threat. The new challenge is how to prepare young people for democracy in contexts that are quite different from those that have been known in the past. What is the role of the teacher in this preparation?
In the past, slogans like “active citizenship” have often been used to signal that citizens need to be involved in their democracy. This is still the case but much more is now required. Young people need to know about democracy – how it works and what is worth defending. They need to be able to recognize the multiple ways in which democracy is being threatened – from both within the nation state and outside, and be able to respond to those threats in ways that ensure that the essential features of democracy remain intact. When the institutions of democracy are used to subvert democracy itself, what should teachers know and be able to do in order to prepare future citizens as protectors and defenders of values that have characterized democratic societies for a very long time?

Teachers’ Civic Responsibilities and the Issue of Teacher Professionalism

The past decade has witnessed considerable debate and discussion about teacher professionalism. Whether it is the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards in the United States, the General Teaching Councils for England, Scotland and Wales or the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards in Canada, there has been extended debate by governments, teacher unions, teacher professional associations and the profession itself about the nature of teacher professionalism. In Australia, for example, The Australian College of Educators was at the forefront of those debates and in association with other parties, produced a National Statement from the Teaching Profession on Teacher Standards, Quality and Professionalism with the following objectives for membership of the teaching profession:

- to be knowledgeable about and skilled in subject matter and pedagogy
- to be effective in the care and development of all learners
- to adhere to professional and ethical standards set by and for the profession
- to act as a strong advocate for the profession and the public interest
- to contribute to the development of the knowledge base of the profession
- to reflect a strong ethical orientation across all areas of learning and teaching

(Australian College of Educators, 2003)

These are necessarily very general statements and it would be difficult to disagree with them. Yet they are capable of being expanded into ever increasing detail eventually leading to processes for monitoring and assessment. This process of extension can be seen in the many sets of teaching standards such as those used in the state of Illinois in the United States. Here eleven broad areas of teacher competence have been identified and each area is expanded in a way similar to that described below for Standard 1 (Illinois State Board of Education, 2003):

STANDARD 1 - Content Knowledge The teacher understands the central concepts, methods of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) and creates learning experiences that make the content meaningful to all students.

Knowledge Indicators: The competent teacher
1A. Understands major concepts, assumptions, debates, principles, and theories that are central to the discipline.
1B. Understands the processes of inquiry central to the discipline.
1C. Understands how students' conceptual frameworks and their misconceptions for an area of knowledge can influence their learning.
1D. Understands the relationship of knowledge within the discipline to other content areas and to life and career applications.

1E. Understands how a student’s disability affects processes of inquiry and influences patterns of learning.

Performance Indicators: The competent teacher

1F. Evaluates teaching resources and curriculum materials for their comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness for representing particular ideas and concepts.

1G. Uses differing viewpoints, theories, "ways of knowing" and methods of inquiry in teaching subject matter concepts.

1H. Engages students in generating and testing knowledge according to the process of inquiry and standards of evidence of the discipline.

1I. Designs learning experiences to promote student skills in the use of technologies appropriate to the discipline.

1J. Anticipates and adjusts for common misunderstandings of the discipline(s) that impede learning.

1K. Uses a variety of explanations and multiple representations of concepts that capture key ideas to help students develop conceptual understanding.

1L. Facilitates learning experiences that make connections to other content areas and to life and career experiences.

1M. Designs learning experiences and utilizes adaptive devices/technology to provide access to general curricular content to individuals with disabilities.

The rationale for developing such approaches – and the one quoted above typifies an international trend - is to make standards explicit – whether they are standards for entry, for maintaining membership of the profession or for advancement within the profession. It is often hoped that by doing so, the status of the profession will be enhanced, along with its accountability for students’ learning. Yet a characteristic of this approach, which focuses on the articulation and specification of professional teaching competencies, is that it conceives of teachers’ responsibilities as though they are confined to the classroom – a kind of educational private sphere. Accordingly, teachers are constructed as competent classroom technicians, even though at times the “technician” might be recognized more as an orchestra leader than a technical worker. Nevertheless, there seems to have been a quite marked reluctance in the standards approach to teacher professionalism to look beyond the classroom to teachers’ broader responsibilities to society – to the public sphere. Yet at the present time it is the public sphere that is experiencing uncertainty, turbulence and even disillusionment. Do teachers have responsibilities beyond the classroom, in the broader public sphere?

One answer to this question comes from a recent book that talks about “the activist teaching profession” (Sachs, 2003). In it the author distinguishes between an older teacher professionalism that is characterized by a conservative approach to teaching standards – regimes of attributes that can be used for various assessment purposes - and a “transformative” professionalism that is collaborative, activist, ethical, flexible, responsive, self-regulating, inquiry oriented and knowledge creating. At the end of the book there is a “call to action” and it is worth repeating:

*Teachers in individual schools can work at the school level, regionally or...nationally to achieve socially responsible goals. Teacher educators, bureaucrats, unionists and others interested in education also need to join together in order to make public and to celebrate the*
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achievements of teachers. They also need strategies to inform those in positions of power and influence of the importance and necessity of a strong teaching profession. It is this kind of profession that can educate our children to be active and responsible citizens. There is no time to lose. We can frame the future agendas for schooling and education; we just need to harness the various intellectual, social and political resources available to us in order to achieve it (Sachs, 2003, p.154)

This vision certainly goes beyond the narrow prescriptions of a more constrained professionalism focused solely on the classroom and accountability. Yet it can be extended further. There is a world outside of the classroom that is the real world where students must not only survive but must also make a difference. Students need to learn how to do this equipped with relevant knowledge and skills and capable of life long learning so they can be flexible and adaptable in an ever changing and challenging environment. As part of these challenges students need to be active and engaged in the society of which they are a part. They need to have a strong sense of their agency and their ability to make a difference. This is a clear responsibility for the whole of society, but it is a special responsibility of teachers. It is what can be called teachers’ civic responsibility. It is about educating future citizens for engagement with society, its issues, its problems, its conventions and its values. It is a distinctive aspect of professionalism that extends beyond the private world of the classroom to the public sphere. It focuses on contributing to the sustainability of democracy in a unique way through the education of future citizens. In terms of teacher professionalism, these civic responsibilities can best be understood as a broader ‘civic professionalism’. The main features of teachers’ ‘civic professionalism’ are outlined in the next section.

Teachers’ Civic Professionalism: Contributing to the Sustainability of Democracy

The concept of civic professionalism has been used both explicitly and implicitly in relation to other professions and community activities. In relation to medicine, for example, Sullivan has argued that:

*A civic professionalism must seek to strengthen and extend the kind of fiduciary morality that has long been part of the ethos of medicine. But it must do this self-consciously and with explicit attention to how the relationship between medicine and society needs to be recast to realize medicine's ideals, which are important components of the larger common good. (Sullivan, 2000).*

Sullivan’s argument here is in favour of a return to medical autonomy and a focus on doctor patient relationships and against a technical professionalism that focuses on the commodification of medical knowledge and skills to be sold in a transaction between doctor and patient. Civic professionalism in this context broadens the scope of a narrow professionalism and seeks to link it to broader social goals. Peters, Jordan and Lemme (1999) similarly argue for a new social contract between scientists and society in order to create “a more publicly engaged professional practice” with “direct links to democratic citizenship”. Natter (2002) has argued about the need for developing the processes of civil society in a more
systematic way so that they can be more effective in the battles that are waged against globalization – he calls this “civic professionalism”. In general, this means that there is a need to take the protection of civic life and values more seriously: one way to do this is to make it a professional responsibility.

The way civic professionalism is enacted will differ in different professions. In journalism, for example, there has been a great deal of debate about the public role of the journalist. Robert MacNeil, a US news commentator on PBS’ MacNeil-Lehrer News Hour put it well:

*We have to remember, as journalists, that we may be observers but we are not totally disinterested observers. We are not social engineers, but each one of us has a stake in the health of this democracy. Democracy and the social contract that makes it work are held together by a delicate web of trust, and all of us in journalism hold edges of the web. We are not just amused bystanders, watching the idiots screw it up (MacNeil, 1995 as cited in Rosen, 1998)*

David Broder, a Washington Post journalist, expressed the political nature of this kind of civic engagement in commenting on the 1990 elections in the US:

*We cannot allow the [1990] elections to be another exercise in public disillusionment and political cynicism... It is time for those of us in the world's freest press to become activists, not on behalf of a particular party or politician, but on behalf of the process of self-government (Broder, 1990 as cited in Rosen, 1998).*

The emphasis has been added here because this is a key point: civic professionalism is not about politics. Rather, it is about engagement in civic issues in order to restore and maintain democratic values that underpin a particular way of life. It is about resisting the drift to the values that undermine democracy as outlined in the first section of this article. Professionalism, even the “new professionalism” (Sachs, 2003; Cumming, 2003) has not always incorporated this dimension. A statement about the “new citizenship” asserted as far back as 1994 indicated that the decline in civic engagement had:

*Undermined the confidence and larger purposes of professionals who find their work increasingly narrow, specialized and devoid of civic meaning. A rebirth of citizenship will require a conscious intentionality among civic institutions to reclaim and revitalize their public missions. (Center for Democracy and Citizenship, 1994)*

Civic professionalism, therefore, is the means to restore larger public purposes and civic meaning to professional lives. The “new professionalism” in the teaching profession, therefore, needs to be conjoined with the “new citizenship” in order to restore teaching’s public purposes. What might this mean for teachers?

Civic professionalism for the teaching profession means more than teaching about civics and citizenship – although at the very least it does mean that. The development of civic professionalism will be a concern for teacher education through to classroom and school life and the broader role of schools within their communities. Civic professionalism might be developed as part of the overall
development of the teacher as professional. Figure 1 below is an attempt to show the multiple contexts in which civic professionalism needs to be developed.

As shown in Figure 1, teacher education provides the foundation for a civic professionalism. Civic knowledge and values need to be regarded as a core requirement for teacher education. Opportunities need to be provided for those preparing to become teachers so that they can experience civic action and engagement. Teacher educators will say: “Not another requirement in an already overcrowded curriculum!” Yet teacher educators need to focus much more on what is core and essential in the preparation of beginning teachers. They need to discern more clearly what society requires of its teachers but perhaps more importantly what society needs. What is being suggested is not mere academic ‘faddism’ – it is about a preferred future for countries that value democracy.

Figure 1: The Contexts for Developing the Civic Professionalism of Teachers

The civic preparation of teachers is an essential element in the development of civic professionalism. Figure 1 suggests that novice teachers need to have a strong grasp of civic knowledge, of pedagogical strategies that will enable them to teach others that knowledge, a good sense of their own civic identities and experience in civic action. Novice teachers need to be in the community. They should not spend time in schools alone. They should also become involved in community agencies concerned with youth and the elderly, community action projects designed to benefit the community and they should be at the forefront of local issues to do with social justice, concern and care for all citizens. This is the foundation of a civic professionalism for those who wish to be teachers. Of course, they should be competent classroom professionals: but that is not all they should be. They should also be equipped with civic knowledge, skills and values so they can assist their students to become active, informed and compassionate citizens.

Teacher education in the community and for the community does not need to become bureaucratized in the same way that teaching practice so often is. Young people preparing to become teachers are more than capable of negotiating attachments and community involvement for themselves just like any other member of the community. The issue for teacher education is to provide opportunities in the curriculum for community experiences and let novice teachers learn about the
community by being in the community. This may well mean taking a look at current core requirements and making new judgements about how time in teacher education can best be spent. There is a lot of historical baggage in teacher education and much of it can well be left behind in the twenty first century. Local needs and requirements can help to make decisions about trimming programmes so they can be more flexible and relevant. Such process will never be easy and will not be uncontested but if teachers are to assume a responsibility for the civic preparation of future generations then clearly room will need to be made for new curriculum components in teacher education.

It is little use preparing teachers as civic professionals if schools remain bureaucratic and authoritarian institutions. The IEA Civic Education Study (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001) suggested that schools in general are not exactly democratic institutions – at least according to 90,000 students in twenty eight countries. Yet unless teachers experience democracy in their workplaces and students come to understand it from their experience in classrooms it is all the more difficult to engender support for democracy in society. Schools need to be democratic workplaces and this democracy needs to extend to both staff and students. The IEA Civic Education Study also showed that when students experience democracy both in the classroom and through institutions such as School Councils, they will be more inclined to be active and engaged citizens. Democratic schools not unnaturally have the greatest potential to produce democratic citizens.

Democratic schools, of course, require teachers who both understand and are committed to democracy. If, as argued previously, teacher education programmes are to produce such teachers then schools must be able to nurture them. This means that schools as institutions must be engaged with their communities so that there are opportunities for community involvement above and beyond tokenism. Schools must be seen as community resources, an issue that will be dealt with in the final section of this paper. Undemocratic schools divorced from their communities can only habituate teachers and students to similar processes in society. Schools and their communities need to work together.

The community itself needs to be a receptive place for the acting out of civic professionalism. The life of schools and the life of the community need to be brought into alignment. Recently Elliott Eisner noted:

*One would think that schools that wanted to prepare students for life would employ tasks and problems similar to those found outside of schools. This is hardly the case. Life outside of school is seldom like school assignments--and hardly ever like a multiple-choice test.*

*(Eisner, 1998)*

This does not need to be so. Real life curriculum linked to community issues and problems can engage students in their learning and at the same time give them hope that they can make a difference in an often disinterested and alienating adult world. Communities need to embrace civic professionalism as one means for renewal and reengagement in the civic life of a nation. The alternative is continuing alienation, disaffection and, possibility major disruption.

It has been estimated that across the globe in March 2003 over five million people took part in anti-war demonstrations (Phar, 2003, 5 July). On 1 July 2003 500,000 people took to the streets of Hong Kong to protest against the passing of national security laws (Phar, 2003). It has been noted that such rallies must continue...
to be big and loud if they are to grab the attention of scornful and derisory politicians. Another commentator noted with respect to the Hong Kong protests:

*Tuesday’s march was notable for the peaceful disposition of the crowd. One cannot be so sure future protests will remain peaceful if the economic malaise continues and incompetent and dishonest ministers are allowed to continue in their old ways unmolested. (Ogus, 2003, 5 July)*

Here is the rub. While the actions of civil society often remain the last resort that citizens have against intransigent governments, such actions are risky and capable of being manipulated. Citizens need to be able to make fine grained judgements about the legitimacy of such actions, their organization, their purposes, their achievements. These assessments cannot be left to chance or irrational decision-making. What is perhaps more important is that any group of protesters anywhere in the world is simply part of the community – and it should be a community that is neither alien nor estranged from teachers and their students. Teachers have a responsibility to ensure that civic learning opportunities for students – either as part of the formal or informal curriculum - will equip them with knowledge and skills that will enable them to be discerning about the actions and issues in their community. Teachers must do this not in a detached academic manner, as though the community is an abstract academic construct, but as members of the community with a stake in the sustainability of democracy.

Teachers must ensure that future citizens are prepared for this new and emerging role of civil society – especially since it seems that citizen action will become more and more common as the institutions of democracy, including parliaments and elected representatives, become more and more alienated from the constituents they are meant to serve. Both teachers and students must have the capacities to make the fine-grained judgements that are needed. This is a key function for civic professionalism. Teachers must be engaged not just in the acquisition and protection of technical knowledge and skills, the traditional focus of professionalism, but also in the profession’s broader social purposes through the education of students in and for a sustainable democracy. As Jerald Liss, himself a special education teacher, put it:

*If we simply choose to apply our knowledge and our skills, then we will be technical professionals. And we will be missing out on another professional path. The alternative path to being a technical professional is to be a civic professional. A civic professional is devoted to the achievement of a strong democracy and to the attainment of full citizenship for all individuals. This means that the civic professional works for the infusion and the practice of democratic principles in all institutions. It also means a devotion to full citizenship by all Americans. This entails not only full political and civil rights for each individual, but also full social and economic rights. Without these rights, an individual cannot be a citizen to the fullest extent. When full citizenship is denied to individuals, then democracy itself is weakened (Liss, 2004).*
Civic Professionalism and a Vision for the Future of Schools

The success of civic professionalism will in no small measure be dependent on the contexts in which it has to exist. There has been much debate in recent times about those contexts and especially about the kinds of schools we shall have in the future. One important line of research has been OECD’s project, *Schooling for Tomorrow* (OECD, 2002). This research suggested six different future scenarios including two de-schooling scenarios in which schools as we know them would disappear; two status quo scenarios that would reinforce either bureaucratic or market driven models of school; and two re-schooling scenarios that focused on the social functions of schools and their capacity to enhance learning capacities. (OECD, 2002). In a recent empirical study using these scenarios in Hong Kong it was found that school level personnel and policy makers preferred the re-schooling scenarios, but felt that it was more likely that the status quo would be maintained (Kennedy, Luk, Fairbrother & Lo, 2003). The perception that wide scale change is not possible is an important barrier to change – almost like a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Yet change is notoriously difficult to achieve. The 1916 version of the recent OECD project may well have been John and Evelyn Dewey’s book, *Schools of Tomorrow*. Instead of multiple scenarios for future schools they put forward a single scenario:

> We have been concerned with the more fundamental changes in education, with the awakening of the schools to the realization of the fact that their work ought to prepare children for the life they are to lead in the world. The pupils who will pass this life in intellectual pursuits, and who get the necessary training for the practical side of their lives from their home environment, are such a small factor numerically that the schools are not acting wisely to shape all the work for them. The schools we have been discussing are all working away from a curriculum adapted to a small and specialized class towards one which shall be truly representative of the needs and conditions of a democratic society. (Dewey and Dewey, 1916, p.288)

This seems to be an on-going objective: developing schools and curriculum that cater for the needs of all students and not just academic elite. The Deweys’ agenda for change has had a rocky road and even today it is not universally adopted. Thus Hong Kong people’s scepticism about the possibility of achieving their preferred future for schools is perhaps understandable. Change does not come easily.

Yet if teachers are to fulfil their responsibilities as civic professionals, then schools need to have more explicit civic missions. The OECD project referred to earlier, considered that one option in this new century would be to see schools as ‘social anchors’ providing for young people the safety and security that very often did not characterize the fast moving, market oriented society of which they are a part. This is essentially the idea that has been incorporated onto one of the OECD re-schooling scenarios. Schools are seen as social centres in their communities. Such schools integrate the delivery of social services, provide access to adult learning opportunities, including the internet, provide after hours care for students with working parents, provide venues for youth activities and other groups that make up civil society and in all respects are integrated into their communities.

This is a preferred vision for schools of tomorrow. It is a vision that would reinstate the civic mission of schools and provide the context for the civic
professionalism of teachers. Democracy can be rebuilt from the ground up and schools and teachers can be part of this process. Schools need to be part of their communities, teachers need to construct teaching and learning around community problems and issues and students need to be engaged in problem solving and critical thinking about these issues. Rebuilding community and contributing towards the development of a sustainable democracy are important goals. Focusing on the civic professionalism of teachers is one strategy that can contribute to these objectives.

The challenge ahead for the teaching profession is to incorporate objectives that will focus on civic professionalism into professional standards and expectations for the profession. This would have the effect of moving teaching away from an exclusive technicist concern with standards and accountability to a social concern for the sustainability of democracy and the values that can lead to a better society for all citizens. Such an orientation in the new century would benefit not only students but society as a whole as democracy comes under threat from different quarters and as solutions seem to be increasingly complex. A civic professionalism for teachers will not solve all these problems but it has the potential to make an important contribution at a time of great challenge.

Correspondence: KERRY J KENNEDY, The Hong Kong Institute of Education
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NOTES

[2] Better understood as the “new terrorism” (Kennedy, 2003) since as Combs (2003) has shown, terrorism has a long history that places September 11 at the end rather the beginning of an international trend.
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Rethinking Teachers’ Professional Responsibilities


ABSTRACT Recent years have seen an explosion of interest and activity around the world in both democracy and democratic civic education. A pervasive feature of this heightened concern with civic education is a growing level of international collaboration; in particular the exportation of programs and expertise from established Western democracies to emerging democracies. Literature in comparative education demonstrates that this kind of work is fraught with difficulty and often results in failure. Drawing on literature on international work in education as well as democratic theory, this paper proposes an approach to international collaboration in civic education that is both democratic and pragmatic. The approach is characterized by the recognition that democracy (and democratic civic education) cannot be imposed but is a choice people must make and shape for themselves; by clear acknowledgement of the complexities of both democratic and educational reform; and by a commitment to collaboration where power is shared and a multiplicity of voices included.

International Context

International interest and action in the field of democratic citizenship has exploded during the past two decades. Kymlicka (2004 p. xii) calls it “a striking worldwide trend regarding the diffusion and adoption of the principles and policies of [democratic] multicultural citizenship.” He describes the scope of the trend as reaching “even the most remote regions of Peru, the highlands of Nepal, and the peripheries of Communist China.” Along with this heightened attention to democratic citizenship, there has been an upsurge in the number of initiatives in democratic citizenship education. New policies and school curricula have been developed in national jurisdictions as diverse as Australia, Russia, Colombia and Hong Kong. In 1997, for example, the Civics Expert Group painted an extremely bleak picture of Australian citizenship and citizenship education (Civics Expert Group, 1994). In response, the federal government committed to develop and implement school programs in citizenship and to ensure that teachers are suitably qualified. In September of 1998 the English Advisory Group on Citizenship was established “to provide advice on effective education for citizenship in schools” (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998, p. 4). The group subsequently called for citizenship education to “be a statutory entitlement in the curriculum” (p. 22) and identified specific outcomes to guide the development of citizenship curricula and practice. Citizenship became part of the National Curriculum in England in the fall
Learning From Each Other

of 2002. A two-phase study by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement makes it clear that similar initiatives are showing up around the world. The editors of a book reporting on Phase 1 of that study point out “that a review and rethinking of civic education is taking place not only in post communist countries and those with a short history of democracy but also in well developed and long standing democracies” (Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999, p. 30).

Recent conferences in Italy and Hong Kong and their ensuing publications illustrate the scope of this contemporary interest in citizenship education. The former brought together scholars from around the world – from places as diverse as England, Japan, Palestine and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) – to examine the interaction between citizenship education and ethnic diversity in their jurisdictions and resulted in the publication of an important new book edited by American educator James Banks (2004). The Hong Kong seminar on the theme, Citizenship Education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and Issues, held in February 2004 was sponsored by The Centre for Citizenship Education at the Hong Kong Institute for Education and involved scholars from the Asia-Pacific region. The seminar was designed to explore “the potential for Asia-Pacific values and traditions to contribute to the development of more democratic societies, and whether aspects of these values and traditions can be harnessed for democratic citizenship education” (Grossman, 2004, p. 1).

In Europe, the year 2005 has been declared European Year of Citizenship through Education. Here, “the aim is to launch . . . a campaign to popularize and put into practice the education for democratic citizenship policies and programmes developed within the Council of Europe.” (Council of Europe, 2005). The initiatives envisaged for the Year include local, regional, national and international activities aimed at the dissemination of best practice, awareness raising and developing initiatives and partnerships, and highlight the Council’s view of education as “crucial to the development of citizenship and the quality of participation in a democratic society…”

A pervasive feature of this widespread interest in citizenship education is its on-going attention to international collaboration; in particular the exportation of programs and expertise from established Western democracies to emerging democracies. The Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California, for example, reports that its materials have been used in “a long list of foreign countries, including Argentina, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, the Czech Republic, Ethiopia, Germany, Ghana, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, and Russia” (Center for Civic Education, 2004a). In addition to exporting materials the Center collaborates in initiatives to develop expertise in democratic citizenship and citizenship education, including the CIVITAS Program that is largely funded by the US Government and “provides for a series of exchanges among leaders in civic education in the United States and emerging and established democracies worldwide” (Center for Civic Education, 2004b). American organizations are not alone in exporting democratic citizenship education programs around the world. Australian scholars and institutions have been very involved in developing citizenship education programs in the Asia-Pacific region and the Council of Europe has participated in developing programs in former communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe (See, for example, Forrester, 2003; Print & Smith, 2000).

In our view there is reason to be cautious about all this international work in the field of democratic citizenship education. There is a considerable literature on the
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transfer or borrowing of educational programs and initiatives across international contexts that is generally agreed on the complexity of moving ideas and programs across borders, even when the countries or jurisdictions involved share similar cultural, economic and political systems. Turbin (2001, p. 98), for example, examined the attempted transfer of industrial training programs in the engineering sector between Germany and the UK and found significant “institutional and structural barriers to the transfer of training.” When the cultural and social differences between jurisdictions increase, the likelihood of successful transfer is even less. As Hughes and Urasa (1997, p. 97) point out, “Educational borrowing between and among developed as well as developing nations has a long tradition, much of it not particularly successful.”

In our work we have been specifically concerned about a phenomenon Steiner-Khamsi (1998) has termed ‘modulitis.’ She uses this idea to describe situations where models of education in various guises – instruction, school governance and accountability, assessment, and so on, are offered up for adoption in the international marketplace of educational ideas. Very often, they come in the form of pre-packaged educational projects or modules designed and developed in the West with the expectation that a local NGO will become the partner of the external funding agency and guide a process of implementation in a non-Western country. Often, the NGO’s are reduced to the role of local agent, with projects being subjected to scarcely even a minimum level of cultural adaptation. For example, names and illustrations or examples might be indigenized or, as in one extreme form, “reference to the Constitution of the United States is simply replaced by reference to the constitution of the respective country.” Here, “the NGOs . . . act as transcultural entities that import and administer prepackaged educational reform models [mainly] from the United States and Western Europe” (Steiner-Khamsi, 1998, p. 7). Steiner-Khamsi suggests that such modulitis is epidemic in proportion and is spreading in all parts of the world. A frequent consequence is storerooms packed with unused and unwanted manuals and modules that are the tangible products of so many well-meaning collaborations.

International work of this ilk is not only antithetical to the spirit of democratic civic education but, as the literature indicates, not a very successful model for reform. Drawing from literature on comparative education and democratic theory as well as examples of international initiatives in civic education, this paper proposes some broad directions for a democratic approach to international collaboration in civic education. In our view this kind of approach will be characterized by the recognition that democracy (and democratic civic education) cannot be imposed but is a choice people must make and shape for themselves; the acknowledgement of the complexities of both democratic and educational reform; and a commitment to collaboration where power is shared and a multiplicity of voices included. It will move beyond the transfer or borrowing of educational policies and practices to a mutual exercise in professional reflection and learning.

Recognizing Democracy as a Choice

Since 1998 we have been involved with colleagues in Russia in a collaboration called the Spirit of Democracy Project. In that project we are working with Russian teachers and teacher educators to develop both an approach to teaching key democratic ideas and material to support that approach (See, Sears, Voskresenskaya, Hughes, Ioffe, & Jironkina, 2004). Among the outcomes of the Project has been the creation of a website that has two sides: one Russian and one Canadian. Importantly,
the two sides are not translations though they possess common elements, particularly the commitment to a pedagogical approach that draws heavily on Vygotsky’s notions of interpersonal and intrapersonal learning. Along with the use of a “situated learning” perspective, the pedagogy places students and their teachers in the position of wrestling with the precepts of democracy in the context of their own socio-historical situations. While the framework of the approach is the product of the collaboration of the project leaders, the particular situations in which teachers and students become immersed have been designed and developed by the teachers and students who have worked to create a project that is on the one hand truly Russian, that is, it is in the Russian language and addresses issues of living in society that are rooted in the Russian context; and on the other hand truly Canadian; that is, it is in English and French and is rooted in the Canadian context. (spiritofdemocracy.com). At the same time, both seek to be informed and educated by an appreciation of how other societies and cultures have addressed or are addressing similar issues. One vivid example developed by the teachers and students in a small rural school in Russia explores the concepts of equality and equity in the context of the role of women in the military.

During a visit to a Russian school in the spring of 2002 a television interviewer asked Andrew Hughes, “What makes you think democracy is the best form of government for Russia?” Dr. Hughes said it really was not for him to decide what is the most appropriate form of government for Russia but rather an issue for Russia’s people and not one for outside meddlers or even mediators. He went on to add, however, that informed choices mean knowing what the choices are and that a commitment to education means exploring the options in an open and intellectually honest manner. As American political theorist, Benjamin Barber (2003, p. 172) points out, “Democracy cannot be gifted to an unwilling people or imported to a culture not ready for it.” But, neither can it be willed or nurtured in a culture that is ignorant of its precepts and concepts. In many respects, a commitment to democracy is a matter of choice; it is a choice of the principles that are to guide the ways in which we live together in society; it is a choice in the institutions, policies and practices that shape our daily interactions.

First, democracy is a choice at the level of constitutions. For the most part social and political change at the state level occurs very slowly if at all. There are rare points, however, at which whole societies are driven to consider a fundamental change of direction. The driving forces for this can be external to the society, internal to it or, perhaps more likely, both. The period of the 1980s and 1990s was such a point for Russia. The Soviet Union was collapsing from a combination of external pressure and internal malaise and something new was bound to take its place (See, for example, Hoffman, 2002; Jack, 2004). The Russian population seemed to indicate they wanted to move toward democracy and populist politicians like Boris Yeltsin stepped forward to lead the move in that direction. There is considerable evidence that neither the people nor the leadership knew quite what that choice meant in terms of actual policies and practices but there was fairly widespread desire for, and commitment to, democratic principles of freedom, openness and participation. On December 12, 1993 a new constitution was ratified the first article of which reads, in part, “The Russian Federation—Russia, shall be a democratic, federal, rule-of-law-state with the republican form of government” (The Constitution, 2004). Russia had made the choice — at the level of the constitution – to be democratic. As we said earlier, this kind of interest in democracy as an idea seems to be gaining ground in many parts of the world that have not been known as
particularly democratic. People seem to be making the choice for democracy, at least at the constitutional level.

Second, democracy is a choice at the level of institutions. Like most abstractions, democratic principles and ideas are both complex and fluid and may mean different things to different people. Sometimes those differences exist across time or contexts but often the same concept can be understood somewhat differently by people in the same time and place; that is, they can be contested. Take the idea of democratic government as the “the consent of the governed,” for example. Almost everyone would agree that rule by “the people” is a necessary condition for democracy but there is wide disagreement about what precisely that means. One area of contention might be who should constitute the governed whose consent is required? In Ancient Athens, widely acknowledged as the first democracy, those included as citizens represented a minority of the total population: women, foreigners and slaves, although certainly governed, were not asked for their consent.

In contemporary Canada while a much larger percentage of the population is entitled to play a role in selecting those who govern, not everyone is included. Under the Canada Election Act voting is restricted to citizens over the age of 18 who meet particular residency requirements. There are a number of organizations, in Canada and elsewhere that feel age restrictions exclude younger people from legitimate participation in their own governance and argue that the voting age should be lowered. Until quite recently the Act also excluded “every person undergoing punishment as an inmate in any penal institution for the commission of any offence” (Department of Justice Canada, 2003). This provision was struck down by the Supreme Court, a decision that has revived a controversy about whether or not prisoners have forfeited their democratic rights by virtue of their criminal convictions. The point is simply this, while all agree that in democracies citizens have a right to participate in their own governance, exactly who matters and how they participate is contested.

There is also disagreement about how citizens are to give their consent. In Canada the consent of the governed is generally obtained through the election of representatives to various levels of government. At the federal and provincial levels these representatives are selected using a “first past the post” electoral system that often leads to the election of individual representatives and whole governments with much less than 50% of the popular vote. In fact, it is rare in Canada to have a government elected with more than 50% of the popular vote. Some believe this system is at least partly responsible for growing voter apathy and consequent record low turnouts at the polls because the end results are not reflective of the will of the people (Centre for Research and Information on Canada, 2001). Other jurisdictions, Italy and Israel are two examples, elect representatives proportionally with parties getting seats based on the percentage of the popular vote they obtain. This often leads to minority and coalition governments but is seen by some as more fairly representing the choices made by citizens. At the present time several Canadian provinces have commissions examining the electoral system and may make recommendations that will significantly change the way the people give their consent. Again, the consent of the governed is a necessary condition for democracy, but that consent can be obtained in different ways.

A structural challenge facing almost all countries today is how to balance concern for national unity with respect for the rights of minority groups, particularly so-called “national minorities” (See, for example, Kymlicka & Opalski, 2001b; Minggang, 2004). In the People’s Republic of China (PRC), for example, “the national minority population has reached over 100 million” (Minggang, 2004, p. 20).
358). A figure that Minggang describes as “stunning” (p. 358). But what is a ‘democratic posture’ toward matters of diversity and minorities? As Castles (2004) points out, policy and practice in democratic countries in terms of citizenship and citizenship education cover a wide range from those who promote diversity and support high levels of autonomy for particular minorities, to those who focus more on promoting unity and greatly limit political and social autonomy for minority groups.

Most democratic societies are rooted in core principles or concepts such as: the rule of law; the consent of the governed and the right to dissent; the common good; respect for diversity; the right to privacy; and equality. These ideas are among some core or universal democratic values, but individuals and societies understand and institutionalize these principles in a wide variety of ways. As Schöpflin (2001, p. 111) points out, “It is vital to recognize in this connection that Europe has generated a very wide set of practices and concepts of democracy, all of which are acceptably democratic.” Once a society decides to be democratic it must then decide what institutional form that democracy will take.

Finally, democracy is a choice at the level of personal contribution. Countries can have the most democratic set of laws and institutions imaginable and still not be democratic if there is no commitment to these among the leaders and the people. Reflecting on the situation in his own country, Russian Alexander Ossipov (2001, p. 176) writes, “I do not believe in the miraculous force of a piece of paper. A law or treaty is nothing more than a well-meaning wish unless the government and society respect it.” This sentiment was thrown into sharp relief for us when we were observers at an exchange of ideas between leaders of an Argentine NGO, Conscienza, and staff at the Center for Civic Education in Calabassas, California. The leader of the Argentinean contingent said to our American colleagues, “Don’t try to teach us about the structures of democracy – constitutions and legislatures, we know all about those, teach us the spirit of democracy.” Although not expressed in the same words, we encountered similar sentiments in our first meeting with our Russian colleagues in Moscow. This is where the name of our joint project came from and our collaboration stems from this interest in the spirit, the animating force that shapes democratic life.

For us the spirit of democracy has two related parts. The first is an understanding of and commitment to, at the personal level, a set of ideas central to democracy and the second is the disposition to operate in a democratic and collaborative way. When the Frenchman Alexis De Tocqueville (1984) toured the new United States of America it was clear to him what idea lay at the heart of American democracy. He observed, “from their origin, the sovereignty of the people was the fundamental principle of most of the British colonies in America,” (p. 56) and went on to write, “The people reign in the American political world as the Deity reigns in the universe” (p. 57). Almost two hundred years later the concept of popular sovereignty still lies at the heart of democracy but even though it may be the central democratic idea, it is not the only one. Kymlicka (2001b, p. 14) points out that a number of related ideas “underlie the operation of Western liberal democracies,” including “the rule of law, freedom of the press, freedom of conscience, habeas corpus, free elections, universal adult suffrage, etc.” While the institutional frameworks that embody these concepts may vary across jurisdictions, the underlying ideas and principles are consistent.

For a democracy to function it is essential not only that these ideas be enshrined in constitutions and institutions but also that the people take them as their own – that they choose democracy. Tsilevich (2001) contends that one of the difficulties new
democracies in Eastern Europe face is the importation of democratic ideas developed over many years in the West. He writes, “Post-Communist countries [are] consumers, rather than co-authors, of this modern and generally accepted liberal democratic political philosophy” (p. 156). We believe the spirit of democracy – a personal commitment to democratic ideas – is fostered by civic education that engages people in co-authoring democratic ideas and practices through wrestling with what they mean and how they should be manifest in particular times and contexts.

The second aspect of the democratic spirit is the disposition to act in ways consistent with democratic values. Barber (2003) argues that the central democratic value is humility. “After all,” he writes, “the recognition that I might be wrong and my opponent right is at the very heart of the democratic faith” (p. 138). In writing about some of the fledgling democracies in Eastern Europe, Schöpflin (2001) makes the point that it is possible to have the form of democracy without an underlying commitment to democratic values. He writes that “post-communist systems were consensual, a consent that was expressed regularly in elections and through other institutions, but were not democratic in as much as democratic values were only sporadically to be observed” (p. 110). He goes on to argue that societies have what he calls first and second order rules. “First order rules include the formal regulation by which every system operates, like the constitution, laws governing elections, procedures for the settlement of conflict and the like” – the form of democracy. “Second order rules are the informal tacit rules of the game that are internalized as part of the doxa” – the spirit of democracy. In a democracy these second order rules include “key democratic values of self-limitation, feedback, moderation, commitment, responsibility, [and] the recognition of the value of competing multiple rationalities” (p. 121). Unless the people choose to contribute to the building of democracy, democratic constitutions and institutions will be for naught.

There has been considerable debate in Western democracies in the past 15 years or so between advocates of civic republican and liberal approaches to citizenship about the level of personal commitment and involvement necessary for a healthy democracy (See, for example, Barber, 1992; Bellah, Masden, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1986; Putnam, 2000). There is, however, fairly widespread agreement that healthy democracies require free individuals to commit themselves to the common good at some level. Wade (1997) points out that growing interest in community service learning as part of civic education has that as one of its central goals. She writes, “Community service-learning has the potential to reveal that personal fulfilment and public contribution are not antithetical” (p.14).

As with citizenship, policy and practice in the area of civic education is ultimately an internal matter of choice for nation states. As Kennedy (2004) points out about international work in civic education, “it is important to understand that citizenship education is the province of nation-states and not some supra-national authority. Thus there can be no external diktat” (p. 18). We believe democracy and democratic citizenship education are choices to be made by countries and peoples for themselves but, as educators, we also believe that such decisions ought to be informed and informed decision ultimately flows, at least substantially, from knowing what the choices are. International experience with democracy gained through collaboration with colleagues from a wide variety of jurisdiction has great potential to enhance democratic civic education, in democracies and emerging democracies, as educators better understand the range of ways in which the dimensions of democracy are manifested around the world; often different but still democratic.
Our focus on ‘choice’ implies that societies are the result of the will of their members. Gellner (1994), however, reminds us eloquently that:

Normally . . . societies and their arrangements are not and indeed cannot be chosen by the will of their members at all. Men are born into and live within the institutions and culture of their society, which they often take for granted, roughly in the manner in which they speak prose. They are made by the culture they live in, and do not come to it fully formed and able to ‘choose’ a society which pleases them . . . Social institutions and cultures are seldom chosen: they are our fate, not our choice. (p. 185)

This observation applies equally to those of us born into democracies and tyrannies. In the former, democracy is not a choice, and in the latter our choices are heavily circumscribed. From time to time, however, there arise circumstances such as those in some of the states of the former Soviet Block where there is occasion to consider seriously and self-consciously the terms of the social contract for their developing societies. The collapse of one order has engendered a search for another. In the marketplace of competing ideas, the concept of democracy can be a superficial slogan but in the context of civic education it can constitute a quest to uncover the essence of the idea, an assessment of its manifestations, and a shaping of its precepts and practices.

Recognizing The Complexities of Democratic and Educational Reform

Saying that democracy is a choice is not to imply it is an easy one. There has been considerable impatience in the West with what is perceived as a slow and uneven move to democracy in many parts of the world including Eastern Europe generally and Russia in particular (Kymlicka & Opalski, 2001b). In our view this reflects a lack of understanding of the history of democratic development anywhere in the world. Barber (2003) writes about the long and often bloody history of the evolution of democracy in Europe and America and makes the point that as recently as the last century it was widely recognized that helping Germany and Japan make the transformation to democracy after World War Two would require considerable time and massive, multilateral, multisector investment both in terms of material and expertise. He writes, “Democracy grows slowly and requires indigenous struggle, the cultivation of local civic institutions, and a carefully nurtured spirit of citizenship that depends heavily on education” (p. 148). Educational reform, properly done, is similarly a long and often arduous process. Sears and Hyslop-Margison (in press) describe the tendency in North America to look for quick and easy fixes for difficult educational problems. Hunt (2002) points out that the history of education contains many examples of just such an inclination. He argues that reform movements in public education in the United States have been plagued by several factors including:

The “bandwagon” tendency, so prevalent in American schooling; the attraction presented by the “novel,” which often turns out to be a “fad”; and the compulsion that Americans have to get everything done in a hurry. . . The crusading behavior of the reformers is another contributing factor. They feel driven to depict present practices as worthless, inane, and ineffective . . .; they seem to believe that their
salvific action alone will rescue the world of education from the forces of darkness and superstition, selfishness and traditionalism (p. xvi).

This general trend to oversimplify both problems and solutions in education has been very evident in recent reform initiatives in the field of citizenship education in the West where significant problems are identified and expensive solutions implemented with little or no evidence provided to support either the diagnosis of the problems or the effectiveness of the solutions (Sears & Hyslop-Margison, in press).

When this tendency to look for quick and easy – indeed almost magical – solutions to difficult educational dilemmas is translated from domestic policy to the international level it often proves particularly disastrous. As mentioned earlier, there is a considerable literature outlining a significant history of failure in terms of the transfer or borrowing of educational programs from one jurisdiction or context to another. The modulitis which concerns Steiner-Khamisi largely involves the transfer of programs or policies from the West to other parts of the world and smacks of, among other things, neo-colonialism. Aside from the questionable moral position of imposing such programmes, Rodwell (1998) points out it simply does not work. She writes, “Simple adjustments to the content of a ‘Western’ programme masquerading as an international programme are unlikely to be sufficient to achieve a curriculum fit” (p.51). Hughes and Urasa (1997) argue that for this kind of transfer to have any hope of success, a detailed, complex, time consuming and possibly expensive, process of feasibility assessment is required. They point out, however, that few jurisdictions have the patience or stamina for this kind of long-term process.

Problems with the imposition of ill-considered ideas across international contexts are not limited to so-called developing countries. Phillips (2000) contends that Western industrialized countries often experience simplistic appeals to adopt international approaches from their own politicians and bureaucrats. He writes, “Politically motivated endeavours to underpin reform proposals through reference to other countries are evident in much of the literature put out by political parties (in and out of government) and in the speeches of politicians” (p. 300). Vulliamy (1998), for example, describes attempts in England to import features of the Taiwanese system of education after students in Taiwanese schools scored significantly higher on a set of international assessments than English students. He argues that the politicians and bureaucrats involved were very selective about the elements of Taiwanese education they proposed England adopt (for example, whole class teaching as opposed to the more child centred approaches), ignoring other important contextual factors in Taiwan such as much higher social regard for teachers, significantly higher relative pay scales for teachers, and the prevalence of private cramming schools across the country. As he points out, “What works in one culture is unlikely to work in another, unless very careful attention is paid to contextual factors” (p. 12).

All of this is not to say that we should not attempt to learn from each other across international boundaries. There are examples in the literature of the successful adaptation of educational ideas across national and cultural contexts but those almost always involved the exchange being truly voluntary rather than imposed, careful analysis of the relevant elements of both the sending and receiving jurisdictions, and significant “indigenization” of the ideas to the new context. “Where transfer does occur and produces some success, it usually goes through a process of adaptation and implementation that includes tailoring basic principles to the receiving
Learning From Each Other

environment and then monitoring the process and intervening when appropriate” (Turpin, 2001, p. 107).

The recent IEA study of civic education in more than 25 countries from around the world is an example of international collaboration that took into account the complexities of working across national and cultural contexts. Recognizing that it would be impossible to identify “a single best approach to civic education in a democracy” (Torney-Purta et al., 1999, p. 17), the organizers of the study departed from normal IEA procedures and designed a two-phase study. The first phase set out to understand approaches to civic education within national contexts and to use that understanding as a basis for designing complex instruments for comparing policies and practices across contexts (See, also, Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt, & Nikolova, 2002; Judith Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001).

Even the successful implementation of educational reform initiatives does not end the process. Education, like any endeavour involving human beings, is in a constant state of flux because both the participants and the social context in which they live are constantly changing. As Law (2004) points out, traditional ideas about citizenship and citizenship education being bound up by and in the nation state have been undergoing considerable change of late. He argues that increasing globalization and the development of supranational and global institutions such as the European Union and the World Trade Organization have significantly changed thinking in this area. “Consequently,” he writes, “nation-states no longer serve as the exclusive source of legitimacy for political activity, nor do they dominate the discourse of citizenship, which tends increasingly to be stripped of national characteristics” (p. 255). This has raised new challenges for citizenship education not only in Taiwan and Hong Kong, the particular jurisdictions Law examines, but also around the world. Ongoing challenges like this mean the processes of learning and reform in education are not only complex, as described above, but must also be continuous. Those seeking a democratic approach to international initiatives in civic education will not be looking for quick fixes, but will recognize the complex, contested and continuous nature of successful collaborations and will approach the work in a manner consistent with that recognition.

International Collaboration as Partnership

In the preface to a recent book about Western, liberal pluralist democracy and its possible application to former communist countries of Eastern and Central Europe, Kymlicka (2001a) points out that he was cautious about his involvement in the project because “there are countless stories circulating in the region of Western ‘experts’ who make grand pronouncements about what freedom, democracy, and justice requires in Eastern Europe without any knowledge of the context, and those recommendations have turned out to be unhelpful, if not counter-productive” (p.xii-xiii). Kymlicka and his co-editor were committed not to fall into that pattern but designed the book to “start a dialogue with Eastern Europeans on the ways in which this work may be relevant to the Eastern European context” (Kymlicka & Opalski, 2001a, p.3). Similarly, when we began working with Russian colleagues in the Spirit of Democracy Project we were determined not to be cast in the role of experts either about democracy, civic education, or the type of government that is right for Russia. We have a range of experience about democratic civic education to share, some of which might be applicable to the Russian context, but we do not come with all the answers. The strategic approach of the project is founded on two elements: first, the progressive and mutual acceptance of the contributions made by both the Canadian
and Russian partners, with increasing emphasis being given to having Russians supplant Canadians in the long-term enhancement and development of the project in Russia; and, second, the use of Russian leadership, scholarship and venues whenever possible.

The IEA study was an example of the same kind of collaborative partnership. The organizing team grounded the work in two principles, “inclusiveness” and “methodological rigor.” They acknowledged these were sometimes at odds but “the tension [was] managed … by a participatory, iterative process in which an international planning committee and national project representatives were the main (though not the only) actors” (Torney-Purta et al., 1999, p. 19).

These kinds of elements are essential to successful international collaboration in education generally and citizenship education in particular. We should be moving away from “transfer,” which implies the shipping of whole programs to new contexts discussed above, and “borrowing” which, again, suggests the taking of someone else’s program more or less whole, to what Phillips (2000, p. 297) calls “learning from elsewhere.” Phillips argues careful attention to ideas and programs from other jurisdictions can be helpful to indigenous policy makers by “showing what is possible, rather than as exemplary characteristics to be copied or ‘borrowed’” (p. 301). A key feature of partnerships established around this principle, will be that the learning is reciprocal – it cuts both ways. One of the most gratifying elements of our collaboration with Russian educators is what they have taught us about teaching, learning and teacher development.

In genuine partnerships power needs to be as equally distributed as possible, and partners have to recognize their place. These are both difficult to achieve. International partnerships often involve partners with considerable differences both in terms of levels of experience and material resources. In the Spirit of Democracy Project the Canadians came to the table with many more years of experience with both democracy and citizenship education than the Russian partners. The Canadians through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) were also providing most of the funding for the project. We were, however, not setting out to foist either our form of government or our approach to civic education on our Russian colleagues but rather responding to a request from them to design a project together. We began the relationship by asking the Russians to tell us what they had been doing in the field of civic education and what they saw for the future. We may not always have been successful but we have made a genuine attempt to work as colleagues and to recognize that Russians know far better than us what is needed and will work in Russian schools and teacher training institutes. To be successful in the end this needs to be a Russian project designed with Canadian help, not a Canadian project pushed on Russian schools.

In writing about the “Americanization” of some elements of the Bahamian education system, Urwick (2002) provides some useful ideas for how to go about learning from other places in education. He argues the Bahamas have successfully incorporated key elements education systems from the United States and Canada for four reasons: the reforms were voluntary; key policy makers in the Bahamas know the North American systems well often because they have studied or worked in those contexts; there is a generally positive attitude to North American culture and values among Bahamas; and the influence from North America was balance by educational relationships with other places, particularly Britain and the West Indies. In regard to the latter he writes that this kind of “diversification of foreign influences helps to preserve space for independent development” (p.178).
In building international partnerships in the area of citizenship education it would be wise to pay attention to these elements. To seek partners who will not try to impose policies or programs but will work collaboratively; to make use of bureaucrats, teachers and scholars who understand the complexities and nuances of other systems; to look for partners whose social, political and cultural values will resonate with the jurisdiction concerned; and to diversify partnerships so as to learn more widely and reduce the influence of any single partner.

Finally, it seems to us that to have real impact at the classroom level international partnerships in civic education need to include not only policy makers and researchers but also teachers. We think this is important for three reasons: the widest possible involvement of actors is consistent with democratic practice; it provides a valuable in-service educational opportunity for teachers; and it is pragmatic. There are many examples of educational reforms that have failed largely because teachers were not included in the process and did not buy into the initiatives (See, for example, Fenton, 1991). Conversely, involving teachers can enhance the quality and credibility of any reforms and materials produced thereby increasing the chances they will be widely adopted by other teachers.

In designing our approach to the Spirit of Democracy Project we built on experience with successful curriculum reform projects in social education in Russia and Canada and particularly two related strands of work: teacher professional development and the production of high quality, easily accessible teaching and learning materials. Froumin (2004) demonstrates that these are two vital areas for development in Russia and argues that the recent history of educational initiatives in civic education in that country shows that a grassroots approach involving teachers is a more effective way to implement change than a top down approach.

Two Canadian projects that provided a model of successful reform were the Canada Studies Foundation (CSF), which operated from 1970-1986 and CIDA Global Education Centres, which were established in most Canadian provinces in the 1980s and early 1990s. Both these initiatives focused on teacher professional development and the production of high quality teaching and learning materials. The projects merged these two strands by developing teams of university based teacher educators and classroom teachers, involving the teachers in both the development of materials and providing in-service education to their colleagues. A range of teaching materials were developed in both projects and widely disseminated and, perhaps more importantly, a significant cadre of expert teachers was established which ensured the reforms would have wide and ongoing impact. In his history of the CSF, Grant (1986) makes the point that 30,000 Canadian teachers had some form of in-service training related to the project. Even so, he argues the wide influence of the project was mostly attributable to the 1300 teachers who were intimately involved in the development of the materials and the provision of workshops for their colleagues. These teachers, Grant contends, built on this professional experience to become leaders in schools, districts and ministries of education.

Indeed there is evidence that the combination of teacher training and curriculum development made both these initiatives hugely influential in Canadian education. Tomkins (1986, p. 332) describes the CSF as “the only national curriculum endeavour in Canada on a scale comparable to those in the United States and Great Britain” and elsewhere he argues that, largely due to the work of the CSF, Canadian Studies “has tended to dominate senior high school social studies” (Tomkins, 1983, p. 22). Similarly, Sears and Hughes (1996) demonstrate that the Global Education Centres had significant effects on curricula in Canadian schools.
A recent collaboration among four European and three Canadian universities also demonstrates the potential of international experience to be a significant force in teacher development (See Davies et al. 2005 p145-6; Davies et al. 2005 p145). In this project student teachers and faculty from the institutions involved participated in a range of activities including conferences, workshops and international exchanges designed to promote reflection on the nature of citizenship and civic education. Both faculty and students reported significant professional growth through participation in the project. They did not talk about borrowing ideas or programs directly from other contexts but rather how the experience of working with international partners and observing a range of professional practice in host countries had stimulated them to reconsider their professional philosophies and practices. For example, one Canadian faculty member said, “my direct involvement in the project caused my to re-think my cultural constructions course in terms of its overlap with the subject of social studies in general and notions of citizenship in particular” (Quoted in Davies et al., in press). Similarly, a student reported, “the experience has had a great impact on me personally and professionally. It has broadened my knowledge in citizenship education, curriculum development, instructional strategies and teaching across the curriculum” (Quoted in Davies et al., in press). Clearly truly collaborative international partnerships have considerable potential to enhance teacher professional development.

**Conclusion**

Urwick (2002) makes the point that in the literature the international transfer or borrowing of educational ideas and programs has an almost universally bad reputation. Transfers between developed countries “have been exposed as hypocritical or ill-informed manoeuvres of politicians, or at best as exercises in political symbolism;” while “Transfers from economically advanced to less developed countries have often been interpreted as elements in systems of domination and dependency, formerly ‘imperialist’ and currently ‘globalizing’” (p. 157). In spite of this rather abysmal record, we would side with Urwick and claim that it is possible for international collaboration in education, particularly in civic education, to be fruitful for partners on all sides. In order for this to happen participants have to be committed to the ideas outlined here: to recognizing that ultimately the decision to move in any particular direction, including toward democracy and democratic civic education, is a choice which must be made at several levels by the societies and people who will be doing the moving; that democratic and educational reform are complex and continuous processes which require detailed analysis, patient and systematic implementation, and ongoing monitoring and flexibility; and that collaboration best occurs among partners who participate voluntarily, share power, and recognize each other’s appropriate place in the relationship. These principles are both pragmatic and consistent with democratic practice. Furthermore, they move us beyond the sterile concepts of “transfer” and “borrowing” and commit us to a recognition that we can learn from each other.
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Teachers’ Educational Experience And Confidence In Relation To Students’ Civic Knowledge Across Countries

JUDITH TORNEY-PURTA, WENDY KLANDL RICHARDSON, AND CAROLYN HENRY BARBER, University of Maryland

ABSTRACT While policy-makers and educators have paid increasing attention to the importance of civic education, little is known about how teachers’ knowledge and beliefs influence students’ development in this area. Most research focuses either on teachers of civic-related subjects or on their students (not linking them) and is conducted in one country (often with small samples). This analysis uses survey data from the IEA Civic Education Study to explore teachers’ knowledge and beliefs and how they relate to their students’ civic knowledge. First, we examine how teachers responded to questions about their professional development, confidence in teaching, and attitudes towards civic education in eight countries. Second, we explore how the average teacher’s educational experience in a country relates to the average student’s civic achievement in that country (using pairs of scores from 27 countries). Finally, within three countries we explore how teachers’ educational experience and confidence relate to civic achievement. Teachers’ educational experience relates to students’ civic achievement both at the between-country level and when analyzed within the United States. Teachers’ confidence in teaching political topics relates to students’ civic knowledge in Hungary. Neither teachers’ experience nor confidence relates to students’ civic knowledge in Finland. Further model building is suggested.

Introduction

In the 1990s, the process of democratization in many post-communist countries and the decline of youth engagement in conventional forms of citizenship such as voting in other parts of the world brought attention to the potential importance of civic education. Reports on the status of citizenship appeared in several countries (e.g. 1998 Crick Report in England; Civic Expert Group report 1994 in Australia, The National Commission on Civic Renewal in the U.S. 1998). Some of these reports promoted research on adolescents’ knowledge, attitudes and engagement, as well as curriculum policies.

While earlier research among adults found secondary school completion to be related to political knowledge and participation, evidence for specific effects of civic education in school was less clear. Analysis of research data in the 1990s demonstrated that civic education conducted in schools plays a significant role in fostering citizenship. This instruction has always been more likely to be incorporated in history or social studies courses rather than found in a separate class.
called civic education or government (Niemi & Junn, 1998; Torney-Purta, 2002). A consensus has developed that an essential route to improvement in civic learning opportunities for students is to better prepare teachers, but there has been less consensus about how that preparation should take place. This is in part because of the lack of empirical data linking the preparation of teachers to the achievement of students in areas relevant to civic education.

The research that does exist on teachers and civic education has focused on teachers’ beliefs about the subject matter and on their knowledge. There is no conceptual model delineating how teachers’ knowledge, beliefs, and sense of confidence relate to each other or (as importantly) how they relate to the extent of initial teacher preparation, to participation in continuing or in-service teacher programmes, to curriculum standards, or to the ultimate goal of student learning, however. There has been more research on teachers of mathematics and several models have been proposed, although they cannot be generalized to civic education. Stodolsky and Grossman (1995) found that mathematics was viewed by teachers as a sequential, well-defined, and relatively static subject, while social studies was not. There was less press for content coverage in social studies classes than in mathematics. Further, teachers with several college majors were likely to teach civic-related subjects and to have different training needs.

Most studies in this area have sampled students or teachers but not both together. This article begins to address this gap in the research by examining data from the IEA Civic Education Study of 14-year-olds, which presents a unique opportunity to assess these issues from several perspectives. It is possible to look at the IEA data at the country level (28 countries), at the school level (more than a hundred schools within each country), and at the student level (about 20 students in each school). Within each country participating in the IEA Civic Education Study, a representative sample of schools was drawn and a class of students within each school was also drawn randomly. At the time when the students were being tested, teachers of "civic-related subjects" who taught the tested students were asked to respond to a survey. Analyses linking teachers’ beliefs and experience to their students’ civic knowledge and attitudes, which previously were not possible, can now be conducted using this data set.

This article has two major purposes contributing to the long-term goal of identifying elements for a model of civic-related teaching, including teachers’ knowledge and their beliefs. The first purpose is to distil the wealth of information available from the IEA Civic Education Study to provide a description of teachers’ knowledge and preparation and of teachers’ beliefs about civic education in eight countries. The questionnaire administered to teachers included questions about their professional training and experiences teaching civics, beliefs about civic-related content and its place in the school curriculum. This current analysis provides more depth than was possible in the chapter on teachers in the IEA report, which dealt with twenty-six countries (Losito & Mintrop, 2001). Given the importance of cultural context in teachers’ professional development and curriculum implementation (Hahn, 1998; Kerr, 2002) we have identified a subset of countries representing regional and political differences, where a sample of teachers can be linked to the participating students and where available research can assist with the interpretation of statistical analysis. The eight countries chosen are the three English-speaking countries (Australia, England, and the United States), three of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, and Norway), and two post-Communist countries (the Czech Republic and Hungary). Our choice has also been conditioned by the wish to add to the information previously published from the IEA Study. This
is the first presentation of the data from U.S. teachers compared to other countries in
the IEA Study because data from the United States were not in the Losito and
Mintrop chapter (2001). Further, in Australia, the Czech Republic, England, and
Hungary changes in civic education systems in the 1990s might have been expected
to lead to lack of teacher confidence (one of the factors we hoped to study). Finally,
the sample of teachers in Finland was well adapted to the planned analysis of
teachers linked to students. It seemed appropriate to include two other Nordic
countries for a regional context.

The second purpose of this article is to explore how teachers’ knowledge
(measured by a degree in a civic-related subject and participation in relevant in-
service training) and teachers’ beliefs (measured by self-reported confidence in
teaching civic-related topics) relate to students’ civic knowledge. The relationships
between data from teachers and from 14-year-olds are considered at both the
between-country level (using averages for the 27 countries where teacher data were
collected) and at the within-country level in Finland, Hungary and the United States
(three countries where one civic-related teacher can be linked to each class of
students tested).

The case studies of civic education from Phase 1 of the IEA Civic Education
Study show that civic-related topics are often embedded within courses such as
history and social studies (Schwille & Amadeo, 2002). Therefore, findings from
research in these areas have been included in this research review. We begin with
teachers’ knowledge and beliefs in general and then cover knowledge and beliefs in
civic-related areas.

Teachers’ Knowledge

Teachers’ knowledge refers not to one construct, but rather to many overlapping
constructs. In an historical overview of how teachers’ knowledge has been
conceptualized since the 1960s, Turner-Bisset (2001) identified six separate types of
knowledge for teaching, ranging from knowledge of the academic subject being
taught to knowledge of how children develop. From this, and from the categories of
knowledge outlined by Shulman (1986), she then identified twelve separate
knowledge types for a model of teaching. Some of these, including beliefs about the
subject and knowledge of the self, will be discussed separately as teacher beliefs.
Others, notably content (or subject) knowledge and general pedagogical knowledge,
provide the basis for our study on the role of knowledge in instruction. Content
knowledge is identified by Shulman as the amount and organization of knowledge in
a subject area. Pedagogical content knowledge is the way of “representing and
formulating the subject that makes it comprehensible to others” (Schulman, 1986,
p.9). Researchers acknowledge that teacher education contributes to both, but they
cannot always be clearly distinguished.

It would be ideal to have separate measures of these aspects of teachers’
knowledge available for a model of effects on students, but this is unlikely in the
foreseeable future. However, the IEA Civic Education Study did ask participating
teachers about their preparatory background (both in initial and continuing
professional education). This can provide a way of examining aspects of teachers’
knowledge in order to explore a model of teachers’ preparation for citizenship
education that could be validated with observational studies.

In studies of teachers the measurement of various types of teachers’ knowledge,
most notably of content and pedagogical knowledge, has taken several forms.
Measures often relate to educational experiences, and include teachers’ knowledge of subject matter, years of teaching experience, level of education (highest degree or academic qualification obtained), degree in a content area, number of subject specific courses, subject specific in-service training, and certification in a particular content area.

There has been no large-scale representative study of the relationship of these teacher characteristics to student outcomes in citizenship (nor social studies nor history). However, a study in the United States using the 1993 Schools and Staffing Surveys examined average data from teachers in relation to their state’s average achievement scores for students in math and reading from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Darling-Hammond (2000) found a significant and positive relationship between teachers’ certification together with degree in the field to be taught (aggregated to the state level) and states’ average student achievement scores. In reviews of previous research Darling-Hammond (2000) and Goldhaber (2002) concluded that a teacher’s years of experience and level of degree were not as valid in measuring subject matter expertise as were degrees in the subject-area, courses taken in the subject, and content area certification.

Another approach to teachers’ knowledge compares novice with expert teachers. Research in this area has found that novice teachers tend to use direct instruction with emphasis on transmission of content, while experts emphasize the construction of knowledge by the learner. Experts are also well versed in disciplinary concepts, epistemology and perennial tensions between themes in the subject matter. Calderhead (1996) concluded that in planning lessons expert teachers use knowledge of subject matter, effective classroom activities, student learning and classroom context. All of these elements could be addressed in teacher preparation programmes but some could be assessed only with studies including an observational component.

**Teachers’ Knowledge related to Civic Education**

While broad consensus exists about principles of democracy (Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999; Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003), substantial disagreement exists even within a single country about the specific content of civics and social studies (Dinkelman & Hoge, 2004; Sexias, 2001). Thus assessing teachers’ knowledge base is difficult. There is some relevant research on expertise in the social sciences. In studies examining the problem-solving processes of novices and experts Voss, Tyler and Yengo (1983) and Torney-Purta (1992) found that those who have better organized knowledge were better able to address social science issues thoughtfully and more likely to seek information before making judgements. Wineburg (1991) explored the processes used by novices (high school students) and experts (historians) as they read historical text sources. Historians were more likely to employ complex strategies of corroboration, contextualization, and sourcing.

In a study of 60 expert and novice U.S. History teachers (identified by supervisors) Torff (2003) found that experts were significantly more likely to present lessons focused on higher order thinking skills and less likely to emphasize content for content’s sake. Factors such age, years of experience, overall educational attainment, subject matter studies and pedagogical studies were not consistently associated with the teachers’ levels of expertise, however.

A few studies have linked coursework in social science with teachers’ knowledge. Dinkelman and Hoge (2004) found that a course in politics, government, and citizenship produced gains in civic content knowledge and confidence to teach selected topics among preparatory teachers, but the results did not show them...
achieving disciplinary expertise. Interviews with 18 social studies teachers about their concepts of justice and their teaching about justice led Makler (1994) to conclude that teachers’ reluctance to present criteria for evaluating theories of justice resulted from teachers’ insecurity with their academic preparation.

An exploratory study of four Australian teachers examined how their knowledge and beliefs influenced the implementation of a unit developed to address recommendations for civics laid out by a governmental expert panel. Dunkin, Welch, Merritt, Phillips and Craven (1998) concluded that teachers’ knowledge in areas where they had little expertise (such as the knowledge covered in this new unit) was influenced by self-initiated study that the teachers undertook prior to teaching the unit to students. While the teachers’ quick study provided them with basic knowledge, some factual errors were also noted. Decisions about what content knowledge should receive emphasis in classroom instruction were also influenced by teachers’ beliefs about individual students’ understanding, other educational objectives such as students’ involvement, or the community context. Despite the exploratory nature of this study it is notable because it links teachers’ knowledge with their classroom practice in a framework of government recommendations and professional development for a civic-related subject area.

Teachers’ Beliefs

The IEA Civic Education Study also asked participating teachers about their confidence to teach a list of civic-related concepts and about their attitudes towards citizenship education. Both attitudes towards citizenship education and confidence to teach it have been found to relate more to teachers’ beliefs about themselves as teachers and about the subject matter, rather than to their knowledge. Interviews with teachers in North America (Cole & Knowles, 1993) and Finland (Virta, 2002) have demonstrated that many attitudes towards subject matter develop prior to formal teacher education, while confidence in themselves as teachers develops during experiences in the classroom. This is in contrast to knowledge, which was shown in the previous section to be related to formal, subject-specific training. The review of research below corroborates that both teachers’ beliefs and knowledge, are important elements of a comprehensive model of teaching.

Pajares’ (1992) review of research indicated that teachers’ beliefs shape their classroom practices. However, despite a substantial amount of subsequent research, firm conclusions about the nature of the relationship between teachers’ beliefs, classroom practice, and student learning have not been drawn (Calderhead, 1996; Richardson, 1996). Beliefs are defined in different ways. Here we have focused on teachers’ beliefs about civic-related subject matter and about the effect of teaching civics on student learning, sometimes referred to as efficacy or confidence. Distinctions can be made between beliefs about the impact teaching in general has on students’ learning and beliefs that one can personally impact students’ learning. The majority of studies have considered general teacher efficacy using self-report measures (Labone, 2004) and have linked it to student outcomes such as students’ achievement in language arts and social studies and students’ motivation (Anderson Greene, and Loewen, 1988). Teacher efficacy has also been linked to teaching practices such as use of varied instructional activities (Fives, 2003).
Teachers’ Beliefs Related to Civic Education

Across and within cultural contexts it is apparent that teachers construct multiple models of citizenship. In some cases, teachers’ conceptions are inconsistent with models laid out by social studies researchers, national associations, education ministries, or community groups. In other cases, teachers’ conceptions closely reflect the national political discourse on citizenship.

In a cross-national study of teachers’ beliefs about citizenship, researchers in England (Davies, Gregory, & Riley, 1999), Australia (Prior, 1999), Russia, China, Hong Kong and the United States (Fouts & Lee, 2005) analyzed survey data from non-representative samples of teachers including their concepts of citizenship, their beliefs about influences on civic development, their views of threats to good citizenship and their perceptions of relevant classroom activities. Teachers across countries identified the social dimensions of citizenship as the most important (Fouts & Lee, 2005). In a closer review of teachers’ responses in England, Davies and his colleagues (1999) found conceptual differences between novice and experienced teachers and suggested different opportunities for professional development for each group. Initial teacher preparation programmes might provide student teachers with opportunities to tap relevant background knowledge or explore cross-curricular links. Experiences could be provided for practising teachers to gain knowledge of the community in which they teach or to integrate professional development into the school environment (Davies et al., 1999).

Prior (1999) found that Australian teachers, parents, and students were likely to endorse social aspects of citizenship and believed in the value of an approach to citizenship based on community consensus. These beliefs were not fully consistent with the policy outlines prepared by the Australian government, stressing a focus on historical and legal events in Australian history. Social studies teachers in Australia were more likely than other teachers to identify active orientation for citizenship and civic understanding (e.g. knowledge of current events or government) as important qualities of a good citizen. The emphasis on social aspects of citizenship supported by teachers, parents, and students was at odds with the formal curriculum.

Arnot and her colleagues’ (1996) analysis of focus group discussions and interviews with student teachers from England, Wales, Greece, Spain and Portugal found that they had difficulty explicitly defining the concept of citizenship and listing the characteristics of a ‘good citizen.’ However, it was possible to discern dimensions of citizenship present in their remarks that mapped onto more formal democratic theories. The student teachers’ concepts of citizenship were grounded in their cultural context. For example, student teachers in Greece and Portugal described possibilities for civic involvement, whereas student teachers from England and Wales focused on citizens as sceptics or on the effects of the state on people’s lives. Interestingly, these patterns also map onto the findings from the IEA Study, showing that adolescents in Greece and Portugal were considerably more positive about involvement than those in England or other parts of Northern Europe (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001).

Other studies suggest that while individual teachers hold different concepts of citizenship, teachers’ beliefs overall reflect national debates on the topic. Anderson and colleagues (1997) conducted a pilot study in one U.S. state and a larger study of teachers from a national professional organization for social studies teachers. There were differences in perspective by region, and between primary and secondary teachers. Four models were identified among the national sample: critical thinking, legalism, cultural pluralism and assimilationism. These reflected tensions in national
curricular debates about citizenship. In dealing with cultural pluralism, teachers were reluctant to deal with institutional inequalities. Wilkins (2001) found similar reluctance among students in a Post Certificate programme in England.

The Influence of Conceptual Beliefs about Subject Matter on Practice

A growing number of case studies indicate that teachers’ beliefs are varied and lead to differentiated instruction (Armento, 1996). However, the studies that have examined teachers’ beliefs and students’ understanding in social studies have been scattered in their methodologies, the context in which they were conducted, the teachers’ level of experience, and the specific subject matter investigated. They have often used very small samples.

In a case study following two preservice teachers from their social studies methods course through their first year of teaching Johnston (1990) found that the methods course and certification programme influenced the two teachers in “partial and differential” ways dependent on their beliefs and their comfort with different teaching practices. Schugurensky and Myers (2003) found evidence in an interview study of Canadian teachers for a life-long and life-wide process of acquiring the beliefs about society and political participation that were reflected in teaching civic-related topics. Wineburg and Wilson (1991) found some common beliefs about interpretation in history, textbook use and instructional strategies for two experienced history teachers who displayed very different teaching practices ranging from the teacher playing a largely invisible role during a student debate to a largely teacher-centred discussion. Bickmore (1991) found in observational case studies of four social studies teachers that their approaches to teaching about conflict depended on their conception of citizenship education. In case studies from the United States and Hungary, Cornett (1990, 2003) reported that teachers’ personal or practical theories influenced instruction. In a study of novice social studies teachers, Wilson and Wineburg (1988) found that beliefs about subject matter related to the teacher’s undergraduate degree were associated with differences in instruction such as an emphasis on facts versus interpretation. Varied beliefs about ways to define a subject can also lead to different types of planning. John (1991) found that British preparatory teachers in geography did not hold shared definitions of the subject and were more heterogeneous in planning than teachers in mathematics.

Other case studies demonstrate that classroom context can interact with teachers’ conceptual beliefs to influence instruction. The observed practices of three elementary teachers led VanSledright and Grant (1994) to conclude that concepts of citizenship education affected both explicit and implicit practices. Furthermore, they found that other dilemmas such as conflicts about content coverage, teacher-student authority and time demands also influenced the ways in which citizenship education was implemented. Merryfield’s (1998) classroom observations of teachers of world studies in one state also showed that teachers’ backgrounds and beliefs interacted in complex ways with student characteristics to produce different topic coverage and types of classroom instruction.

These small sample observational studies give some evidence that teachers’ beliefs shape classroom practices. The nature of this effect is influenced by factors such as teachers’ knowledge of student needs or curriculum content standards (Torney-Purta & Vermeer, 2004)
Information about Teachers from the First Phase of the IEA Civic Education Study

The IEA Civic Education Study of 14-year-olds (1994–1998) consisted of two phases, the first a more qualitative set of case studies and the second a quantitative test and survey administered to nearly 90,000 students in 28 countries. These case studies from the first phase provided contextual information for constructing the instruments and interpreting teachers’ experience and confidence as well as the student tests and surveys. For analysis within and across countries of Phase 1 data, see Torney-Purta, Schwille, and Amadeo (1999) and Steiner-Khamsi, Torney-Purta, and Schwille (2002).

The case studies for the countries selected for this analysis indicated that the majority of teachers providing instruction in civic-related subjects had their initial training in history or social studies (Mintrop, 2002; Torney-Purta et al., 1999). Most reported more years of teaching experience than years teaching civics, indicating that somewhere in their career they began teaching civic content. Teachers in the post-Communist countries were likely to have begun teaching civics relatively late in their careers.

The degree of confidence teachers reported about teaching civics varied as a result of their experiences and the cultural context (see individual chapters in Torney-Purta, et al., 1999). For example, substantial numbers of pre-service teachers in England did not feel comfortable teaching civic content because of the lack of its emphasis in the national curriculum in force in the mid-1990s. Teachers in Hungary reported reluctance to discuss sensitive issues in class for fear of the appearance of bias. The emphasis on theoretical aspects of civic education in initial training, combined with a shift to democratic principles from Marxist-Leninist ideas, presented challenges to teachers in the Czech Republic. Some teachers in the United States noted that they drew on personal experiences rather than academic training when teaching civics. Overall the teachers in Finland appeared to have relatively high levels of confidence about teaching civics, and the very large majority had a master’s level degree.

Data from the IEA Teacher Survey in the Context of the Phase 2 Study

The test and survey administered to students in Phase 2 was built on the case studies and research in a range of fields (see Appendix A for background about the study). A sampling referee met with each National Research Coordinator to design the sampling plan, designate strata and draw a random selection of schools and a class within each school (see Schulz & Sibbers, 2004). In 1999 teachers were administered a survey in 27 of the 28 countries that surveyed 14-year-olds (not in Colombia). In each school where students were tested between one and three teachers were identified who taught subjects such as government, national history, social studies, and social sciences and were asked to fill out the Teacher Survey by the national coordinating team. While it was preferred that the three sampled teachers could be linked to the class of students who filled out the survey (i.e., they taught these students), other teachers of civic-related disciplines were surveyed if one or more teachers could not be linked to the tested class. The student samples were nationally representative; the samples of teachers were not.

Once teachers were identified, they were administered a survey about their teaching background and methods, their experience and confidence in teaching various civic-related topics, and their attitudes towards civic education at school.
Losito and Mintrop (2001) provide additional information on how teachers were selected for surveying, as well as an overview.

We focus our analysis on teachers’ background knowledge (initial educational preparation for teaching and subsequent professional development experience) and on their beliefs about civic education (confidence about teaching civic-related topics). Teacher efficacy has been linked to student outcomes but has not received much attention in research on civic education. The IEA survey of teachers had two sections relating to teacher efficacy. The first section assessed the degree to which teachers believe civic education makes a difference for students and matters to the country. Nearly 90 percent of the students had teachers who agreed or strongly agreed that teaching civic education makes a difference for students’ political and civic development and that schools play an important role in this development.

The IEA teacher survey provided some items that measured teachers’ personal efficacy by gauging their confidence to teach about civic-related topics. Having confidence about a topic may be related to the ability to convey information to students. The average level of confidence across topics is fairly high across the countries selected for this analysis.

This analysis explores the results of the teacher survey in several new ways. First, we present descriptive analyses of both the linked and the non-linked teachers in the eight countries we selected. Second, we summarize results from exploratory factor analyses, which we have used to identify dimensions underlying teachers’ beliefs about civic education. Third, we compute average teacher scores in each country and relate them to an average student knowledge score at the country level. Finally, in three countries we relate teachers’ responses to questions about their educational experience and their confidence to their students’ civic knowledge with a scale developed from student data using Item Response Theory and reported in publications focusing on student results (Torney-Purta et al., 2001 and Torney-Purta & Richardson, 2004).

Selection of Variables from the Teacher Survey

We divided the variables from the teacher survey to be analyzed into three categories. First, we defined teacher experience in terms of professional education and training. The two questions are whether the teacher holds an academic degree in a civic-related discipline, and whether the teacher has participated in in-service professional development activities in a discipline related to social studies or civic education. We formed a three-point composite experience score for this descriptive analysis (1 = participation in neither activity, 2 = either holds a civic-related degree or has participated in in-service professional development, 3 = both holds a civic-related degree and in-service professional development experience).

The second group of variables captured teachers’ confidence in teaching civic-related subjects. Losito and Mintrop analyzed teachers’ confidence by computing average ratings in a way that did not allow an analysis of topics by countries. In a more differentiated approach, we used exploratory factor analysis in each of the eight countries and extracted two separate factors that appear to underlie teachers’ confidence in teaching civic topics. We created composites to measure each of these two types of confidence. The first, labelled “confidence in teaching political topics,” averages teachers’ confidence in teaching about citizens’ rights, conceptions of democracy, the national constitution, elections, and the judicial system (Cronbach’s alphas, which measure the reliability of scales, range from .65 to .93 in each country). The second, “confidence in teaching social topics,” averages teachers’
confidence in teaching about equal opportunities, cultural differences, and the media (Cronbach’s alphas range from .60 to .84). Each composite is a scale of 1 to 4, 1 indicating that the teacher strongly disagreed with all items and 4 indicating that they strongly agreed with all items. We emphasize confidence in teaching political topics because of its higher reliabilities and because political topics were heavily covered in the students’ test and likely to be prescribed for coverage by national curricula.

The third and final category of teacher survey items examines teachers’ attitudes towards civic education. Three sets of attitude items are discussed here. The first assesses teachers’ beliefs that consensus exists in how civic topics should be taught in school. Included are items related to how teachers should teach (e.g., according to standards), as well as whether a country’s political and social context allows consensus about civic education. The second asks teachers whether they believe that civic education in schools makes a difference in students’ development or for the country. The third asks teachers where they believe civic education belongs in the school programme (e.g., as a separate subject, integrated into subjects). All items and the importance composite are on a scale of 1 to 4.

In the descriptive analysis we computed average scores of the items and composites previously identified for each of eight countries. In order to give further context, we described how countries’ average levels of teachers’ education experience and confidence related to the average levels of civic knowledge possessed by students in all twenty-seven countries where teacher data were available. Because the averages in both types of descriptive analysis included both teachers who were and were not linked to students, these data were not weighted.

A Descriptive Analysis of Teachers’ Educational Preparation and Beliefs in Eight Countries

Several aspects of teachers and their beliefs or attitudes are of particular interest. First is the extent of their professional preparation (both in initial or pre-service phases and through in-service training). The education and training systems differ a great deal in different countries in what is available and what is required (and in the extent to which older teachers have had the same opportunities as younger ones). There are also differences in the extent of overlap between what is covered in the teachers’ education and the content knowledge they are expected to teach.

In Australia, Denmark, Finland, England, Hungary and the United States more than seventy-five percent of the teachers reported that they took their degree in a civic-related discipline (including history) (Table I). In contrast, only about 55 percent of the teachers in the Czech Republic, and Norway completed their initial or pre-service preparation with a degree in a civic-related subject. The extent of in-service experience also varied. In Denmark, one hundred percent of the teachers reported this experience, ranging down to 7 percent in Norway. We do not know, however, the nature of the training offered.

Teachers were asked to rate their confidence in teaching a number of specific topics. Two composites were formed – one of confidence or perceived efficacy in teaching about political topics (such as the constitution or the judicial system) and the other about social topics (such as cultural diversity and the media) (Table I). Overall the greatest confidence in teaching about political topics was found among teacher respondents in Australia, Finland, and the United States. The lowest confidence in teaching about political topics was found among respondents in the Czech Republic, England, Hungary, and Norway. Three of the countries with high
confidence were those where responding teachers had high levels of education and training. The low confidence among teachers in the Czech Republic and Hungary may result from recent massive changes in the curriculum to meet the demands of post-Communist civic education. Changes making civic education a statutory subject in England were in the planning stage at the time the teachers answered these questions. Their lack of confidence may have been in response to a situation in flux where they were uncertain about what would be required of them in the near future. In Norway the low confidence may be attributable to lack of in-service education and to a relatively low percentage of teachers holding a degree in the subject area.

Table I - Teachers’ Educational Preparation by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% with degree in civic-related discipline</th>
<th>% with participation in civic-related training</th>
<th>Avg. experience composite score</th>
<th>Confidence in teaching political topics</th>
<th>Confidence in teaching social topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.5 (.7)</td>
<td>3.0 (.6)</td>
<td>3.2 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.0 (.8)</td>
<td>2.8 (.5)</td>
<td>3.0 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8 (.4)</td>
<td>2.9 (.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.4 (.6)</td>
<td>2.5 (.8)</td>
<td>2.9 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.6 (.6)</td>
<td>3.0 (.5)</td>
<td>2.8 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.1 (.6)</td>
<td>2.8 (.4)</td>
<td>2.7 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7 (.6)</td>
<td>2.8 (.4)</td>
<td>3.0 (.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.6 (.6)</td>
<td>3.1 (.7)</td>
<td>3.2 (.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The first two columns contain percentages and the last three columns contain means (on a 4 point scale). Standard errors of the means are in parentheses.

Teachers expressed comparable levels of confidence in teaching political and social topics except in England. English teachers were considerably more confident about social topics than about political topics, perhaps because for many years prior to this survey in 1999 they had not been expected to teach political topics, while they addressed social topics in subjects such as personal and social education, religious education, geography and history. In Australia and the United States teachers were relatively confident about teaching both political and social topics. Hungarian teachers were confident about teaching neither political nor social topics. Teachers in the Czech Republic were slightly more confident about social than about political topics. Finnish teachers were the opposite – more confident about teaching political than social topics.

Responding teachers in most of the countries agreed that civic education has the potential to make a difference for students and for the country (Table II). Schools are not irrelevant in developing students’ citizenship competencies, according to most respondents. Teachers in the United States, which has a long tradition of education
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for citizenship, were the most convinced about the value of civic education; teachers in the Czech Republic were the least convinced.

An interesting item about teachers’ and students’ power asked whether teachers should negotiate with students about learning (Table III). Norwegian teachers were the most likely to agree, with teachers from Denmark and Finland also responding in a positive way. Teachers in the Czech Republic and the United States were least likely to want to share this power with students. These were also the countries where teachers believed that teaching to meet curricular standards was especially important, giving little opportunity for student input.

Table II - Teachers’ Beliefs about the Importance of Citizenship by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Civic Ed. makes a difference for students’ development</th>
<th>Civic Ed. at school matters a great deal to our country</th>
<th>Schools are irrelevant for the development of students’ citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3.2 (.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (.6)</td>
<td>1.7 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2.6 (.7)</td>
<td>2.9 (.6)</td>
<td>1.8 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3.1 (.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (.6)</td>
<td>1.6 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>3.1 (.5)</td>
<td>3.0 (.6)</td>
<td>1.7 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3.2 (.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (.6)</td>
<td>1.6 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3.2 (.5)</td>
<td>2.8 (.7)</td>
<td>1.7 (.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3.3 (.5)</td>
<td>3.2 (.5)</td>
<td>1.7 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3.4 (.5)</td>
<td>3.4 (.5)</td>
<td>1.6 (.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All columns contain means (on a 4 point scale). Standard errors of the means are in parentheses.

Civic-related material is not taught in a vacuum. Responding teachers in three of the countries where there had been recent changes in prescriptions for civic education (Australia, England and Hungary) agreed that "changes have been so rapid in recent years that teachers often do not know what to teach" (Table III). Teachers in Hungary were likely to disagree with an item about the existence of a consensus in society about what should be taught in this area. Teachers in England and Hungary were likely to subscribe to the belief that "there cannot be agreement on what should be taught in civic education." Responding teachers in England were also substantially less likely than those in the other countries to agree that "teachers should teach according to standards," perhaps because they were unsure what those standards were likely to be or because of a tradition of teachers’ independence in curriculum decisions.

As for the place of civic education in the curriculum, the integration of these topics in the social sciences or social studies was favored in every country except the Czech Republic (where a separate subject was preferred). Integrating civic education into all subject matters was not preferred in any of these eight countries.
Table III - Teachers’ Views of the Source of Content in Civic Education by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Broad consensus in our society about content</th>
<th>Teachers should negotiate with students</th>
<th>Teachers should teach according to standards</th>
<th>There cannot be agreement on what should be taught in civic ed.</th>
<th>Changes have been so rapid in recent years that teachers often do not know what to teach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2.4 (.7)</td>
<td>2.5 (.7)</td>
<td>2.9 (.7)</td>
<td>2.1 (.7)</td>
<td>2.5 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2.5 (.6)</td>
<td>2.1 (.7)</td>
<td>3.1 (.5)</td>
<td>1.9 (.5)</td>
<td>2.2 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2.2 (.7)</td>
<td>2.7 (.6)</td>
<td>2.8 (.7)</td>
<td>2.1 (.7)</td>
<td>2.4 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2.4 (.7)</td>
<td>2.4 (.7)</td>
<td>2.5 (.7)</td>
<td>2.4 (.7)</td>
<td>2.7 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2.5 (.6)</td>
<td>2.6 (.6)</td>
<td>2.8 (.5)</td>
<td>2.0 (.6)</td>
<td>2.2 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1.8 (.5)</td>
<td>2.4 (.7)</td>
<td>2.8 (.6)</td>
<td>2.2 (.6)</td>
<td>2.5 (.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2.4 (.6)</td>
<td>3.0 (.5)</td>
<td>2.8 (.5)</td>
<td>2.1 (.6)</td>
<td>2.1 (.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.6 (.7)</td>
<td>2.1 (.6)</td>
<td>3.1 (.5)</td>
<td>2.0 (.6)</td>
<td>2.3 (.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All columns contain means (on a 4 point scale). Standard errors of the means are in parentheses.

Relationships between Teachers’ Educational Experience and Students’ Civic Knowledge across Twenty-seven Countries

In order to give a context for the analysis of teachers linked to students in three countries, Figure 1 presents a scatter plot which shows the relationship at the country level between average level of teacher education completed in each country (measured by the composite experience variable) and students’ average score on the 38-item civic knowledge test. The 27 countries are the units of analysis. The correlation coefficient that corresponds to this scatter plot is .456, with an N of 27 countries significant at the .01 level.

Countries where the teacher experience composite was high were countries where the students’ average knowledge scores were also high (for example, Poland, Finland, and the United States). The country where students had the lowest civic knowledge score, Chile, also had the lowest level of teacher educational experience. Cyprus and Hong Kong had average student knowledge scores that were higher than would be expected on the basis of teacher preparation. In contrast, Romanian teachers in the study had relatively high levels of educational experience, but their students performed relatively poorly on the test. Perhaps there was a substantial disconnect between the education offered in the degree programmes in which these teachers studied and the knowledge covered in the curriculum in 1999.

This analysis suggests that increasing the extent of teachers’ preparation in civic-related subject matter could be a viable strategy to improve students’ civic knowledge. Analysis that cannot be included in this paper because of space limitations indicated that there is no significant relationship at the country level between extent of teachers’ educational preparation and students’ expectations that
they will vote. There is, however, a significant relationship at the country level between teachers’ confidence in teaching political topics and the likelihood of students expecting to vote.

Figure 1 - Relationship between Teacher Experience and Student Civic Knowledge at the Country Level

Relationships between Teachers’ Educational Experience/Confidence and Students’ Knowledge within Three Countries

Our most important analysis investigates whether teachers’ experience and confidence in teaching civic-related subjects relates to their students’ civic knowledge and attitudes when analyzed within countries. In order to address this question, we performed a series of multilevel regression analyses using Hierarchical Linear Modeling software (HLM: see Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, & Congdon, 2002). Using HLM allowed us to properly estimate the effects of both students’ and teachers’ characteristics on students’ civic knowledge. The analysis is very similar to an ordinary regression analysis in its design, but it allows us to take into account that students are nested within teachers’ classrooms. The purpose of these analyses is to explore how teachers’ confidence and experience influence the students that they teach in order to formulate more extensive models for future research.

This analysis focused on students and teachers in Finland, Hungary, and the United States. In the data from these countries, there is generally one teacher per school linked to the class of students surveyed, allowing for an estimate of the
effects of the classroom teacher’s characteristics on students’ civic knowledge. Classes of students were linked to one teacher each, and all teachers reported that they taught the class of students. However, we do not have information on the particular subject that these teachers taught (e.g., history, social studies, civics). The sample of linked teachers included 138 teachers in Finland, 149 teachers in Hungary, and 71 teachers in the United States. The average number of students per linked teacher was 19 in Finland, 21 in Hungary, and 23 in the United States. Because teachers were linked to students, and the student data were nationally representative, these data were weighted using the weighting factors included in the IEA Civic Education data set (see Schulz & Sibberns, 2004). Appendix B contains more information on teacher selection in each country.

Students’ civic knowledge was the outcome explored in this analysis. The civic knowledge scale assesses students’ content knowledge and interpretive skills measured by the IEA Civic Education Study with a 38-item test. The scale is set to have a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 20 across all twenty-eight countries. The intraclass correlations (ICCs) [1] calculated in HLM indicate that while only 8% of the variance in students’ civic knowledge exists between classrooms in Finland, over a quarter of the variance in scores exists at this level in the other two countries (26% in Hungary, 30% in the United States).

Two sets of multilevel analyses were performed for each country. The first used teachers’ previous experience in civic education to predict their students’ civic knowledge. Teacher experience was measured using a series of dichotomous variables (“dummy variables”): whether the teacher holds a degree in a civic-related discipline (but has no professional development experience), whether the teacher has had civic-related professional development experience (but no civic-related degree), or whether the teacher has both a degree and professional development experience. The group of teachers with neither type of experience acted as the reference category (and the mean scores for this group appear in the first column of the Table). The dummy-coded variables at the teacher level were centred on their means across all teachers. The second analysis used a re-coded version of teachers’ ratings of their confidence in teaching political topics to predict student outcomes. We chose this scale because of the focus on political topics in the civic knowledge test. Teachers were designated as having confidence in teaching political topics if they scored 3 or above on each scale, meaning that they agreed that they have confidence in all topics in each scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Civics Achievement</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>% Between-Class variance accounted for by Books in Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each model also controlled for the number of books that students reported having at home, common in IEA analysis to control for home educational resources. The control variable was included both at the student level and at the classroom level. Including this variable in the analysis allows us to account for differences between classrooms in the average educational resources available to students at home, as
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well as to control for the effects of being in a classroom with a certain level of home resources. A summary of the proportion of between-class variance explained by home resources is found along with a summary of intraclass correlations in Table IV. All the analyses attempted to explain classroom-level variance in student outcomes after controlling for students’ home resources and classes’ average levels of home resources.

Table V - Difference in Students’ Civic Knowledge IRT Scores by Teachers’ Type of Civic Training in the United States

|teachers' educational experience related to students’ civic knowledge only in the United States (Table V). After controlling for home resources, U.S. teachers’ professional development experience related positively to students’ civic knowledge. In particular, students who had teachers with in-service professional development experience but no degree had civic knowledge scores that were a half of a standard deviation above those of students who had teachers with neither degree nor in-service, a statistically significant and relatively substantial effect. The effect of having a teacher with both in-service professional development and a degree was also significant. Students of these teachers had civic knowledge scores that were approximately one-third of a standard deviation higher than students of teachers with neither type of experience. Students of teachers who held a degree in the subject but had no in-service professional development did not differ from students of teachers with neither type of experience. In the analysis over all the categories, experience accounted for 1% of the between-classroom variance in civic knowledge (after controlling for home resources). The teacher educational experience variables did not predict civic knowledge in Finland or Hungary.

Table VI - Difference in Students’ Civic Knowledge IRT Scores by Teachers’ Confidence in Teaching Political Topics in Hungary

The analysis relating teachers’ confidence in teaching political topics to student knowledge produced significant results in only one country, Hungary (Table VI).
Having a teacher with high confidence in teaching political topics had a small but significant positive effect on students’ civic achievement, with a difference in average civic knowledge scores of one-tenth of a standard deviation. In the analysis across categories, teachers’ confidence explains 4% of the remaining between-classroom variance in student achievement scores. Teacher confidence did not predict civic knowledge in Finland or the United States.

After taking into consideration differences in home resources, it appears that teachers’ experience and confidence influence students’ civic knowledge outcomes in certain cases. To summarize our analyses of these IEA data collected in 1999:

- Neither teacher experience nor teacher confidence in teaching political topics was significantly related to student knowledge in Finland. This may reflect Finland’s emphasis on providing all students with similar learning experiences, and mirrors the results of analyses of PISA data (Gorard and Smith, 2004). This characteristic of Finnish education may also explain the low between-classroom variability in student civic knowledge scores, and the smaller effect of controlling for home resources, when compared to Hungary and the United States.
- In the United States teachers’ educational experience, but not teachers’ confidence, appears to influence student knowledge to a significant degree. While the overall impact of teacher experience on civic knowledge appears small after the effects of home background have been accounted for, the effects of in-service professional development on civic knowledge scores appear relatively sizeable.
- In Hungary, teachers’ confidence but not teachers’ educational experience seems to impact students’ knowledge. Students who have teachers with high confidence in their ability to teach political topics had higher civic knowledge scores.
- In Hungary and the United States over half of the variability in average knowledge scores between classrooms was related to the average level of home resources of the students in the classrooms. While teachers’ experience and confidence appear to influence their students, they work in tandem with many other factors, some of which could be assessed only in multi-method studies.

**Discussion**

This examination of aspects of teachers’ experience and beliefs can be related to previous research and can also be projected into future investigations. We have extended the findings from other subject areas by demonstrating that civic-related in-service experiences and civic-related degrees relate to students’ civic knowledge. This was true on an average level across countries and also within one of the three countries that we examined closely, the United States. This strengthens arguments for assigning teachers to subject areas in which they are prepared and providing in-service training which focuses on topics relevant to civic education (Carnegie Corporation and CIRCLE, 2003).

The absence of significant relationships between teachers’ educational preparation and students’ knowledge in the other two countries examined closely suggest that preparation may operate differently across contexts. In Finland almost 90% of the teachers who completed the IEA survey have degrees in civic-related subjects. The mean number of years they have been teaching is 15, and the mean number of years teaching civic education subjects is 14. These are, for the most part,
individuals who have spent their entire careers learning how to teach in this particular area. They believe that good instruction makes a difference, both for students and for the country. As other international studies have found, Finnish curriculum and instruction succeed very well in raising students to a high level of performance regardless of their socioeconomic background. The level of training that most teachers have is sufficient to foster high levels of student performance, and this may be the reason that we find no systematic variation associated with teachers having somewhat more or less educational preparation.

The situation in Hungary appears to be different. Teachers have been teaching on average for 19 years, but 13 years is the average time they have been teaching civic-related subjects. Many who have a degree in a relevant field completed it under the Communist system, before massive governmental and curricular changes. Teachers appear to be concerned about the rapidity of changes and whether there is sufficient consensus in society to teach without being accused of bias.

Results across these countries indicate that the relationship between civic-related degree programme and professional development and students’ civic knowledge is impacted to some extent by whether programmes are consistent with the curriculum on which students are assessed, the cultural context, or the concerns of teachers. The IEA Civic Education Study’s assessment of students’ knowledge was quite consistent with the concepts emphasized and very consistent with methods of assessing knowledge in the United States. Teacher preparation in the United States has not faced massive shifts and appears to be relatively well aligned with expectations for students. This may explain why the predictions of students’ knowledge scores by teacher’s educational preparation are significant in the United States. Making sure that all teachers have access to civic-related training appears a viable strategy in the United States. In the other two countries, the picture is less clear.

Hungarian teachers in this study were low among the eight countries in their confidence in teaching about political and social topics. It is notable in Hungary that the individual teacher’s level of confidence in teaching political topics was related to students’ knowledge. What we do not know is whether this pattern is common across the post-Communist countries. In countries where average confidence is higher, such as the United States and Finland, differences between individual teachers in confidence don’t seem to make a difference in students’ knowledge.

Something to keep in mind is that the combination of qualities that teachers need in order to foster knowledge on the part of students are more complex than confidence alone. The measure of confidence may be tapping teachers’ assessment of their personal abilities, but this confidence may not always translate into effectively helping students construct their own understanding. Careful consideration of this would require observational studies.

The overall conclusion is that the context of a country, both the history of its political system and the extent to which teachers’ preparation is consistent with the beliefs of the public and curricular policies governing education, are important components defining the effectiveness of educational programmes designed to raise teachers’ content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge (as well as their confidence in teaching about civic-related topics).

The analyses in this article should stimulate at least one activity that goes beyond the IEA Study: that is, to begin to develop a model with cross-national validity for assessing teachers’ knowledge and beliefs and for guiding educational or intervention programmes to improve teacher quality in civic education. These programmes need to be at the initial or pre-service and at the in-service or
continuing education levels, and they need to be tailored to particular cultural settings. These include post-Communist countries with both strong and weak academic systems and countries where certain economic, racial or language groups are likely by age 14 to have little knowledge and little motivation to participate, to give only two examples.

Implications for Teachers’ Professional Development

The results of our analyses suggest that initial teacher preparation and subsequent professional development influence students’ civic knowledge in some circumstances. The reason for the inconsistent effects across countries may lie in differences in the character or quality of teacher preparation and in-service programmes.

Previous research suggests the need for professional development focused on the ability to articulate the principles underlying citizenship and civic education (Davies et al., 1999). The current combination of initial preparation and in-service programmes may not be sufficient to produce subject area expertise among teachers. Valli and Stout (2004) note that in-service programmes in the United States tend to focus on generic teaching methods, innovative technologies or new curriculum materials. Other research suggests that merely introducing teachers to new curriculum materials will not produce dramatic changes in instruction. Dunkin and his collaborators (1998) concluded that presenting new materials prompted teachers to initiate self-study to enhance their own knowledge, but these short-term efforts did not lead to substantial improvements in the teachers’ subject knowledge or in their presentation of the information to students. The ways in which teachers develop their confidence about teaching and relevant content expertise is related to personal experience and context as well as to professional development programmes.

Some research has found that teachers’ content knowledge can be enhanced through the use of professional development that is aligned with both school context and teachers’ professional needs. For example, a large-scale study of professional development in mathematics and science in the United States found that an emphasis on enhancing teachers’ content knowledge through reform-oriented activities that were aligned with other school reforms had positive effects on teachers’ knowledge, skills and classroom practice (Valli & Stout, 2004). The alignment of professional development with school reform efforts seems well suited to the nature of citizenship education.

Another approach for enhancing teachers’ knowledge would be to facilitate cooperation between teacher preparation programmes and academic fields such as the politically-related disciplines. This could help increase the number of teachers of civic-related subjects who have experienced in-depth study of civic concepts. Teachers’ engagement in research in their classrooms or in the development of citizenship curriculum or standards may be strategies to stimulate reflection by teachers.

Our analyses also confirm previous calls for teacher preparation programmes in citizenship education to be developed within specific cultural and educational contexts (Hahn, 1998; Kerr, 2002). The descriptive analysis presented for eight countries demonstrates that responding teachers hold different views about the place of civic education in the curriculum and the level of consensus within the country about content relating to citizenship. The different relationship of teacher experience and confidence to student civic knowledge revealed from our detailed analysis in
Teachers’ Educational Experience

Finland, Hungary and the United States illustrates the importance of context. One way to gain more understanding about the role context plays in the development of teacher confidence would be to expand the concept of teacher efficacy to include tasks and settings outside the classroom. This could include efficacy to create a positive school climate or efficacy to enlist community involvement (Labone, 2004). Such a contextual approach to efficacy is especially relevant because there is consensus across countries that citizenship education extends beyond the boundaries of a single subject (Torney-Purta et al., 1999).

Directions for Future Research

In a number of the countries that participated in the IEA Civic Education Study a substantial degree of effort has been devoted to the development and implementation of new teacher education programmes in citizenship education. Empirical studies examining the qualities and outcomes of these programmes could provide a wealth of information for future development of a model of teacher preparation. For example, Davies and his colleagues (1999) identified several promising programmes in their review of civic-related teacher education in England. The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study in England, initiated following the establishment of Citizenship Education as a new statutory subject in 2002, expects to identify many of the elements of teaching contributing to strong programmes (Kerr, in press). A cohort of 18,000 young people is being surveyed in years 7, 9, 11 and 13 by this study. More than 300 teachers are also being interviewed, and 20 case studies based on school visits are planned. Clusters of schools are being analyzed on the basis of instructional delivery, ways in which achievement is recognized, students’ involvement in classes, and democracy in school.

A number of universities in Hungary have implemented a programme offering a civic education minor to pre-service teachers (Setenyi, 2003) while the Center for Civic Education has established a number of Hungarian programmes (Pepper, 2003).

While the IEA Civic Education national case studies provided some information about teacher preparation programmes, more detailed and current cross-national data could provide insight for identifying the essential components of such programmes. A study of this type has been conducted in mathematics and science among the countries participating in IEA’s Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), and has presented valuable suggestions about improving teacher preparation (Wang, Coleman, Coley, & Phelps, 2003).

It would be efficient to use existing data to further examine the influence of teachers’ characteristics on their students’ achievement, as well as to frame the development of measures for future studies. For example, in the United States, data on teachers of civic-related subjects could be extracted from the national Schools and Staffing Surveys and linked to student achievement on the National Assessment for Education Progress in Civics (if state-level data becomes available).

There are opportunities within the IEA data set for additional analysis, for example extending the within-country models beyond the three countries examined here. Countries where teachers’ confidence is low or where there has been recent decentralization of educational authority may be of special interest in understanding the context of civic education. Within the IEA data set there are also a number of other variables of interest. What do competent or confident teachers do in their classroom that is different from those less expert? Do they allow students more open discussion or cultivate a greater sense of efficacy at school? Do they create other kinds of participatory motivation (for example, for social-justice-related activities)
or a strong sense of institutional trust? In preparation for this article, some of our exploratory analysis found teacher confidence related to students’ intent to vote in the future.

This analysis has begun to fill an important gap in understanding teachers’ roles in citizenship education by exploring the relationship between teachers’ experience or beliefs and students’ civic knowledge. However, the design of the sample of civic-related teachers for the IEA study was not nationally representative in participating countries. The different ways in which civic education is implemented across and within countries could begin with rigorous studies of units smaller than a country in future research. For example, representative samples of civic-related teachers within a state in the United States or in Finland at a regional or local level could be studied. Case studies could also be included.

This article also explored several possible elements of a model for teacher preparation and professional development in civic education. Consideration of these elements descriptively across countries and in relation to data about student civic knowledge within a few countries could serve as the springboard for development of a wider array of valid and reliable ways to assess relevant teacher characteristics cross-nationally. The findings confirm the importance of teachers’ knowledge (measured by initial and in-service experiences) and teachers’ confidence about teaching political topics. Differences in the patterns of association of these elements to students’ civic knowledge cross-nationally shows what can be learned about teacher preparation from survey data examined within the context of schools and countries.
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NOTES

[1] HLM partitions the total variance in an outcome among the levels of analysis in a model. In this two-level analysis, the variance is partitioned between the student level and the classroom (or teacher) level. The intraclass correlation is the proportion of total variance that exists at the classroom level. This proportion represents the total amount of variability that can potentially be explained by teacher characteristics (classroom-level characteristics). The higher the intraclass correlation, the more the average level of civic knowledge varies between classrooms.
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Appendix A

Background of the IEA Civic Education Study

The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), a consortium of educational research institutes in nearly 60 countries has been conducting comparative education studies for nearly 50 years. In the 1980s and early 1990s it focused on large-scale data collections on literacy, mathematics, and science (e.g. TIMSS, PIRLS). In the early 1990s some member countries, spurred by recent massive changes in political and social structures, asked for a study of civic education that included measures of young people’s civic-related attitudes and behaviors. Their aim was to study schools’ intentions and practice relating to democracy. The IEA organization brought to this effort a wide network of research institutes in different countries and a wealth of technical and methodological expertise in cross-national comparative education research (for example, in sampling and scaling).

Case studies were conducted in the first phase of the study that were used as the basis for a consensus process to develop content specifications for a test of students’ civic knowledge (with right and wrong answers) and surveys of political attitudes and civic behavior, as well as a short survey for teachers (See Torney-Purta et al., 1999; and Steiner-Khamsi et al. 1999).

The second phase of the IEA Civic Education Study began in 1997. An International Steering Committee, together with National Research Coordinators, constructed items, and then pre-piloted and piloted an instrument (a student test and survey) that would be suitable for younger and older adolescents and would take about two class periods to complete. The attitude survey included a number of scales drawn from political scientists’ surveys of adults. The teacher survey was designed to take about 15 minutes.

Nationally representative samples of students in the modal grade for 14-year-olds (a total of about 90,000 students from 28 countries) were tested in 1999; upper secondary students ranging in age from 16 to 19 (a total of about 50,000 students from 16 countries) were tested in 2000. See Torney-Purta, Lehmman, Oswald and Schulz (2001) and Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmman, Husfeldt, and Nikolova (2002) for a description of scaling (IRT scales) and analysis of the 28 and 16 countries, respectively, for the 14-year-olds and the upper secondary students. See http://www.cited.info for further details including a list of participating countries.

Appendix B

Selection of Classrooms for Hierarchical Linear Modelling (HLM) Analysis and Missing Data

The IEA Civic Education Study surveyed 312 teachers in Finland, 150 teachers in Hungary, and 116 teachers in the United States. The following procedures were followed.

First, seven schools in Finland were identified as having surveyed more than one teacher per class of students. In four schools, only one of the two teachers surveyed reported actually teaching the tested class. In these cases, the teachers who did not teach the tested classes were removed from analysis. In one school, the second teacher reported teaching only two of the students in the tested class. This teacher
was also removed from the analysis. Two additional schools had two or more teachers each that taught the entire class of tested students. These schools were removed from analysis.

Second, teachers from 45 schools in the United States reported that they did not teach the classes of students surveyed. The teachers and students from these schools were also removed from analysis.

After these adjustments were made, 138 teachers in Finland, 149 teachers in Hungary, and 71 teachers in the United States remained for analysis. Due to missing data, two teachers in Finland, four teachers in Hungary, and one teacher in the United States were removed from the analysis of teachers’ experience. In the analysis of teachers’ confidence in teaching political topics, two teachers in Finland, three teachers in Hungary, and eight teachers in the United States were removed due to missing data. The students that they were linked to were also removed from analysis.

The number of students in each country included in analysis is 2723 in Finland, 3167 in Hungary, and 1587 in the United States. Students were removed from the analysis if they were missing data for an outcome variable or the books in the home variable. Less than 1% of students in each country were missing these data.
Citizenship Education and Social Studies in Singapore: A National Agenda

JASMINE BOON-YEE SIM, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University AND MURRAY PRINT, University of Sydney

ABSTRACT Citizenship education has been, in some form, an overarching goal of public schooling historically in every society, as it is in Singapore today. The introduction of social studies as a compulsory and examinable subject in Singapore secondary schools in 2001 reflects the continuous single-minded pursuit of citizenship education to meet perceived national needs. Social studies has become, therefore, a key subject of the state for citizenship education in the context of national education.

We report on research into teacher understandings and approaches to citizenship education within the context of this compulsory subject and under the umbrella of national education. While still in the early stages of implementation, it is certain that social studies is a departure from past citizenship education programmes. Social studies in emphasizing the development of thinking in students, is an important curricula move in light of the conservative history of citizenship education in Singapore, and this bears implications for citizenship education in schools.

Introduction

Citizenship education has been, in some form, an overarching goal of public schooling historically in every society. The task of socializing the next generation to the directions of the nation state has been so important that schools, directed by many governments, have been specifically assigned that duty. Citizenship like anything else has to be learned, as young people do not become good citizens by accident (Parker, 1991; Patrick, 2002). While citizenship education can occur through a variety of sources, particularly through family and the media, schooling remains the main source of formal citizenship education for young people and the one avenue over which governments can maintain high levels of control. So it is in Singapore that education, in the guise of formal schooling, is the primary instrument for citizenship education.

Citizenship education involves preparing young people in the essential areas of knowledge, skills and values of an informed, responsible and participative citizen of their respective countries (Sears, 1994; Print, 1997; Patrick, 1999; Naval, Print & Velhuis, 2002). And while citizenship education takes many forms, there is a growing trend across the world that it is based upon the concepts, processes and values of education for democratic citizenship (Patrick, 1999; Torney-Purta, et.al., 1999, 2001; Print & Smith, 2000; Naval, Print & Veldhuis, 2002). Yet in many countries it is difficult to locate a subject in the school curriculum which is known as citizenship education. Many countries embed aspects of citizenship education within
a school subject, often known as civic education, which in turn is usually blended with other learnings such as moral education (Torney-Purta, et.al., 1999; Torney-Purta, et.al, 2001).

Among scholars there is general agreement that the development of good citizenship is the central purpose of social studies instruction (e.g. see Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1977; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Hahn, 1985; Houser & Kuzmic, 2001; Sears, 1994; Shaver, 1997; Stanley, 1985). It is not surprising, therefore, that in many countries, such as the United States and Australia, social studies education is a significant, if not, main source of citizenship education for students (Print, 1997; Torney-Purta, 1999, 2001; Gonzales, Riedel, Avery & Sullivan, 2001). In Singapore secondary schools social studies is a compulsory, examinable subject, newly introduced from 2001 for all students at the upper secondary school level - Years 9 to 10 for the four-year secondary course, and Years 9 to 11 for the five-year course.

The research and literature that established citizenship education as the raison d’etre for social studies are conducted and located mainly in the United States, Canada and Australia (Sears, 1994). While many of the key issues addressed in social studies are common concerns of the global community, including the globalisation of the economy, terrorism, rapidly changing technologies, the significant level of deterioration in the quality of the global environment, ethical questions regarding genetic engineering, and global migration, there are also significant issues unique to individual countries. Furthermore, the fact that the citizenship is a contested concept inevitably leads to a variation of citizenship education, and thus social studies education and the connection between the two within school curricula. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that in order to make sense of any curriculum, it must be understood within its context (Print, 1993).

This paper explores the nature and connection between citizenship education and social studies in Singapore and what both are trying to achieve. It asks – ‘what is the nature and purpose of citizenship education in the context of social studies within Singapore?’ And: ‘In what ways is social studies different from past citizenship education related programmes?’ Consequently, we firstly discuss the relationship among state, education and citizenship education in Singapore to set the perspective for understanding citizenship education. Then we examine the historical background of citizenship education programmes in Singapore, and locate the development of social studies within that chronology. Finally, we draw out the relationship between social studies and citizenship education and its implications for Singaporean students and future adult citizens.

We suggest that social studies is qualitatively different from past citizenship education programmes. Underlying the difference is the need to develop a more thinking and active citizenry within Singapore, able to respond to a global present that will become an intense, demanding future. But unless Singaporean social studies education can become more engaging, more problem-oriented and less constrained by government, it will continue to fall short of preparing active citizens for a democracy. The classification of social studies by Barr, Barth and Shermis (1977), as well as the dimensions of socialisation and counter-socialisation by Engle and Ochoa (1988) will be used as conceptual frames to guide this part of the discussion. A secondary question, whether there is a changing conception of citizenship within Singaporean education will be raised.
State, Education and Citizenship Education in Singapore

Education in the guise of formal schooling is the primary instrument for nation-building in Singapore. This is characteristic of the developmental state where education serves the process of state formation or nation-building (Green, 1997; Koh, 2002) and is found commonly in Asia. Rapid educational advance, in reality, is an inherent and essential part of the developmental process in these states. Furthermore, state leadership and bureaucracy play a dynamic and shaping role in relation to civil society (Green, 1997). This has also been described as the strong state (Gopinathan, 1994). Underpinning the legitimation of state power is the ability to promote and sustain economic development (Gopinathan, 1994; Green, 1997). Besides, economic development is one of the few goals that a pluralist society with large racial minorities, like Singapore, can agree (Han, 1997). The goals of national development are sacrosanct, on-going and are often couched in terms of nothing less than the need for national survival.

Since independence, nation-building policies in Singapore have focused on two aspects: engineering consensus among diverse ethnic groups and strong economic development driven by modernisation (Chua & Kuo, 1991). The overriding priority has been the promotion of economic growth, perceived to be inextricably linked to national survival. The state intervenes not only to promote economic development but also to improve social conditions and in constructing the national identity. A nationalized school system was initiated in 1973 through policies of integrated schools, bilingualism and meritocracy (e.g. see Hussin, 1992; Gopinathan, 1994 for details). Since then a highly centralized, tightly controlled education system has been responsive to perceived social and national needs. For example, economic survival meant producing an educated, efficient, diligent workforce, where education was, and is, regarded by the government as “an investment in human capital” (Chua, 1995, p. 62). Although economic development and the attendant improvement in standard of living is a desirable objective, a longer term question, as Han (1997) highlighted, is whether this goal should be achieved at the expense of other considerations, such as respect for individual freedoms or environmental protection.

In the developmental state, education as an instrument is fundamental and powerful because it straddles both the cultural-symbolic and civic-instrumental dimensions of nation-building (Hill & Lian, 1995). Education not only provides high level technical skills and knowledge for economic development, it also develops attitudes and motivations in individuals which ensure continuing collective commitment to active participation in the goals of national development (Green, 1997). In this regard, education has the potential to transform a generation into sharing a common destiny. It is from this perspective that the relationship between education, nation-building and citizenship should be understood in Singapore.

Two key definitional characteristics of education in the developmental state are the role of the state and bureaucracy in educational planning, and secondly, the emphasis on moral and social education (Green, 1997). That the Singaporean political leaders have always considered citizenship education as an important aspect of education is clear from the attention given to it and its impact on citizenship for the state (Hill and Lian, 1995). Consequently it is little wonder that the education system in Singapore is highly centralized, and remarkably responsive to directives by the Ministry of Education (MOE) and its political leaders. As with policy development, curriculum development and design are highly centralized under the purview of the MOE. All curricula materials including school textbooks and
teachers’ guides, especially those related to citizenship education, are developed and produced by the MOE. In Singapore, it is noteworthy that citizenship education issues are considered high stake and urgent, and thus given high priority, often prompting political leaders to wield direct influence over citizenship education programmes (Han, 2000; Koh, 2002).

Strong political leadership, together with centralisation of authority over formal education and curriculum development, are elements of a single-minded effort to build and mould a nation and to ensure that curricula objectives and content are congruent with national goals. This relationship is captured in the mission statement of the MOE, which sees the task of education is to mould the future of the nation by moulding the people who will determine its future. Within the formal educational system, co-ordinated and sustained effort is made to transmit relevant knowledge, desirable values as well as to shape attitudes and behaviours. Half a century ago Durkheim (1956) described this as “...a methodical socialisation of the younger generation”, the objective of which is to “... arouse and develop in the child a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states which are demanded of him both by the political society as a whole and the special milieu for which he is specifically destined” (p. 71). The goal of socialisation in this context is to encourage conformity and ensure the continuity of the society through a lack of dissent, to strengthen social cohesiveness as well as to preserve prevailing practices and values. And this has been the case since Singapore attained its independence in 1965. As Engle & Ochoa (1988) cogently note, in this way children are taught to fit into the existing social order and to fulfil their role as citizens in an appropriate and compliant manner.

However, in recent years the winds of change have touched Singapore. Due to many factors including the changing global context, increasing international competition and a younger political regime, gradual steps have been taken to decentralize school management as well as allow for cautious experimentation with differentiated curricula and assessments in selected Singaporean schools. With the launch of the Thinking Schools, Learning Nation (TSLN) vision in 1996, the national curriculum was revamped to infuse thinking and integrate information technology in schools. Students were similarly encouraged to think critically and creatively. Employing the TSLN concept the National Education (NE) initiative was launched in 1997. One outcome of these educational developments is reflected in a changing conception of citizenship education in Singapore.

Historical Background of Citizenship Education in Singapore

Since Singapore attained self-government in 1959, a single-minded pursuit of citizenship education has been evident. It has taken many forms over the years to meet perceived social and national needs (e.g. see Chew, 1998; Eng, 1989; Gopinathan, 1980; Gopinathan & Sharpe, 2002; Han, 1997, 2000; Hill & Lian, 1995; Tan, 1997). For example, between 1959 and 1966, citizenship education was taught as Ethics. It aimed to “lay the foundation for character development in young children so that they would develop into self-respecting individuals and good citizens” (Ong et al., 1979, p. 2). Following Singapore’s separation from Malaysia, Ethics was replaced by Civics in 1967 at the lower secondary school level. Civics dealt with topics such as the constitution, legislation and international relations, and included values such as patriotism, loyalty and civic consciousness. It aimed at fostering in Singaporean pupils a sense of social and civic responsibility as well as a love for their country and its people (Ong, 1979; Chew, 1988; Gopinathan, 1988). In
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1973, Education for Living (EFL), a short-lived interdisciplinary programme that integrated civics, history and geography, was adopted for primary schools. EFL was developed for the purpose of social and moral education, with the aim to "enable pupils to obtain a better understanding of how Singapore developed and of its geographical environment" (Ong et al, 1979, p. 3). Civics and EFL reflected the concern of the authorities to develop in children a sense of national identity in the initial years of Singapore’s independence.

The rapid industrialisation of the 1970s and 1980s witnessed growing concern among political leaders that with the adoption of science and technology, the increasing use of English, and an English-stream education, younger Singaporeans were becoming too westernized. Western values, with their emphasis upon the individual over the community, were perceived as threats to deculturize Singapore and destabilize the societal common good (Hill & Lian, 1995). This period saw citizenship education defined as essential in terms of dichotomous values - Asian versus Western values. Consequently, following the Goh and Ong Reports of 1979, citizenship education reflected greater moral elements aimed to inculcate Asian moral concepts and values (Han, 1997; Ong et al., 1979). Three elements were highlighted - personal behaviour, social responsibility and loyalty to the country, all transmitted through an accepting, non-challenging educational system.

Both the Goh and Ong Reports were noted for an absence of the skills of critical thought and of procedural values generally considered crucial to citizenship education in a democracy (Han, 1997). Indeed, learning about and understanding democratic principles and processes were all but ignored in favour of dutiful obedience to the state, reinforced during this period through an attempt to use the mother tongue in citizenship education. Although highly contestable, the official position was that language was relevant to the teaching of moral and civic values. It was believed that Asian values such as closeness in family ties, filial duties and loyalty were thought to be more effectively conveyed and understood in the mother tongues. Using the mother tongue to convey Asian values would provide cultural ballast to the influence of Western values, by emphasizing ethnic identity and values (Gopinathan, 1991; Han, 1997).

Hence, moral education and citizenship education were closely integrated; moral values and ‘right conduct’ were regarded as essential to being a good citizen. Despite some variations of emphasis in different citizenship education programmes, the central element of moral education has always been clearly present. Indeed, the ideal citizen is often described in moral terms (Han, 1997), an approach certainly not unique to Singapore. A recent study of Asia-Pacific Civics Values found that participating Asian countries (including Japan, Taiwan and Thailand) emphasized moral education within their civics and citizenship programme (Cogan, Morris & Print, 2002).

Consequently to counteract the growing influence of Western values among the young and strengthen moral education, two new citizenship education programmes, Being and Becoming and Good Citizens replaced Civics and EFL respectively. Both programmes had values and moral education as their focus. Being and Becoming, interestingly, employed the deliberative approach which encouraged pupils to deliberate and reflect on value issues, then debate and arrive at their own judgement. The advantages of the deliberative approach notwithstanding, there remained a major conflict which had to do with the confidence that certain Asian values were right and appropriate for the pupil. The deliberative approach did not square with this notion, as it is grounded in the liberal belief that individuals should select and pursue their notion of their good life (Han, 1997). In contrast, Good Citizens, taught
at the primary school level, used the didactic, teacher-centred approach. This approach was later found wanting in transmitting values, and in meeting the pupils’ needs (Eng et al., 1982).

Another outcome was the introduction of Religious Knowledge and Confucian Ethics in 1982 to reinforce the teaching of moral values. By the end of the decade, however, Religious Knowledge and Confucian Ethics were abandoned as they were perceived to have heightened religious fervour. Given the ‘fragile’ nature of religious harmony in Singapore, there was concern that religion and religious precepts could be given an inappropriate application in politics, leading to potential unrest that could adversely affect national security (Hill & Lian, 1995; Tan, 1997).

However, both the programs Being and Becoming and Good Citizens were not successful in achieving the government’s goals for citizenship education. In 1992 they were replaced with the program Civics and Moral Education (CME). The aim of CME was to develop commitment to nation-building. Apart from the transmission of moral values and cultural norms which were included in both primary and secondary school, issues related to citizenship were examined in the upper secondary level. Topics included the Constitution of Singapore, and the fundamental liberties that it guarantees; the necessity and importance of the law; and participation in government, specifically in the electoral process.

Prior to the implementation of CME, the Deputy Prime Minister defined the boundaries of political knowledge in the new subject.

"Every schoolboy or schoolgirl should grow up with a common understanding of the basic facts of political life – that Singapore is small, that it depends on exports to other countries to make a living, that it is through ceaseless endeavour and the pursuit of excellence that Singapore can do well and get ahead.” (The Straits Times, 1991).

Disseminating the message about the achievements of the country, and the circumstances in which these could be lost, CME emphasized moral and political socialisation (Han, 1997). Pupils were taught the major difficulties faced by Singapore since independence, as well as issues of national concern such as population growth, racial and religious harmony, economic growth, and national security. Pupils were also encouraged to think about the ways they could support and contribute to national campaigns. CME was not concerned about helping children acquire and develop skills to think independently about social and political issues. Han (1997) questioned its adequacy in terms of political education. In this context, she argued that the individual’s ability to think critically about issues affecting the country, and independently to make decisions concerning these, are important if they are to be citizens in the full sense of the term. For this, they need to be equipped to handle complex issues concerning morality and politics. CME and Good Citizen continued to be taught as compulsory non-examinable subjects in both primary and secondary schools until they were revised when incorporated within National Education after 1997.

**National Education and the development of Social Studies**

The introduction of social studies in the upper levels of secondary schools must be seen in the context of National Education (NE) within Singapore. Launched in 1997 as the latest nation-building initiative to address citizenship, National Education is aimed at deliberately developing and shaping positive knowledge,
values and attitudes of Singapore’s younger citizenry. In adopting this approach its
purpose is to develop national cohesion, the instinct for survival and confidence in
the future of Singapore. This is to be achieved through National Education by:

1. Fostering a sense of identity, pride and self-respect in being Singaporean;
2. Relating the Singapore story: how Singapore succeeded against the odds to
   become a nation;
3. Understanding Singapore’s unique challenges, constraints and vulnerabilities,
   which make us different from other countries;
4. Instilling the core values of our way of life and the will to prevail, to ensure
   continued success and well-being (MOE, 2003)

The catalyst for NE was increasing government apprehension about the attitudes
of young Singaporeans. Two newspaper surveys in 1996, confirmed by a later MOE
survey, revealed younger Singaporeans’ lack of knowledge and interest in their
country’s recent history and nation-building issues. The government saw this as a
critical issue, potentially jeopardizing the nation as young people appeared to take
peace and prosperity for granted. An adequate historical knowledge was essential, it
was argued, so that young people would be committed to such ideals as meritocracy,
multiracialism and Singaporean way of life.

This ignorance will hinder our effort to develop a shared sense of
nationhood. We will not acquire the right instincts to bond as one
nation, or maintain the will to survive and prosper in an uncertain
world. For Singapore to thrive beyond the founder generation, we must
systematically transmit these instincts and attitudes to succeeding
cohorts. (Lee, 1997)

Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong even became directly involved. He envisaged
National Education as “…. a vital component of our education process….[that will]
…. engender a shared sense of nationhood…. and provide an understanding of how
our past is relevant to our present and future” (Goh, 1996). The issue for the
government was how to develop, among a new generation of Singaporeans who are
highly educated, affluent and mobile, a sense of national consciousness based upon
the hardships of the past blended with an awareness of the constraints facing
Singapore, to develop a sense of belonging and feeling for Singapore. To achieve
this goal National Education was conceptualized to develop in students, “ … an
awareness of facts, circumstances and opportunities facing Singapore, so that they
will be able to make decisions for their future with conviction and realisation …. [as
well as nurture] …. a sense of emotional belonging and commitment to the
community and nation so that they will stay and fight when the odds are against us”
(Lee, 1997). The government fully realizes that National Education is high-stakes
policy targeting both the cognitive and affective domains. As the Prime Minister
stated, “It is an exercise to develop the instincts that become part of the psyche of
every child…It must appeal to both heart and mind. (Goh, 1996).

What was striking was the scale and pervasive nature of the programme. The
speed at which NE was implemented in all schools underscored the perceived
urgency of the task. In the formal curriculum, social studies was introduced at the
upper secondary school level in 2001, taking less than five years, from
conceptualisation, through writing of instructional materials to the final
implementation in all schools. And characteristic of past citizenship education
programmes, the implementation and institutionalisation of social studies was top-down in approach, state initiated and driven by the goal of effective nation-building.

At the secondary level, the subject matter emphasis was on knowledge, of an awareness of facts, circumstances and opportunities facing Singapore. Social studies can be seen as a direct response to young Singaporeans’ lack of knowledge and interest in their country’s recent history and the issues key to her survival. Social studies is high-status, its importance is highlighted by its compulsion for all secondary school students and examinable at the national examinations – the GCE ‘O’ and ‘N’ Levels.

It is significant that NE was initiated in the absence of war or any real crisis by which the citizenry is tested and nations are built. Benjamin (1988) noted that from time to time, the state engenders crises in the citizenry so that leaders can then present themselves as possessing means to solve people’s crises and provide them with a certain ‘identity’. Crisis construction and management is a strategy used openly and a conscious goal of enhancing the sense of dependence on the state, thereby maintaining the nation (Hill & Lian, 1995). As with the ‘crises’ of Westernisation and deculturalization in the late 1970s and 1980s that led to a reinforcement of moral education, so it is with NE. A more critical interpretation would suggest that National Education in general and therefore social studies in particular, are more about attempts by governing elites to maintain power in increasingly challenged contexts (by forces such as globalisation), than a genuine concern for better educating young people.

Social Studies and Citizenship Education

A review of the evolution of the social studies field concluded that, “….there is now general agreement that the primary, overriding purpose of the social studies is citizenship education” (Barr, Barth & Sherman, 1977, p. 67-68). Over the years this understanding has come to set the boundaries for what is considered legitimate for the social studies field. Of course, as in the case of any field, there is considerable debate about specific problems, concepts and methodologies (e.g. see Banks, 1987; Cherryholmes, 1980, Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Houser & Kuzmic, 2001). Thus, social studies as a field generally equates with citizenship education. But variations of the equation are expected given that conceptions of citizenship vary depending on historical circumstances, the development of politics of a society, and its cultural values and traditions.

The most frequently cited effort at conceptualizing social studies was published by Barr, Barth and Sherman (1977). Although general agreement exists that the purpose of social studies is citizenship education, the subject can be approached from different traditions. Barr, Barth and Sherman identified three traditions of the social studies and citizenship - social studies taught as citizenship transmission, social studies taught as social science, and social studies taught as reflective inquiry or thinking.

Complementary to the three traditions, Engle and Ochoa (1988) argued that two dimensions, socialisation and countersocialization, are central to the education of citizens in any democracy. Socialisation is an inescapable dimension of citizenship education. It is the process by which the society inducts young children into its customs, values and behaviours as a way of continuing existing traditions and practices. Children are taught to fit into the existing social order by learning the traditions and values grounded in the past experience of that society. But socialisation, Engle and Ochoa argue, must be balanced by countersocialization,
which emphasizes independent thinking and responsible social criticism. This a process of expanding the individual’s ability to be a rational, thoughtful, and independent citizen by promoting active and vigorous reasoning, including a reappraisal of what has been learned through socialisation. In this way countersocialization develops the salient citizenship qualities of reasoning and independent thinking.

But what is taught about citizenship education in social studies? If social studies is the key subject for citizenship education in Singaporean schools, what is addressed in schools? The positioning of social studies must be seen within the chronology of the continuous single-minded pursuit of citizenship education to meet government needs. Social studies was conceived as a major vehicle for NE at the secondary school level, with a focus on the nation, common culture and shared values. Consequently it seeks to develop in students what the government deems to be the essential areas of knowledge, skills and values of an informed, responsible and participative Singapore citizen.

In secondary schools, social studies emphasizes knowledge, and understanding of national issues pertaining to the historical, political, economic and social development of Singapore. Besides national issues, social studies also addresses regional and international issues which can or may affect the development of Singapore. It is hoped that with greater awareness of these issues, pupils will be more informed of Singapore’s achievements and limitations and have confidence in her future. And this will prepare them to adopt a more participative role in shaping Singapore’s destiny in the 21st century (MOE, 2003).

With social studies positioned as a vehicle for NE, the aims of the social studies syllabus are to enable pupils to:
1. understand the issues that affect the socio-economic development, the governance and the future of Singapore;
2. learn from experiences of other countries to build and sustain a politically viable, socially cohesive and economically vibrant Singapore;
3. develop citizens who have empathy towards others and who will participate responsibly and sensibly in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious society;
4. have a deep sense of shared destiny and national identity. (MOE, 2001)

In this sense, social studies is socializing students to a particular set of values and knowledge at both the cognitive and affective levels. In the tradition of social studies as citizenship transmission (Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1977), the state possesses an ideal conception of society and citizenship, and this should be taught to students in order to help them become loyal believers in the particular set of truths necessary to guarantee the survival of society. This is clearly citizenship education within the parameters of NE, nation-building and government policy, where nation-building in Singapore presupposes “... an omnipresent state that cherishes stability and order.” (Tan & Gopinathan, 2000, p. 10).

**New directions for learning citizenship education in Singapore**

The introduction of social studies was a significant milestone in the development of citizenship education in several ways. The new curriculum, in response to global forces, has seen a de-emphasis upon moral education, enhancement of thinking skills, and encouragement of participation for more active citizenship. In the past, citizenship education-related subjects emphasized moral education and, underlying
it, a highly passive citizenship. But social studies was designed to emphasize knowledge consistent with National Education outcomes, which means a separation of the moral education dimension from the citizenship education related subject. While the moral elements have not been neglected, they have been located separately and continue to be addressed in CME, quite apart from social studies.

The framework that separates moral elements from citizenship education issues is an important development because it provides greater space and scope for exploring new grounds, particularly for infusing thinking skills in the curriculum. Developing thinking skills in students is usually seen as a major objective of social studies (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Parker, 1991; Shaver, 1997). But what is the nature of thinking that social studies seeks to develop in young citizens? After all social studies is a vehicle for NE and any exploration is ultimately circumscribed by the demands of nation-building. As Koh (2002) concluded, the version of critical literacy to be used in Singapore “ … should be sensitive to the discursive framework and salient discourses that structure the political and material conditions of Singapore.” In other words, “ … critical literacy has to be adapted and translated as a thinking tool and critical framework to serve the instrumentalist ideology of producing a generation of thinking work-force to support the Singapore economy” (p. 263).

Nevertheless, the emphasis on thinking in social studies per se is a significant departure from past citizenship education programmes. A new assessment format with new test items, including a compulsory source-based case study, has been adopted. These items assess students’ ability to interpret and evaluate sources and given information, as well as to construct explanations respectively. These assessment objectives are biased towards higher order critical thinking skills. Furthermore, a new method of marking, the Level of Response Marking scheme (LORMs), which awards students for demonstrating higher order thinking skills, was adopted.

But what is the nature of thinking that social studies seeks to develop in young Singaporeans? In the past, citizenship education programmes focused almost entirely on socialisation at the expense of counter-socialisation (Engle & Ochoa, 1988) and this was certainly the case in Singapore. Driven by the fear of deculturalization in the face of growing Western influence and modernisation, or maintaining economic development, citizenship education programmes sought to conserve Singaporean society as they transmitted traditions and values that were grounded in past experience.

An acknowledged objective of social studies is developing the rational, thoughtful and independent thinking citizen, through an emphasis on thinking skills, such as making judgements, evaluating evidence, recognizing values and detecting bias, as well as drawing conclusions based on a reasoned consideration of evidence and arguments. Prime Minister Goh highlighted the importance of thinking skills.

“We cannot assume that what has worked well in the past will work for the future. The old formulae for success are unlikely to prepare our young for the new circumstances and new problems they will face. We do not even know what these problems will be, let alone be able to provide the answers and solutions to them. But we must ensure that our young can think for themselves, so that the next generation can find their own solutions to whatever new problems they may face.”

(Goh, 1997)
Therefore, social studies, in emphasizing the development of thinking in students, is an important counter-socializing factor given the conservative tradition of citizenship education in Singapore. Reasoning and independent thinking are hallmarks of countersocialization, so in Engle and Ochoa’s (1988) terms social studies in Singapore may be seen as a move to balance socialisation.

Similarly, Engle and Ochoa (1988) identified the democratic ideal as the basis of counter-socialisation, where social criticism and participation in decision-making by citizens on public issues are desirable outcomes. Singapore, where citizenship is modelled on the civic-republican tradition in which it is the duty of citizens to participate in the political process (Hill & Lian, 1995), does not achieve that ideal. Singapore is a democracy that is non-liberal and communitarian in nature, controlled by a paternalistic and authoritarian government (Chua, 1995). In this regard, even though social studies helps students acquire and develop skills to think independently about issues, it does not accommodate the critique of political economy and society (Koh, 2003). The government is sceptical of, and does not encourage the active participation of its citizens in the political process (Chua, 1995; Han, 2000). Hence, the basis for counter-socialisation differs from other contexts. For Singapore, the basis of counter-socialisation is linked with economic development and nation-building (Goh, 1997; Koh, 2002; Tan & Gopinathan, 2000). It encourages “…the incubation and (re)production of a thinking workforce intended to sustain the competitive edge of the economy” (Koh, 2002, p. 255). Social studies thus serves as a context for developing thinking in students, who constitute the future innovative workforce. Thinking is characterized by its depoliticized nature and one that focuses on creative problem-solving and mastery of skills, processes, procedures and practice (Koh, 2002).

The move towards a more thinking curriculum for Singaporean schools has to be understood in the context of the growth of an intensively global, competitive economy characterized by increasingly rapid change and unpredictability (Goh, 1997; Tan & Gopinathan, 2000). In such an economy, where globalisation and new technologies sit at centre stage, “…knowledge and innovation will be absolutely critical...[because] .... nations which organize themselves to generate, share and apply new technologies and ideas more quickly than others will, like the early bird, catch the worm ... [and hence] ... the capacity to learn, as individuals and as a nation, will decide our future, whether we stagnate, perish, or continue to succeed.” (Goh, 1997). The implication is for workers to take on complex duties that require them both to think independently as well as function as team players, be creative and knowledgeable about information technology and adept at problem solving. The rationale for thinking is thus informed by a human capital ideology and a competitive nationalism that sees education as a social investment in preparing ‘human resources’ able to participate in an intensively global, competitive economy (Koh, 2002). However, scepticism exists about the outcomes of thinking in the current political state. According to Tan and Gopinathan (2000, p. 10), “The larger problem for Singapore’s educational reform initiative is that Singapore’s nation-building history resulted in an omnipresent state that cherishes stability and order. A desire for true innovation, creativity, experimentation, and multiple opportunities in education cannot be realized until the state allows civil society to flourish and avoids politicizing dissent.” This situation creates a dilemma of major dimensions for the Singaporean government.

It is significant that the social studies syllabus identified as an important objective the need to prepare pupils to adopt a more participative role in shaping Singapore’s destiny. This step marks a key difference in the development of
citizenship education programmes in Singapore, from passivity to more active citizenship. However, in the social studies curriculum the nature of participation is broad and vaguely stated. It is not specified clearly what is meant by a more participative role in shaping Singapore’s destiny, in terms of the nature, type and scope of participation. Does it mean a greater willingness to engage citizens in the political process? This is a possibility given that the political leadership in recent years has been more open to engaging and consulting citizens in the ‘Singapore 21’ and ‘Remaking Singapore’ initiatives in 1997 and 2002 respectively. Moreover, Singapore is at a crossroads, characterized by “…greater social class differences; the emergence of new lifestyles reflecting greater affluence and individualizing tendencies; greater freedom and creative cultural expressions and unbottled desire for control in personal sphere and more say in the decision-making processes in the collective arena through multiple modes and nodes of representation…. (and) the desire for greater political democratisation and freedom from state intervention.” (Chua, 1995, p. 184). These developments are occurring within a global context where democratisation movements have successfully challenged authoritarian regimes in Eastern Europe, Africa, and other parts of Asia.

In the social studies syllabus, the assumption regarding participation is that by developing a base of democratic knowledge, skills and values, one will become a more effective and participative citizen (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Patrick, 1999). While the acquisition of knowledge can enhance awareness, awareness itself does not necessarily lead to effectiveness nor a more participative role in shaping Singapore’s destiny. This is especially true given the general passivity and acquisitive tendencies of the people, largely attributed to the paternalistic nature of Singapore society (Tan, 2001).

To prepare students for active citizenship, it is imperative that the implementation of social studies be accompanied by appropriate educational practices and pedagogy that encourage participative skills and values (Print & Smith, 2000). This is validated by the IEA 28-nations study which found schools that model democratic practice are most effective in promoting civic knowledge and engagement (Torney-Purta et al, 2001). The literature in the field has long argued the importance of participative, active learning about civics and citizenship by young people (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Hahn, 1996; Newmann, 1989; Osborne, 1991; Parker; 1991; Patrick, 1999, 2002; Patrick & Hoge, 1991; Stanley, 1991). The premise driving this argument is that an active approach to learning by students will be reflected later in an active approach to participative citizenship as adults (Print & Smith, 2000).

From the perspective of the traditions of social studies (Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1977), social studies in the Singapore context is largely taught as citizenship transmission and as a simplified social science. The infusion of thinking is defined as counter-socialisation (Engle & Ochoa, 1988). Acting as a mitigator, the thinking process may weaken the process of transmission and internalisation the NE messages. But this may vary amongst students given factors such as attitude, experience, age and ability. As a subject, the content of social studies includes elements of history, economics, political science and human geography. These are taught as issues organized around the six National Education messages. However, in practice social studies is conveniently divided into ‘the history part’ which subsumes political science, and ‘the geography part’ that subsumes the economics, and taught in this way. This division is further reinforced by the fact that social studies is usually taught by history and geography teachers who perceive the subject more as a simplified social science with the criteria for instruction derived mainly from history
and geography. And social studies is still far from ready to be taught as reflective inquiry that grants students the autonomy to self-select problems for investigation. After all, a large purpose of social studies is still to socialize citizens within National Education in a highly centralized state.

Conclusion

Citizenship education involves the preparation of young people to become informed, responsible and participative citizens. In Singapore, social studies is a key vehicle for citizenship education in the context of National Education, the Government’s initiative to drive the future. The introduction of social studies as a compulsory, examinable subject in Singapore secondary schools at the upper secondary level reflects the government’s continuous single-minded pursuit of citizenship education to meet national needs.

Social studies is taught mainly as a combination of simplified social science and citizenship transmission. Yet a significant feature of the social studies syllabus is the focus on developing thinking skills in students. As citizenship transmission, social studies seeks to socialize students to a particular set of values and knowledge at both cognitive and affective levels, focusing on the nation, common culture and shared values. However, the transmission process may be mitigated by developing thinking skills in students, a process of counter-socialisation necessitated by an intensively global economy. This is the case of social studies in Singapore today.

While the nature of thinking is informed by a human capital ideology and the goal is overwhelmingly economic, it is not possible to contain thinking within the economic domain. In social studies, developing thinking in students will raise their consciousness as citizens, which can be converted into a basis for negotiation with the political leadership. This has created a dilemma for Singaporean government policy in education. And while many school subjects may develop thinking in students, it is significant that in Singapore that social studies has been formally allocated that role. Consequently social studies is the context where both the components of citizenship education and thinking meet. The economic rationalisation for developing thinking is clearly espoused, but is there a political agenda in developing more thinking citizens?

Within Singapore, several very significant developments have been taking place in recent years. In particular, a growing political tension has created a dilemma for the Singaporean government. Should it direct policies, including education, to maintain stability and order to achieve economic prosperity as in the past? Or should it encourage a more creative, problem solving approach through educational policy, in the context of a highly global society, to achieve economic growth? One approach continues a highly successful past, the other surrenders some control to an unpredictable future.

This dilemma is compounded by the emergence of a younger and characteristically different generation of citizens – highly educated, technologically savvy, mobile and increasingly concerned with individual (and family) lifestyle needs. These young people have also, in the context of a globalized society, been exposed to an unprecedented democratisation movement. They have, consequentially, a different view about the needs of the state, of individuals and of the role of democracy in their lives. The government cannot afford to ignore these developments.

Does social studies represent a changing conception of citizenship education in Singapore? In theory it does as seen from the new syllabus, though in schools it is
too early to ascertain a trend. What is certain however, is that the social studies curriculum is a significant departure from past citizenship education programmes. In emphasizing the development of thinking in students, social studies has initiated an important curricula move in light of the conservative history of citizenship education in Singapore, and this carries implications for the practice of citizenship education in schools.
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Citizenship Education In England –
Listening To Young People: New Insights
From The Citizenship Education
Longitudinal Study

DAVID KERR, National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)

ABSTRACT This article reports on a number of key findings from the third annual report of the eight-year Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study in England (Cleaver et al., 2005). The findings are based upon the survey responses of 6400 students across years 8, 10 and 12 (students age 13 to 14, 15 to 16 and 17 to 18 years old respectively) from a sample of 237 secondary schools and 50 colleges, as well as the survey responses of 238 school and college leaders and 876 teachers and college tutors. The survey was administered in the academic year 2003-04. The findings are provisional at this stage but provide potentially new insights about student experiences of, and attitudes to, citizenship education and wider citizenship issues and the factors that influence those experiences and attitudes. These new insights make a positive contribution to the growing literature and evidence base for citizenship education. They require further investigation during the course of the Study as well as by other researchers. Though they relate to the context of citizenship education in England they have implications for wherever citizenship education is being developed, implemented and researched across the world.

Introduction

This article is divided into five sections. In the first section background information is provided about citizenship education policy in England and about the aims and overall design of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study. Second, there is a consideration of some of the leading questions arising from existing empirical and theoretical insights concerning citizenship education in England, including an overview of what the evidence base reveals to date. In the third section, some of the key findings about students from the analysis of the second cross-sectional survey data are introduced. Fourth, there is a focus on the findings which add new insights to the evidence base for citizenship education. The final section considers the implications of the findings for a range of groups involved in citizenship education and for the future direction of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study.
Background and Study Aims and Design

Citizenship in the National Curriculum (England)

Citizenship was introduced as a new statutory National Curriculum subject for all students between the ages of 11 and 16 in schools in England, in September 2002 (Crick, 1998; DfEE/QCA, 1999). The Curriculum Order for the new subject stated that the importance of citizenship is that it:

‘...gives pupils the knowledge, skills and understanding to play an effective role in society at local, national and international levels. It helps them to become informed, thoughtful and responsible citizens who are aware of their duties and rights...It encourages pupils to play a helpful part in the life of their schools, neighbourhoods, communities and the wider world.’ Citizenship Key Stages 3-4 p.12

The introduction of the new statutory subject, in 2002, marked the beginning rather than the end of the policy process and citizenship has continued to attract considerable interest and activity from policy-makers, practitioners, researchers and commentators. This is understandable, as the evidence base concerning citizenship education prior to 2002 was weak. Although the evidence base remains sparse, it has been strengthened considerably since 2002 (Kerr and Cleaver, 2004).

The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study

The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) sponsored Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study has played a central role, to date, in strengthening the evidence base. This, alongside the monitoring activities of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) (2003; 2005) and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2003; 2004) and other smaller scale surveys and studies (CSV, 2003; 2004; Watchorn, 2003) has provided more comprehensive insights and a clearer picture of the state of citizenship education in schools post 2002.

The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (hereafter, the Study) is tracking a cohort of over 18,000 young people who entered secondary school in September 2002 and are the first students to have a continuous statutory entitlement to citizenship education in England. The overarching aim of the Study is to assess the short-term and long-term effects of citizenship education on the knowledge, skills and attitudes and behaviour of students.

The research design of the Study is based on four interrelated components:

• Four cross-sectional surveys of Year 8, 10 and 12 students, their school leaders and their teachers.
• A longitudinal survey of a cohort of Year 7 students (age 11-12 years) tracking the whole Year 7 group through Years 9 and 11 and 13 (or equivalent when they are aged 18), their school leaders and their teachers.
• Twenty longitudinal school case studies
• An annual literature review
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The Research Context and Evidence Base for Citizenship Education

It is important in the course of the Study to take account of the research context and evidence base for citizenship education as well as to contribute to that evidence base. While it is impossible, in this article, to provide a complete overview of the literature reviewed to-date, the following section briefly highlights some of the leading empirical and theoretical insights which help to frame the Study’s investigation of the impact and outcomes of citizenship education and the various contexts and processes which may influence these outcomes. [3] First, are the insights concerning definitions and understanding of citizenship and citizenship education and their impact on approaches to practice in schools. Second, is the literature on approaches chosen by schools to citizenship in the curriculum and within the life of school and their impact on students’ development of citizenship dimensions (knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and behaviours). Third, is the literature which takes a wider view and addresses the promotion of active citizenship both within schools as well as in spheres outside of school.

Definitions and understanding of citizenship and citizenship education in England

An issue that has received considerable attention is the recognition that citizenship and citizenship education are ‘contested’ concepts. Any definitions of citizenship education put forward are therefore the by-product of a larger, more wide-ranging debate about the changing nature of citizenship and its impact on the nature of modern society. Scott and Lawson (2001), for example, define the competing definitions of citizenship education in relation to competing definitions of citizenship; citizenship as: knowledge (Usher, 1996), action (Habermas, 1994), community (Etzioni, 1995), rights and responsibilities (Giddens, 1994), public and private morality (Beck, 1998), inclusivity (Lynch, 1992; Arnot, 1997; Lister, 1997) and locality (Cogan and Derricott, 2000).

These competing definitions and models of citizenship and citizenship education are important because they suggest the potential for an incoherent vision and varied practice of citizenship education to develop in English schools. Thus, despite the clear definition of citizenship education put forward by the Citizenship Advisory Group (Crick, 1998) the literature suggests that there are still considerable questions to be addressed concerning the ‘definition, purposes, and intended outcomes’ of an education for citizenship (Pearce and Hallgarten, 2000; McLaughlin, 2000).

School approaches to citizenship education and their impact on student development

There is much discussion and debate in the literature about where citizenship education should best fit into the existing curriculum and its potential to impact on the school community. Whereas some (Best, 2002) have concentrated on the continued strength of the links between citizenship education and Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE), others believe that other subjects are critical or important for citizenship education, with cases made for links, among others, with science (Finegold and Campbell, 2003; Wellington, 2002; 2003), the humanities – particularly history and geography – (Lambert, 2003; Westaway & Rawling, 2003; Freeman, 2003), and ICT (Selwyn, 2002). In practice, early research shows that PSHE is the main vehicle for the delivery of citizenship education (OFSTED, 2003).
and 2005; QCA, 2003), which is consistent with Gearon’s (2003) assertion that the area is strongly rooted in past work on PSHE. However, this curriculum approach is described by OFSTED (2003) as ‘unsatisfactory’ and is viewed as a possible result of the ‘light touch’ description of citizenship advocated by the Crick committee (Crick, 1998).

While much of the literature concerns citizenship education as a curriculum subject, other literature takes a wider view and addresses the implications of citizenship education for the life of schools as communities. The literature in this area focuses on the importance of citizenship as part of the ethos of the whole school.

Some commentators believe that, to use Gearon’s terminology (2003), citizenship education should be an ‘implicit’ part of the school curriculum, rather than something that is taught explicitly through a citizenship curriculum. Bloomfield (2003), for example, sets out the case for the development of a school ethos of citizenship which permeates the whole curriculum. In the same vein, Hicks (2001; 2003) stresses the need to link citizenship education to schools’ ‘global dimension’, which refers to the curriculum as a whole and the ethos of a school; it consists of all those subject elements and cross-curricular concerns that focus on global interdependence’ (Hicks, 2003, p.2). He advocates promoting the global dimension of citizenship education.

Newton (2002), on the other hand, calls for the recognition that effective citizenship education requires a whole school dimension, including behaviour policy and opportunities for pupil participation in school and in the wider community. This is echoed by Kennedy (2003) in his call for ‘authentic teaching that moves beyond abstract academic concepts’ and gives students opportunities to ‘engage with both the knowledge they are expected to learn … and with activities that will give them experience with the “practice of democracy” both in their classrooms and outside their classrooms’ (p.65). Alexander (2002) is supportive of this view and argues for the notion of a ‘citizenship school’ ‘a school in which citizenship is practised as well as taught’ (p.33). Furthermore, Ruddock (2003) argues that the development of pupil voice can benefit schools as well as pupils, and the DfES (2003) view the participation of students in decision making in the school as having potentially positive impact on schools in terms of attainment, attendance and behaviour, inclusiveness, curriculum provision and democracy.

There is also a growing body of research on the potential benefits for students and schools of active participation in the running of schools through school councils. Such benefits include the development of notions of citizenship in children and young people (Taylor & Johnson, 2002) and the fostering of an inclusive democratic environment in schools, based on respect and equality between members of the school community (Inman & Burke, 2002).

Active citizenship in school and in the wider community

Many of those commentators in favour of the promotion of active citizenship within the school community are also supportive of promoting active citizenship in spheres outside of school. They call for recognition that citizenship education also takes place beyond the school. Osler and Starkey (2003), for instance, argue that citizenship ‘is not a process that can be realised exclusively at school. Learning is taking place beyond the school and the school needs to build on this learning and to encourage learners to make connections between their experiences and learning in the school and the community’ (p.252). This is supported by Kerr (2003) when he
states that 'citizenship education is a complex enterprise which involves a variety of
citizenship dimensions (knowledge, skills, concepts and attitudes) in a range of
educational approaches and opportunities for young people both in and out of
school' (p.16).

The involvement of students in the wider community has been seen as having
benefits for students, schools and indeed the community. Potter (2002) believes that
such benefits encompass both improved skills (for students) and the encouragement
of positive relations with the community (for schools). The DfES (2003) argue that
through increased student participation in the wider community, schools will play an
important part in contributing to community cohesion and social inclusion. This idea
is supported by Prime et al (2002) and Attwood et al (2003), who argue that
knowing and spending time with other people in the locality can build strong social
networks, increase trust and provide a stepping stone to future community
involvement.

What do we know to date?

Citizenship is still at an early stage as a policy initiative in England and this is
reflected in the growing evidence base for citizenship education post-2002. There is
a consensus emerging from this evidence base that provides answers to questions
about definition, approaches and wider dimensions of citizenship. This consensus
includes:

• Definition – a growing conceptualisation of citizenship in schools as
comprising three interrelated aspects – the three citizenship ‘Cs’: Citizenship
in the curriculum; Active citizenship in the school culture; and active
citizenship through links with the wider community.
• Approaches – acceptance that provision is uneven, patchy and evolving but
that types of school approach to citizenship education appear to have
emerged. Figure 1 outlines these types (for further information see Kerr et al.
2004).
• Factors – the identification of and agreement about key school level and
learning-context level factors that work together to support, promote and
champion citizenship education (see Kerr et al., 2004, for discussion of these
factors).
• Challenges – recognition of a number of key issues and challenges that need
to be tackled in order for citizenship education provision to become more
visible, coherent and effective (see Kerr et al., 2004, for a comprehensive list
of these challenges).

Students’ views, attitudes and experiences

The previous section reveals that some of the main questions arising concerning
citizenship education theory, policy and practice in England revolve around the
following questions:

• What is understood by citizenship?
• How is citizenship approached in schools and what impact does this have on
students’ development of citizenship dimensions?
• To what extent do schools provide opportunities through citizenship for
students to engage with the school community?
To what extent do schools recognise and encourage students’ engagement with the wider community outside school?

This section of the article focuses on analysis of data concerning students’ experiences, understandings and views of citizenship education and wider citizenship issues. This analysis addresses the questions listed above. However, there are two equally important reasons for this focus.

First, there is one crucial dimension which is missing in this growing literature and evidence base for citizenship education in England to date: evidence about students’ experiences of, and attitudes to, citizenship education and wider citizenship issues. A preoccupation with emerging definitions and approaches to citizenship education in schools has meant a necessary concentration on the attitudes of commentators and on the actions of school leaders and teachers rather than on those of students. As was noted in the Study’s first annual literature review,

‘This is ironic given that ...[students form one of ] the key groups who will ultimately decide on the success or otherwise of the citizenship education initiative’ (Kerr and Cleaver, 2004: 55).

Yet little is known about what students’ think about citizenship education, and the influences on their thinking, two and a half years after its statutory introduction into the school curriculum. Support for this focus can be found in the growing
literature on student voice and pupil attainment (Hannam, 2003, Trafford, 2003; Flecknoe, 2002) and in efforts to encourage schools to increase opportunities for pupils to become involved in decision-making processes (MacBeath et al. 2003).

Second, this new focus is particularly pertinent to the Study’s overarching aim - to assess the short term and long term effects of citizenship education on the knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviour of young people.

Young people are a vital source of information and insights about citizenship education, to be put alongside those provided by school leaders and teachers, in order to build a comprehensive picture of the short and long-term impact of the introduction of statutory citizenship into the school curriculum in England. The time is right to examine students’ experiences and attitudes. It is important that this experience and perspective is brought to bear on the existing evidence base.

The analysis that follows focuses on data from the second cross-sectional survey, but reference is made to data from Year 7 (age 11-12 years) students in the first longitudinal survey undertaken in autumn 2002 (Kerr et al. 2003) and Year 10 (age 14-15) and Year 12 (age 16-17) students in the first cross-sectional survey undertaken in spring 2002 (Kerr et al. 2002) where appropriate.

Students’ understandings and experiences of citizenship

The first set of analyses concentrates on students’ understandings of citizenship, recognition of the new subject in the curriculum and views on what they have learnt.

What do students understand by citizenship as a concept?

Students who took part in the second cross-sectional survey were presented with eleven common definitions of citizenship (provided by Year 7 students in answer to an open-ended question in the first longitudinal survey). When asked to tick up to three boxes to indicate which descriptions best fitted their own definition of citizenship, students prioritised six items (see Figure 2):

- Belonging to your local, national or international community
- People’s responsibilities and obeying the law
- Making sure everyone is treated fairly
- Working together to make things better
- People’s rights (e.g. health, education, jobs, housing)
- Being a good citizen.

Interestingly, voting, politics and government was the least often selected definition across the age range.

What have students learnt in citizenship?

A greater percentage of students (68 per cent of all students) said they were taught citizenship at least a little in school in the current survey than in the 2002 longitudinal survey of Year 7 students (48 per cent) and the 2002 cross-sectional survey (48 per cent of Year 8, 10 and 12 students).

Year 10 and year 12 students were asked to list the citizenship-related topics they had learnt about in school. Topics that students reported learning about most often were rights and responsibilities (69 per cent), different cultures and ethnic groups (67 per cent), crime and punishment (62 per cent), environment (56 per cent) and the media (52 per cent). The topics students most often said they had not been taught included the voluntary sector (40 per cent), resolving conflict (37 per cent), voting
and elections (40 per cent), the European Union (39 per cent), the economy and business (36 per cent), and parliament and government (34 per cent).

**Figure 2 – Most common student definitions of citizenship**
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Has students’ knowledge increased?

Despite the increasing percentage of students who are being taught citizenship, students’ scores for knowledge of citizenship issues were lower in 2004 than in 2002, before the introduction of statutory citizenship education. For seven ‘knowledge’ questions posed to Year 10 (age 14-15) and Year 12 (age 16-17) students, the mean score for the percentage answered correctly fell from 60 per cent in 2002 to 52 per cent in 2004. [4] The mean score fell most dramatically amongst Year 10 students (ten points) and amongst those students who reported low levels of home literacy resources [5] (a drop of nine per cent for both those students who reported that their homes contained no books or 1-10 books). On average boys gained similar mean knowledge scores to girls (mean = 48 and 46, respectively), while mean knowledge scores, somewhat predictably, rose with age (see Figure 3). Mean knowledge scores also rose in relation to home literacy resources. In short, as the number of books in students’ homes rose, so too did mean knowledge scores.

Having a say: the student voice

The second set of analyses concentrates on the extent to which citizenship practices permeate school culture and students feel that they have a voice.

Having a say in school

Students’ views on how much of a voice they have in school were analysed using factor analysis. Their views grouped into a factor called student efficacy: high scores
indicate that students thought that they had a say in the running of their school and how they work in their classes.

**Figure 3– Knowledge scores by age and books in the home**

Student councils were in place in almost all of the schools surveyed (97 per cent of schools and 98 per cent of colleges). However, on average, students reported only moderate levels of student efficacy [6] (mean = 42). In schools and colleges where students had, on average, a greater sense of student efficacy, staff also tended to perceive their school or college to be more democratic.

Levels of student efficacy declined between the beginning of key stage 3 and the beginning of key stage 4, but they then rose again, particularly for Year 12 (age 16-17) students attending colleges (see Figure 4). This was despite the levels of school/college democracy reported by school teachers and college tutors being similar (mean = 48 and 51, respectively). Finally, Asian students reported considerably higher levels of student efficacy than other groups (except for black students), whereas such efficacy levels were identical for males and females. [7]

**Participating in the classroom**

Students’ reports of the teaching and learning methods to which they are exposed, the extent to which they have an opportunity to be active in the classroom and how positive the climate in their classrooms is were analysed using factor analysis. This yielded the following factors:

- **Traditional teaching and learning**: High scores mean that students reported the frequent use of traditional methods (e.g. taking notes, listening while the teacher talks, working from textbooks).
- **Active student participation in class**: High scores reflect active involvement of students in lessons (e.g. role play and debates; giving presentations).
• Positive classroom climate: High scores indicate that students discuss and debate, bring up issues for discussion, receive unbiased information from teachers, express their views, even if they disagree with teachers, and are encouraged to make up their own minds.

Consistent with findings from the teacher survey, students reported being exposed to high levels of traditional teaching and learning methods (mean = 76) and only being given a moderate level of opportunities for active participation in class (mean = 55).

Despite this, and also consistent with the teacher survey, students were moderately positive about their ability to express their views and develop their own opinions in class (positive classroom climate, mean = 57). However, many students felt that they were not very involved in planning teaching methods (80 per cent) and just under half felt they did not have a say in their own pattern of working during lessons (45 per cent).

Consistent with teacher survey findings, older students reported greater exposure to traditional teaching and learning methods. Students’ views on classroom climate, however, became more and more positive as they progressed through their education. Males and females reported similar levels of positive classroom climate, active student participation and traditional teaching and learning methods.

Students’ engagement and empowerment

The final set of analyses concentrates on students’ feelings of engagement and empowerment both within schools and in the wider community beyond school.

Do students feel generally empowered?

Questionnaire items on students’ views on their opportunities to have a say, both in school and beyond, were analysed using factor analysis. Their views grouped into a factor called personal efficacy: high scores reflect students’ confidence that they have a voice that is heard across the different spheres of their lives.

Students had moderate levels of personal efficacy [8] (mean = 50). Many felt that their opinions were taken seriously by their family (48 per cent), although only about one-fifth (19 per cent) felt they could have a real influence on the Government if they got involved.

The pattern for personal efficacy across the year groups was identical to that of student efficacy, i.e. it appears to dip in Year 10. Furthermore, males and females reported similar levels of personal efficacy whereas, amongst the ethnic groups examined, Asian students reported the highest levels of personal efficacy.

One variable which was inspected in relation to feelings of empowerment was students’ home literacy resources. It was found that students who reported low levels of home literacy resources tended to report considerably lower levels of personal efficacy (and, for that matter, lower levels of student efficacy, classroom climate, active student participation and exposure to traditional teaching and learning methods) (Figure 4, below).

Engagement with the school community

The graph below (Figure 5) reveals the top three activities that students participated in most frequently and the proportion of schools that offered these activities. As the graph shows there is some discrepancy between the proportion of
Figure 4 – Student efficacy and participation in school by Year group, ethnicity, gender, and home literacy resources
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Figure 5 – Opportunities for participation in school: Offered and taken-up
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schools that offer activities and the proportion of students that participate in them. Electing school or class council members was the activity in which students most frequently participated (44 per cent of students) and for all types of activity the
take-up was greater amongst younger students, compared to older students. A much smaller proportion of students said that they had participated in a school council, and Year 10 students had the lowest participation rates (11 per cent of Year 8, 9 per cent of Year 10 and 12 per cent of Year 12). These were in line with the Year 7 (age 11-12) students’ participation rates in 2002-3, where 12 per cent indicated that they had taken part in a school council.

Students were also asked about the help that they had given to clubs, groups or organisations over the 12 months prior to the survey. Although the largest proportion of students said that they had not given help to any clubs, groups or organisations (42 per cent), 30 per cent had taken part in a sponsored activity, whilst 26 per cent had helped to run or organise an event. Nineteen per cent had helped a club, group or organisation in another way, whilst, 14 per cent said that they had been part of a committee.

**Opportunities to participate in the wider community**

As Figure 6 illustrates, opportunities to raise money for a good cause were more frequently offered by schools than opportunities to volunteer in the local community. Whilst only a small proportion of students indicated that they had volunteered in the local community, a larger proportion had been involved in raising money for a good cause.

**Figure 6 – Opportunities for participation in the community – offered and taken up**
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**Conclusions and Implications**

The final section of this article focuses on findings which add new insights to the existing evidence base for citizenship education. It considers the implications of
these new insights for the existing evidence base and for our understanding of citizenship and citizenship education. In conclusion, it considers the implications for some of the groups currently involved in citizenship education at a range of levels: school leaders, co-ordinators and teachers, policy makers, NGOs and the voluntary sector and researchers, and points forward to the future direction of the Study.

Supporting the existing evidence base

In line with the earlier findings of this Study (Kerr et al. 2003 and 2004) and the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) Civic Education Study [9] (Torney-Purta et al., 2001; Kerr et al. 2001 and 2002) the analysis in this article reinforces a number of important findings with regard to the meaning and practice of citizenship education. These include:

- The classroom as a ‘traditional’ teaching and learning environment with note taking and teacher talk taking precedence over discussion and debate;
- Students’ recognition of their classrooms, despite the predominance of ‘traditional’ teaching and learning, as having a positive climate where they feel free to express their opinions and raise issues for discussion if required;
- Large gap between the availability of extra-curricular activities across school and college and their take up by students;
- Close linkage between citizenship knowledge and home literacy resources: the more books that students’ report their homes contain, the higher the knowledge scores.

Providing new insights

However, the analysis in this article not only reinforces considerably what is already known about citizenship education and wider citizenship issues but it also adds a number of new insights to the current evidence base in this area. While it should be remembered that this article is drawn from an interim report from the Study and that its findings and conclusions remain tentative at this stage, the analysis presented includes a number of potentially new and exciting insights concerning students’ development of citizenship dimensions (knowledge, skills, understanding, attitudes and behaviour) and the influence that schools, families and communities can have on such development. These new insights require further detailed investigation in the course of the Study as well as by other researchers working in the area of citizenship education and political socialisation.

These new insights can be grouped around three areas of further investigation: students’ development of citizenship dimensions; school influences on students’ development of citizenship dimensions and the influence of other ‘sites’ of citizenship (particularly the family and wider community) on such development. Each of these areas is examined in turn.

Students’ development of citizenship dimensions

The findings reveal some potential new insights into students’ development of citizenship dimensions across different age ranges and educational stages, which have not been found in existing surveys and studies. They suggest:

- Students’ development of citizenship dimensions is neither even nor consistent. Indeed, there may be a considerable ‘dip’ in this development in the later years of adolescence among both male and female students. The findings reveal drops in
students’ development of citizenship dimensions is also influenced by their personal, family and community characteristics, among other factors. For example, the findings suggest a clear relationship between home literacy resources and feelings of empowerment, levels of trust, engagement, community attachment and commitment to volunteering and participation. In short, higher levels of home literacy resources relate to higher levels of empowerment, trust and so on. There may also be differences in attitudes and behaviours between male and female students as well as between those from different ethnic backgrounds. For example, Asian and Black students in the sample had the most positive views about volunteering compared to other groups and this may be influenced by the particular family and community context in which they grow up.

Students’ sense of belonging and attachment to the different communities in their lives may change over time. It is noticeable in the survey that students’ sense of belonging to the school community increases with age in comparison with their attachment to other communities. They are much more attached to the school community in the later years of their schooling than to other communities. This may be the result of their increased seniority and status in the school community and the associated privileges and responsibilities that go with such seniority, or may conversely reflect their increasing detachment from their families and local communities as they reach adulthood.

School influences on students’ development of citizenship dimensions

The findings also suggest that what goes on in schools, in classrooms, corridors and grounds, can have an influence on what students think, know and do in relation to citizenship education and wider citizenship issues. In particular:

Students in all year groups associate citizenship more with rights and responsibilities and issues of identity and equality than with formal political processes. This may be influenced by the nature of the teaching of citizenship they receive in schools and the topics that are and are not covered. It is perhaps no coincidence that the topics least taught – voting, elections, government and the EU – are those that students least associate with the concept of citizenship, the groups and institutions that students trust the least and the ‘knowledge’ questions that students struggle to answer correctly.

Students in all year groups also report that citizenship is more noticeable to them in schools than in 2002, with just over two-thirds (68 per cent) saying that had experienced it. This is perhaps a recognition of the growing use and acceptance of the term in the curriculum and by teachers, co-ordinators and school leaders in their interactions with students.

When compared to the results of the first cross-sectional survey (2002), there has been an apparent drop in students’ citizenship knowledge scores; particularly for students in Year 10. However, this may be due to a number of reasons. It may be related to the home literacy resources of this student sample being lower overall than the 2002 sample. It may also be a reflection of the nature of what is, and is not, taught in schools than on the ability of students to comprehend citizenship topics and issues. The knowledge items in the survey tested knowledge about political and legal processes and institutions, including those concerning voting, political
representation and legal rights. These are precisely the citizenship topics that students report they are taught least about.

The apparent reduction in students’ knowledge scores may suggest that schools and teachers lack the expertise and confidence to teach the core knowledge component of citizenship (focusing on the legal and political system, government, political parties and voting processes) and/or that they do not recognise that this core component is distinctive from anything else in the curriculum, therefore needing to be focused on directly. Thus, the fact that citizenship is currently taught by a range of teachers from different subject backgrounds, and through a number of different subjects and areas, most notably PSHE, rather than through discrete citizenship lessons may exacerbate this situation in schools.

**Influences of other contexts and ‘sites’ on students’ development of citizenship dimensions**

The findings also make clear that school is only one of the contexts or ‘sites’ that have an influence on students’ development of citizenship dimensions. They underline:

The potential influence of personal, family and community characteristics on students’ development of citizenship dimensions. For example, the findings suggest a clear relationship between home literacy resources and feelings of empowerment, engagement, community attachment and commitment to volunteering and participation.

The potential impact of cultural and community influences on students’ development of citizenship dimensions. The findings hint at differences in attitudes between those from different ethnic backgrounds. For example, Asian students in the sample had the highest levels of student efficacy compared to other groups while Asian and Black students had the most positive views about volunteering compared to other groups. The influence of community and culture on students’ attitudes and behaviour, alongside other influences, is something that requires further investigation during the course of the Study as well as by other researchers.

**Combining the new insights and existing evidence base**

The findings reported in this article both strengthen the existing evidence base for citizenship and citizenship education and also add new insights. Now we must ask ourselves about the combined effect of the existing and new insights on our understanding of citizenship and citizenship education. Combining what we already know with new insights has four important outcomes:

First, it suggests that young peoples’ development of citizenship dimensions (knowledge, skills, understanding, attitudes and behaviours) is complex and influenced by a range of interrelated factors and influences. These influences include contextual characteristics [10] or factors, ‘sites’ of citizenship education (school, family, peer groups, community) and the various actors (teachers, parents, friends) that take part in the (formal and informal) educational processes at these different ‘sites’. This raises the difficulty for researchers of identifying these factors and influences, disentangling their interrelationship and isolating their particular impact on young people over time.

Second, the findings highlight the need for more in-depth investigation of those students from ethnic backgrounds and the influences on their development of citizenship dimensions. Though the numbers of students in this sample from
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different ethnic backgrounds is small, there is some evidence of differences in their attitudes to citizenship participation and behaviours compared to other students. The underlying reason for these differences, and the potential impact of family, community and cultural influences, is an area that is rich for further exploration by researchers.

Third, the findings raise the need to give more consideration to the impact of year on year effects on students’ development of citizenship dimensions across a number of age ranges and educational stages. This article speculates that students’ development of citizenship dimensions is neither even nor consistent. Indeed, the findings suggest that there may be a considerable ‘dip’ in development around Year 10, when students are age 14 to 15. However, while it is acknowledged that cohort of students who participated in the second cross-sectional survey is a representative sample, the conclusions must remain tentative at this stage. It is unclear whether these findings are cohort specific, will be replicated in future years, or indeed if such a ‘dip’ exists nationally, whether this stretches beyond Year 10 into Year 11 when students are age 15 to 16. The impact of year and year effects requires further in-depth investigation in other elements of the Study in the coming years.

Third, the findings suggest that schools do and can have a strong influence on students’ development of citizenship dimensions. There are already signs in this article, from students’ experiences of the first two years of statutory citizenship education in the curriculum, that these school experiences are having an influence on students’ conceptions of citizenship, students’ civic knowledge and on their sense of efficacy and empowerment.

The findings also suggest that schools have the potential to have an even greater influence in the future, particularly if the trajectory of students’ development of citizenship dimensions over time proves to be correct. If students feel a greater sense of belonging to the school community with age, and at the same time they show a maturing sophistication of views, then the school has the potential to take this understanding and provide increased opportunities for students’ to participate and engage actively in the school community and to develop student voice.

Fourth, and finally, the findings also remind us of the importance of grounding research in the changing realities of citizenship education practice and policy and of building an evidence base that is strong, robust and relevant. The findings in this article underline that what happens in practice in schools is not always in line with the intentions of policy makers when drawing up citizenship curricula. The conceptualisation of citizenship education, for example, put forward by the Citizenship Advisory Group, with its emphasis on political literacy, is somewhat different from how students in the sample conceptualise citizenship. They also remind us that practice does not always reflect the thoughts and arguments of commentators and researchers about definition of, approaches to and wider dimensions of citizenship.

These are still early days for citizenship education in England in terms of policy development and the construction of effective practice in schools and elsewhere. Practice is evolving rapidly and unevenly. It is therefore important to refer the findings in this article to the growing evidence base, in order to better contextualise them, as well as to make adjustments to that evidence base as a consequence of the findings. It is still unclear, for example, what the impact of definition, approaches and key factors concerning citizenship education in schools, as set out earlier in this paper, at an individual school level is on students’ experiences of and attitudes to citizenship. How far, for example, has the four school approach (set out in Figure 1 earlier) been an influence? Do progressing schools have a much greater influence on
student development of citizenship dimensions than minimalist schools? It is these and similar questions which will be investigated further through the 20 in-depth school case studies which are a feature of the Longitudinal Study design.

Key considerations and future directions

The findings raise a number of considerations for the main groups currently involved in citizenship education at a range of levels. Though there is not the space to detail them here, there are considerable implications for the ways that school leaders, co-ordinators and teachers, policy-makers, NGOs and voluntary organisations and teacher educators and researchers currently conceive, approach and engage with citizenship education and wider citizenship issues with young people. It is hoped that the findings will encourage further discussion, deliberation and action at a variety of levels from the classroom to the local community.

The findings also indicate the power of longitudinal methodology for answering the overall aims of the Study and providing vital information with which to inform the future elements of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study. Above all, this article has confirmed the importance of ensuring that student experiences of, and attitudes to, citizenship and citizenship education are no longer the ‘missing dimension’ but are at the very heart of all the elements of the Study and of citizenship education policy, practice and research activity in general. It is vital to the success of the Study, and to the future direction of citizenship education policy and practice in England that the voice and experiences of the students who are participating is heard alongside those of teachers and school leaders. After all, encouraging ‘pupils to play a helpful part in the life of their schools, neighbourhoods, communities and the wider world’ is one of the intended outcomes of the introduction of citizenship into schools in England. It is also what effective practice should be about wherever citizenship education is developed in the world. Researchers, teacher educators, policy-makers and practitioners take note.
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NOTES

[1] For the latest findings, reports and progress of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study and other citizenship related research projects at NFER visit http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research/citizenship.asp

[2] For further details about the methodology of the survey, including survey design, sample characteristics and survey analysis see Appendix 1.
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Appendix 1. Methodology

Survey design

The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study comprises cross-sectional surveys which are carried out every two years to gather data from students in Year 8, Year 10 and Year 12 [A], as well as from the leaders and teaching staff in their schools or colleges. In alternate years, a longitudinal cohort of students are being followed from Year 7 through to Year 13, with data also being collected from the leaders and teachers in their schools (see Kerr et al., 2004 for further details).

The present report concentrates on data collected during the second cross-sectional survey, which was carried out in spring 2003. However, where appropriate, data from the first longitudinal survey of Year 7 students (autumn 2002) and the first cross-sectional survey (spring 2002) are also used.

Second Cross-sectional Survey Administration

Questionnaires were sent to each school or college for completion by one whole class in either Year 8, Year 10 or Year 12. Each school or college was also sent questionnaires for completion by the headteacher, their deputy or equivalent in colleges, and up to 5 teachers or tutors involved in the delivery of citizenship education or related topics.

Questionnaires

The questionnaires were identical to those used in the first longitudinal survey, with some minor adjustments made to wording to account for the fact that citizenship education implementation in schools had now been statutory for over a year. In addition, some items were re-worded to improve the breath and quality of the data collected. Overall, these changes were minimal meaning that it was possible to make comparisons between the results and those from the first cross-sectional and the first longitudinal surveys.

Sample

The sample was a nationally representative sample of 237 schools and 50 colleges [B] in England during the autumn term of 2003-4, just over one year after citizenship education became a statutory subject in secondary schools in September 2002. Questionnaires were completed by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School leaders</td>
<td>College leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8 students</td>
<td>Year 12 college students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 196 | 441 | 2377 | 2091 | 855 | 42 | 167 | 987 |

The numbers of schools and colleges returning each type of questionnaire were as shown:

http://www.citized.info ©2005 citizED
The characteristics of students were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Students %</th>
<th>Books in the home</th>
<th>Students %</th>
<th>Ethnic background</th>
<th>Students %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asian/ British Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Very few (1-10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Black/ Black British</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One shelf (11-50)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mixed ethnic origin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 bookcase (51-100)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>White British</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 bookcases (101-200)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>White European</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3+bookcases (201+)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Other ethnic group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Base: All students in schools and colleges. There was 1-3% non-response for these questions.


Survey analysis

Tables of basic frequencies were used to gauge the types of responses obtained from different groups of respondents. The data were weighted to reflect the known proportion of schools and colleges in the population. This was done for the total percentages and means for Year 12 students from colleges and schools and for all students.

In addition, the analysis built on the factor analyses performed on the data from the first longitudinal survey (for a full discussion of the factor analyses see Kerr et al., 2004) to provide composite variables. These variables provided summaries of the data to create reliable measures of the key constructs underlying groups of individual items. In addition, new factor analyses were performed where required due to the addition of items. The internal consistency (reliability) of all factors was checked for all new data, and per year group, where applicable. The factors used in this report are described in the sections where they are used.

NOTES

[A] Year 7 (age 11-12); year 8 (age 12-13); year 9 (age 13-14); year 10 (age 14-15); year 11 (age 15-16); year 12 (age 16-17); year 13 (age 17-18).

[B] Of the 300 schools and colleges approached for participation, 287 returned questionnaires.
The Development Of Political Thinking In School Students: An English Perspective

DON ROWE, The Citizenship Foundation

ABSTRACT This paper discusses the written responses to a political problem of 100 English students between 12 and 14 years of age. The responses showed a wide variation in the levels of understanding students brought to the issue. Findings are discussed in the light of previous research into the development of political knowledge and understanding and recent work on schema theory. These students are seen to think about political issues largely using ‘personalized’ and not societal schemas [1] but within these personal schemas there appear to be significant differences ranging from describing simple emotions to speculating on others’ states of mind. The problem-solving skills employed by students also range from the inability to identify opposing viewpoints, through a stage where opposing positions are held in crude opposition, to one in which opposing considerations are held in tension. More sophisticated thinking amongst these students is also marked by self-awareness with regard to the thinking processes and by principled, as opposed to consequential, reasoning - but examples are rare. Implications of the findings for teachers of citizenship and political literacy are discussed.

Introduction

The citizenship curriculum for secondary schools in England, which became statutory in 2002 (DfEE/QCA, 1999), provides the framework for a curriculum which includes learning about key elements and institutions of public life. This should be taught in the context of real and relevant issues in order to nurture the development of political understanding and thinking skills. Students’ progress must be assessed and reported to parents at the end of each year. At the end of Years 9 and 11 [2], so-called attainment targets provide ‘end of key stage descriptions’ the intention being to provide a standard against which to measure progress. Such attainment targets are set for all statutory National Curriculum subjects. However, because citizenship is a new subject, these targets are as yet only broadly defined and they give little indication of the actual levels of knowledge and understanding to be expected of students performing below, at, or beyond the average for the age group. For example, the attainment target for the end of Year 9 states that, by this age, pupils should have:

A broad knowledge and understanding of the topical events they study; the rights, responsibilities and duties of citizens; the role of the voluntary sector; forms of government; provision of public services; and the criminal and legal systems. (DfEE/QCA, 1999).
Such a statement raises many questions for teachers attempting to assess students’ progress against this description. For example, what can be said about the level of understanding young people of 13 or 14 might be expected to display of, for example, the role of local and national government? How do students of this age construe topical political issues, given their limited experience of the world of politics? Does the nature of their thinking change as they get older and, if so, what characteristics mark out this particular stage of development? Teachers need to know how political thinking develops not only to assess it appropriately but also to teach more effectively. This paper represents an attempt to develop an understanding of the level of political understanding which might be expected of Year 8 and 9 citizenship students, as they approach a point half way through the statutory citizenship curriculum.

Research into the development of political thinking

The accumulation of Political knowledge

A substantial body of research has accumulated around the development of political thinking in young people, though a search of the literature shows that most of this has not been undertaken in the UK. One major English study in the field is that of Robert Stradling (1977) who undertook a large-scale study of the level of political awareness in over 4,000 15 and 16 year-olds (Year 11 students) in England. He attempted to elicit not only levels of political knowledge but also the complexity of their political understanding. Stradling found that the vast majority of these students could recognize the leaders of the two main parties but their knowledge of other politicians was poor. Their knowledge of how Parliament works was limited to a broad understanding that laws emanate from Parliament but few (10%) understood the difference between the government and Parliament. Recognition of the different policies associated with different parties was also low. For example, only about one third of the sample correctly associated the Conservative Party with lower taxation policies. About half of the sample either could not think of the name of a single pressure group or did not understand the term. Ten years later, Furnham and Gunter (1987) were able to replicate many of Stradling’s earlier findings in UK students.

An earlier developmental study of interest is that of Connell (1971) who noted that the accumulation of political knowledge takes place from the early school years. He conducted in-depth interviews with 119 Australian young people from 5 to 16. According to Connell, the political understanding of his subjects went through four distinct phases in its development towards maturity. In the early years, Connell’s subjects displayed scant awareness of the political domain as distinct from the personal and there were often non-logical leaps in argument when they talked about political events. Elements of fantasy crept in where real social or political knowledge was lacking. Connell called this first stage intuitive thinking.

Connell noted that, with the growth of a more realistic understanding of the social world, after the age of 7 or 8, these fantasy elements began to disappear. There was evidence of a basic understanding that a distinct political world exists and most children could identify the country’s leading politician and head of state. They were also aware of symbols of statehood (see also Jackson, 1972) and had an outline concept of political power, as vested in the monarch, prime minister and police. However, political thinking at this age was naïve and non-problematic. Judgements were simplistic, ad hoc, and often internally inconsistent. Connell called this stage primitive realism.
Early adolescence, according to Connell, is marked by rapidly increasing understanding of the political world, growing awareness that relationships are complex and that political issues involve numbers of different players or agencies with different roles and perspectives. Connell concluded that this rapid development begins around the age of 10 or 11. At this stage a person’s stance on one issue might lack consistency with other stances on related issues. Politics comes to be seen as more problematic, involving competing interests and choices. Young people at this stage are more and more able to take personal stances on issues. This stage is called by Connell construction of political order.

Finally, political thinking becomes characterized by more direct reference to abstract concepts or theories. Societies and polities are now understood as entities in themselves. Stances on single issues are increasingly consistent and inter-connected by over-arching ideologies and values, which become progressively more explicit in the thinking. For Connell this stage is one of ideological thinking.

The development of political thinking

Adelson and O’Neil (1966) and Adelson, Green and O’Neil (1969), looked at the development of the understanding of key political concepts such as community, law and individual rights in American young people between the ages of 11 and 18. Subjects were posed a question about whether it was right for a community to insist on the building of a road across private property. A central finding of their research was a clear developmental shift towards more socio-centric thinking in mid-adolescence. Prior to this, younger students strongly favoured the rights of the individual against the claims of the community, which is understood at this stage as no more than a collection of individuals. The more developed understanding of society as a collective entity did not appear to be salient for most subjects until around the age of 14. This important shift is consistent with Connell’s (1971) findings and has also been noted by many others, e.g., Rest et al (2000), Colby and Kohlberg (1987), and Gibbs (1992). The same phenomenon was also observed by Stradling (1977), who replicated the findings of Adelson et al in his survey of English Year 11 students.

Developmental psychologists have also noted significant shifts in the way children and young people conceptualize law. Law is a critical concept for citizenship education, associated as it is, with concepts of fairness, justice, rights, duties and law-making (authoritarian or democratic). Adelson et al (1969) noted that his younger subjects tended to see the law as authoritarian, rigid, concrete and punitive. Older subjects were more likely to see that laws have a social purpose and that they can be criticized on moral grounds. As children’s legal and justice reasoning develops it goes through the same sequence from inter-personal to social contexts noted earlier, according to Gibbs (1992) and Colby and Kohlberg (1987). Stradling suggests about two-thirds of the students in his English Y11 sample employed some elements of socio-centric reasoning.

Implicit versus explicit modes of reasoning

Stradling (1977) observed that the young people in his study tended to employ different modes of reasoning. About half of his sample showed no explicit forms of reasoning in their answers. However, students’ logical processes became more visible as their direct experience of specific issues increased. According to Stradling, poorer reasoners addressed problems by reference to personal experience or the
perceived consequences of a situation, deciding on an issue in terms of its likely outcomes. Some of the more sophisticated reasoners made reference to some form of moral concept or principle. For example, in response to the problem of the road being routed over private land (originally used by Adelson), some respondents explicitly used concepts of welfare, individual rights, fairness and democracy.

**Development of social and political schemas**

How is new knowledge assimilated as young people become more socially and politically aware? Torney-Purta (1992) argues that the construction of political understanding takes place through the absorption of new knowledge into existing cognitive frameworks called ‘representations’ or ‘schemas’. Schemas are hypothesized mental structures which organize information into clusters around a given topic. For citizenship students such schemas would include clusters of knowledge about law, democracy, government, the environment, the family and so on. For example, mention of the word ‘police’ would call to mind a set of associated ideas and information which would differ from person to person, since no two people’s experiences are identical.

Torney-Purta suggests that schemas serve a number of functions. First, they mediate a person’s understanding of what they experience. The absence of appropriate schemas can explain why someone may misunderstand or misconstrue an issue. Second, they enable a person to learn new information. In learning, existing schemas are extended, or even rejected and replaced by new ones. Third, they have a function in problem solving. It is through their existing schemas that people come to identify issues as particular kinds of problem and select appropriate steps to address them. Schemas are not, therefore, one-dimensional structures. They comprise complex mixtures of socio-political knowledge and belief.

Torney-Purta asked a sample of young people attending political summer schools to think aloud about how they would respond to particular political issues before and after tuition. Pre- and post-course responses were analysed and these were also compared with those of adult professionals in the field. Torney-Purta was able to show that, as a result of tuition, respondents drew on larger numbers of schemas in analysing given situations and that the schemas themselves became more elaborated. In some cases, naïve schemas, marked by a lack of ‘real world’ knowledge, were replaced by more realistic ones. In addition, she notes that one of the major contrasts between the responses of the adolescents and the experts was the way that the problems were approached and solved. Some of the novices reacted as though they felt there was a straightforward, ‘right’ answer to each problem (i.e. the thinking was simplistic or non-problematic), whereas, in contrast, the more expert thinkers drew on more complex understandings which acknowledged tensions between competing interests and balanced different perspectives within the proposed solution.

In a study of English 17 year olds, Weinreich-Haste (1984) found positive correlations between levels of reasoning about social and political problems and levels of moral reasoning. She argues that the development of political understanding is dependent on schemas by means of which the interrelationship between individual action and the social system is understood. It is therefore, possible to speak of implicit social theories which individuals draw on to interpret any given issue, such as law breaking or conflict resolution. Weinreich-Haste identified four different levels of social reasoning within this group, the simplest being concrete/individual, the second level was interpersonal/dyadic, the third was community/collective and the fourth, systemic. 900 school students aged 17
responded to 84 items [3], which were designed to elicit the extent of individualism versus collectivism in their thinking: in other words, the attribution of social change or improvement to individual characteristics versus locating the causes in institutional or societal origins. On 58 out of these 84 items, there were significant correlations between political and moral reasoning:

Almost without exception (author’s emphasis), the direction of these correlations indicates that the higher the moral stage preferred, the more likely it was that the respondents would endorse beliefs or values which reflected explanations in society or institutions. The lower the moral stage, the more likely was the endorsement of concrete explanations located in individual attributes or actions.

A pilot study in UK schools

In order to understand the relevance of such findings to English students in key stage 3, my colleague Ted Huddleston and I conducted a pilot study which involved asking students to respond to a problem in which a local council has to decide whether or not to grant permission for an extension to the quarry on a hillside overlooking the town (see fig 1). Respondents were asked to put themselves in the position of the council and to write as much as they could about the problem as they saw it. The question was therefore designed to encourage students to discuss the problem in as much complexity as possible, not merely state what they thought the council should do. Although we recognized that written production measures of this kind are never as revealing of students’ knowledge and understanding as in-depth interviews, we only asked for written responses in order to replicate the kind of work a teacher would receive. The problem was read aloud by the teacher to each class, and the basic terms explained. Then students were asked to answer the question on their own, to the best of their ability. The scenario had not been studied beforehand and so students had not, in any sense, been coached to answer the question. Students were therefore more likely to give answers which reflected their own personal constructs of the scenario.

Responses were collected from 56 Year 8 students and 58 Year 9 students in non-selective secondary schools. Fourteen of these were incomplete or insufficiently coherent to be included in the study, leaving exactly 100 responses in the analysis.

On the hillside above the town of Standley, there was a big quarry. For years the people of the town have dug stone out of this quarry. Bit by bit, the hillside is being eaten away. Two months ago, the people who own the quarry asked the council if they could be allowed to make it bigger still. The council can’t decide whether it should allow the quarry owners to make the quarry bigger or not.

Think about the council’s decision. Why might it be difficult for them to decide? Write as much as you can about the problem as you see it. Begin with the words…

The problem as I see it is …

Fig 1: The problem of the Standley Quarry
Analysis of the data

Analysis of the transcripts was carried out first of all to determine the number and nature of schemas utilized by students in their answers. How would students interpret this problem? It was of more interest to see what level of sophistication they brought to the issue than which solution they favoured. Are there significant differences in the schemas students utilize to understand the situation? Is there a correlation between the number of schemas utilized and their nature – would students’ answers reflect Weinreich-Haste’s (1984) finding of a shift from a ‘personalized’ view of the world towards more societal perspectives?

Secondly, the transcripts were analysed in terms of the thought processes or problem-solving procedures employed by the students. Evidence has already been referred to which suggests that students’ thinking about political issues becomes more abstract and ideological as students reach the age of 16. Both Stradling (1977) and Connell (1971) noted that many students of this age made explicit references to moral and political ideas in their responses. To what extent would this be evidenced in the responses of these 14 year-olds? Also of interest here is the extent to which students still think intuitively or implicitly about such problems and whether there are developments in the way they resolve the tensions inherent in political issues of this kind.

Students’ responses

Number and Nature of Schemas employed by respondents

Responses varied widely in terms of the number of schemas students drew on to analyse the problem. Generally, speaking the very weak responses employed only two or three schemas. The following is a rare example of the use of just one schema [4], i.e. loss of land.

Respondent 1

The problem as I see it is I think that the quarry should not be allowed to make it bigger because it is just going to [take up more of the land] where it is and if they make it bigger the hillside is going to be eaten away more and it won’t stop getting smaller because the more that is taken away the less the land will be because there won’t be much land left.

In this second example, the student draws on just two schemas, one relating to the environment and another to traffic.

Respondent 2

The problem as I see it is that all of the [animals and the wild life] would be in great danger and also people who lived near by in a cottage they would not be happy because of all the [vehicles] driving by all the time.
In both of these answers, the schemas drawn on relate to concrete (physical or visible) aspects of the student’s world. None of these is wrong or irrelevant but in each case the elaboration of the schema (whether ‘environment’ or ‘land use’) is much less developed than in many other students’ answers. In the second answer, the reference to environmental concerns is put very simply and the nuisance from traffic is discussed in terms of people who live ‘near by in a cottage’ – almost the language of the fairy story.

Across the whole sample, the majority of respondents draw on between 2 and 4 schemas though, for the most part, these are relatively unelaborated. More adequate, sophisticated responses are associated with a higher number of schemas, the best ones containing 6 or 7, the schemas themselves tending to be more complex or sophisticated. However, there is not a straight correlation between the number of schemas and the length or sophistication of the answers. For example, the following answer draws on six schemas, and whilst it displays the beginnings of a societal perspective, it is still not amongst the most sophisticated because each schema is virtually unelaborated, factors on either side are listed almost in isolation from each other and the writer seems to have jumped to his or her conclusion without saying why.

**Respondent 3**

_The problem as I see it is that this [town’s backbone is the quarry] if the land is created then the people of Standley [keep their jobs]. If the quarry is granted the land then the homes nearby will suffer [noise, dust] and the [price of their home will slump]. If the area is a beauty spot then things may lead to [demonstrations]. A good way would be that the quarry should have the land but slowly eat away at the hillside and over a time it will be less drastic on the area around the quarry._

This answer is relatively unusual because of its reference to three economic schemas – jobs, house prices (rarely mentioned in our sample) and town’s economic dependence on the quarry. Besides frequent references to ‘jobs’ and the idea that the quarry would ‘make money’ our sample was notable for very few references to economic factors – which is noteworthy given the nature of the problem. This is consistent with Furnham and Lewis’s (1986) findings about the general lack of economic awareness in this age group.

The most common schemas across the sample, were concrete and personal or inter-personal. In examples 1 and 2, the writers speak of people making the quarry bigger and people being unhappy about the traffic. In both of these cases, these personal references speak of isolated acts or feelings and make no reference to others. More elaborated examples of personal schemas speak of people in relation to others (what Weinreich-Haste calls ‘inter-personal’ or ‘dyadic’). For example, below I give one of the more extended responses, which whilst, drawing on six schemas, still interprets the situation in predominantly inter-personal terms. Negative public opinion is described in terms of people making ‘complaints’, ‘making a fuss at the council’ and ‘a lot of rows’. And tourists are spoken of as staying away because ‘there would be nothing to look at’. A more sophisticated response might have spoken of there being a slump in the tourist trade (a systemic description of the same phenomenon).
Respondent 4

The problem as I see it is that they have 2 choices.

1) They [need the stone] from the quarry to make roads and buildings. Also if they do not allow the quarry to be made bigger lots of people will be [out of a job] and will come and [complain] that they do not have jobs.

2) But if they do allow it to take place the land will be [unreadable], [the public will come and make a fuss at the council] about all the [noise and dust and pollution] that is taking place and [no tourist will come] because there would be nothing to look at. If they chose to ignore it there would probably be a lot of rows.

If I was the council I would let them take a little bit out.

Within these personalized schemas, there appear to be three different levels of response. Firstly, the weakest students tend to use an individualistic ‘happy/sad’ paradigm (see respondent 2) showing a basic understanding of people’s emotional responses to the situation. The majority of students demonstrate an ability to discuss the problem in terms of people’s actions, needs or wants. For example, one student suggests that a key point would be that ‘if they did make the quarry bigger the people of the town would not be able to play on the hill or have picnics and things’. See also respondents 3 and 4 who describe people complaining, tourists staying away and so on. Only a small minority of students show a more empathic ability to discuss the situation in terms of people’s thoughts or motives, as in the following example.

Respondent 5

The problem as I see it is I think that the people in the town would not mind, or have to put up with the [noise, dust and traffic] caused by the extension to the quarry because [when they bought the houses there] they knew about the quarry and anyway they would be in favour of an extension since a [lot of jobs] nearby would come from the quarry and they wouldn’t want to lose their jobs.

On the other hand the [environment is at risk] from the extension. But you might have thought that since they built a quarry on that hill people would have [chosen a hill that would contain stone and not contain rare wildlife].

I think they should extend the quarry but [set aside the older areas of the quarry for wildlife], planting trees there. But this is bias since I am human and human jobs are at stake. Morally they should not extend it
and should replant all of the hill with trees and make it suitable for wildlife.

This is the most elaborated and thoughtful response in the whole sample in terms of the extent to which the respondent speculates on the states of mind of those affected by the proposal. This respondent interprets the situation through the eyes of those affected. He or she infers that people ‘would not mind’ the expansion and suggests that, because they would have already known about the quarry, they would probably understand the need to expand. He or she then infers that the site would probably not have been selected had ‘people’ (a collectivist perspective) considered it valuable in terms of wildlife. This respondent also shows an unusual level of self-awareness in the reference to possible bias in favouring the rights of humans over animals.

In contrast to the predominantly personalized schemas utilized by most of our respondents, only a few (thirteen in all) display an ability to discuss the problem from the perspective of the council, the town as a whole or in terms of social, political or economic forces. Bearing in mind that the Standley Quarry problem was actually presented in terms of the council’s dilemma, it is striking that so few students responded in like terms. It seems that most students did not have sufficiently elaborated schemas by which to understand the problem as stated and had therefore to utilize their own less developed, personalized constructions. The example below is one of the small number that tackles the problem from the council’s standpoint.

Respondent 6

‘The problem as I see it is if the Council want to stop the quarry getting bigger it means two things 1) locals out of a [job] 2) it stops the [damage to nature] and the countryside. But if they do let it get bigger, vice versa to the above statements. So either way, however you look at it, something bad comes out of it.

So I think the council should think hard about this. Personally, I think the Council should stop any more digging and these are my options I would take:

1) Find each person a new job that is local around the town.

2) They can keep digging until the Council find you a job.

3) Do a [survey] around the town who wants what and how do [they] get around it.

4) Find a [quarry somewhere else] where people do not mind.'
My own thoughts I think is that no 3 is a good option and so is 2.

This answer includes an interesting reference to a democracy schema (‘Do a survey around the town…’). We have already seen references to this schema from a personalized standpoint (i.e. people will demonstrate or have rows) but this reference to the council’s need to make its decision in the light of people’s views is altogether more elaborated. There are, in fact, few references to public interactions with the council in the sample as a whole and what there are are almost entirely couched in terms either of people physically demonstrating (as in examples 3 and 4 above) or of the council gathering the opinions of individuals in surveys. There is, for example, no reference anywhere to public opinion which would be a more abstract and systemic level interpretation of this ‘democracy’ schema.

So, broadly speaking, our students’ political thinking is dominated by the actions and reactions of individuals, with only a limited awareness of the societal backdrop against which these actions play out. References to economic or social forces are largely absent from the way students have interpreted the problem of Standley Quarry. Having said this, most students appear to have understood the concept of ‘the council’ in making sense of the problem. Even though they selected personalized schemas, the majority of students clearly understood that it was the council which had the power to decide one way or another. This is compatible with, e.g. Connell’s (1977) findings that awareness of the main institutions of government is already well developed by this age. In a more recent large-scale survey of civic knowledge amongst English 14 year-olds, Kerr et al (2002) showed that almost all of them understood the role of government in relation to the provision of key services such as health and education. Nevertheless, the few references in our sample to the possible processes involved, such as the granting of planning permissions, suggest that students of this age know what the main political agents do but as yet know little about how they work.

Simple or complex reasoning

Three forms of problem solving can be observed in our sample. The first and weakest form is where students discuss or acknowledge only one side of the problem. In the first example, above, the reasoning is one-sided and non-problematic. There is no argument offered, merely several re-statements of the fact that the quarry will mean a loss of land. At this level, respondents fail to indicate why one side is favoured over the other. The thinking seems to be implicit and intuitive. A second, more adequate, type of problem solving is displayed by a significant number of students who are able to identify two sides of the problem, but do not (or cannot) reconcile these conflicting interests in any way. This is crude either/or thinking, as in the following example:

Respondent 7

The problem as I see it is if they make the quarry bigger than it is, the hillside [will disappear], but if they make it bigger they will dig up more stone. The decision is either to make it bigger and get more [stone], or leave it the size it is and then there won’t by any hillside to crumble away, so it will either be made bigger or leave the hill-side alone, so it doesn’t crumble away.
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Less than one third of the sample show evidence of a third type of reasoning which I will call balancing. Here the students, aware of the tensions created by the opposing demands, demonstrate the ability to employ a form of thinking which holds conflicting interests in a creative kind of tension or compromise. An example of this is where students suggest that the council should allow quarrying to go ahead but within limits or with conditions (see respondents 4, 5 and 6 above for examples of balancing perspectives). Torney Purta (above) noted the same ability to balance competing claims in her more expert reasoners.

**Implicit/explicit reasoning**

It is a striking feature of the responses as a whole that only a few students make explicit reference to their own logical processes. The weakest form of reasoning, as we have noted, is intuitive – the conclusion is stated with no hint as to how it is arrived. Most of the students, while giving reasons on either side of the problem, make no reference to how they have approached the problem. In a small number of answers, however, there is an element of meta-cognition, as in responses 5 and 6 above. Instead of merely stating a solution, respondent 6 has set out a number of alternatives and then selected those he or she favoured (albeit without stating why). These data suggest that, as students progress in their thinking, they become aware, not only of greater complexities within issues, but also of alternative problem-solving procedures. They perhaps also learn that, to indicate why one procedure was considered more appropriate than others, can constitute a more persuasive answer.

**Consequential versus principled reasoning**

In Stradling’s (1977) study, he observes around a quarter of students employing some form of principled reasoning in their answers. Our students relied almost completely on consequential thinking (i.e. deciding on the balance of likely outcomes) rather than basing their reasoning on moral principles. There are only two answers in the whole of the sample which explicitly introduce a moral principle into the argument. One of these suggests that the quarry should not be extended because in principle the land belongs to the people:

...You have to look upon it as their land after all so why should they [the townspeople] be denied of that right?

And another student (respondent 5 above) states that it is a moral duty to care for the land and not destroy it:

...morally, they should not extend it and should replant all of the hill with trees and make it suitable for wildlife.

This particular response is interesting because the writer distinguishes between a consequential or pragmatic solution (the quarry should go ahead because of the economic benefits) whilst still holding the opinion that, in principle, the expansion is wrong. This answer is unique in our sample in this respect.
Conclusions

The main concern in this paper has been to map the spread of different types of political thinking represented in this sample of 12 – 14 year olds. Answers from both year groups were spread fairly evenly across the whole sample, which suggests that, between them, these two schools included most levels of ability to be found in this age group. And there is no reason to suppose that the levels of exposure to the political world, through schooling or the media, is not reasonably typical of the age group.

Compared with Connell’s (1971) findings that many of his Australian 16 year-olds, were regularly using societal perspectives as well as drawing on ideologies and principles in their thinking, it looks as if this is much less well-established in English 14 year-olds, though we have to allow that Connell’s in-depth interviews may have supported the production of higher level answers than our written responses. Most of Stradling’s Year 11 students also displayed some form of societal awareness, compared with 13% of our sample. The vast majority of our responses were found to employ what Weinreich-Haste termed ‘concrete/individual’ or ‘inter-personal’ modes of reasoning.

Furthermore, by comparison with Stradling’s English 15-16 year olds, principled thinking appears to be not well-established in the younger age group and most of the thinking is implicit, with little evidence of meta-thinking. One fruitful area for further research would be to probe the ability of students to say why they selected the schemas they did or favoured one alternative over another.

In summary, on the basis of the literature reviewed and the data in this study, it would seem that by the end of KS3 (Y9), we should expect to see most students demonstrating the ability to:

- discuss socio-political issues in terms of three or four different schemas,
- display an outline awareness of the roles of government bodies,
- see political issues as conflicts of interests; many (but not all) will be able to propose ways in which these interests can be reconciled or held in tension,
- discuss socio-political issues in terms of their effects on people’s lives, feelings and behaviour,
- draw on key citizenship concepts, such as fairness, law and rights, but generally as implicitly embedded in real situations,
- discuss moral aspects of situations in terms of outcomes or consequences.

At the same time, the data suggest that most 12-14 students seem to lack:

- a societal or collective perspective,
- awareness of social or organisational processes,
- the ability to reflect on their own logical processes or form of thought,
- the ability to discuss issues in terms of moral principles, values or ideologies.

Key Stage 3 (Years 7 - 9) appears to be a crucial link in the passage from childhood to adulthood as far as political awareness is concerned. It broadly coincides with the first stage of the growth of realistic socio-political knowledge such that, whilst weaker students in this age group are still largely child-like in their construction of the political world, there are those at the other end of the scale who have already developed a societal perspective. Not until students can take such a
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perspective, understanding how individuals relate to the group or community as a whole, can they think politically in an adult sense. Furthermore, the emergence in this age group of the ability to hold competing interests in tension when solving political problems, is another important step in the development of mature political thinking. Having said that, the vast majority of these students are, as yet, still unable to discuss political problems in principled terms and are still naïve about the complex nature of the processes involved in political decision-making.

This study suggests that teachers should nurture the development of political thinking in a bottom-up direction, beginning with realities recognisable to young people, enabling them to access issues first at the level of personal and interpersonal experience, then showing how individual actions relate to the whole group, to institutions of government and the processes by which society regulates itself. Because students use their own personal schemas to interpret the social and political information they receive, a teacher working with a class of students cannot assume a common understanding of any issue; there will be many different versions of the same story under discussion. Furthermore, some students will be well on the way to mastering the appropriate vocabulary necessary to make their thinking more explicit, whilst others will not. In such situations, discussion approaches which are open-ended and exploratory, which encourage students to discuss all the factors they see as relevant and to say why, will expose other students to wider spheres of knowledge as well as new forms of reasoning, at least some of which they will be ready to absorb.
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NOTES
[1] In this paper, I use an anglicised form of the greek plural 'schemata', following Haste (1999, 186).
[2] The English national curriculum is divided into four key stages. The first two (primary) stages comprise Key Stage 1 (Years 1 and 2, 5 to 8 year-olds) and Key Stage 2 (Years 3 – 6, 8 to 11 year-olds). Secondary schooling begins in year 7 and Key Stage 3 comprises years 7 – 9 (11 to 14 year-olds). Key Stage 4 includes years 10 and 11 (14 to 16 year-olds).
[4] I have shaded the schemas used by students in each example. In every case I include the student’s complete response.
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Teachers, human rights and diversity: Educating citizens in multicultural societies

Edited by Audrey Osler. Published 2005 by Trentham Books, London.

A recent posting on the Internet listserv hr-education (Human Rights Education) posed the question of whether human rights education should be part of a citizenship education program or vice versa. There have been some interesting responses from around the world; what wonderful timing that we also welcome a new collection edited by Audrey Osler who again brings her wide experience and perceptive analysis to these two productively entangled fields of education. Not only is Osler prolific, but she is able to write as a participant and insider about key developments around the world that explore “how educators can prepare young citizens to participate in contexts of diversity.” (p.xv)

This volume will definitely appeal to a wide audience including policy makers who should read it, theoreticians who will read it and practitioners who I hope can make time to read it. More than appealing to all of these groups, the book shows solid examples of the bridge between theory and practice – school based conclusions from effective research ventures. Audrey Osler points out that we have come to realize that our cosmopolitan democracies need cosmopolitan citizenship; this collection will add to the body of work that helps us think about how to effectively teach and learn for cosmopolitan citizenship.

The book’s 175 pages comprise nine chapters divided into two parts. Part 1 looks at the citizenship agendas and the context of learning and teaching citizenship in England, United States, Northern Ireland and Ireland. In chapter 1 Audrey Osler looks at the tensions and challenges of educating for democratic citizenship in contexts of diversity including the effects of structural inequality. Chapter 2 is an illuminating comparative analysis by Carole Hahn of the ways in which diversity and human rights are addressed in schools in England and the United States. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 focus on Northern Ireland and Ireland, but present data and draw conclusions that are widely relevant to multicultural democracies in general and to post-conflict and intensely segregated societies in particular.

Part 2 of the book focuses in on the direct experiences of students and teachers. Hilary Claire’s research in chapter 6 underlines the importance of history teaching in this area with a compelling study of primary students’ responses to five moral dilemmas such as Nelson Mandela’s decision to take up armed struggle against apartheid. In chapter 7 Anne Hudson reports on a London school’s initiative to develop citizenship education within the formal curriculum and also by empowering students to see themselves as change agents in the school (including involvement in decision-making) and in the wider community. In chapter 8 teacher educator Jill Rutter reports on the nature and effects of a specialised course for future citizenship teachers that helps them to enable students to critically examine society’s images and attitudes towards refugees. In chapter 9 Chris Wilkins reports on research that
tracked teacher candidates in their training in the mid 1990s through to 2003 in terms of attitudes to racial equality and the role education can play in challenging racism.

Academic works of quality share a characteristic with good novels: they leave you wanting more. I would like a chance to meet with the authors in a seminar and explore the way we might problemmatize the so-called balance between the unity and diversity. Osler asserts, as do Banks and others, that a cosmopolitan democracy must “both nurture diversity and foster a common sense of belonging and a shared identity amongst its members.” (p.9) Is that always a tension or does it sometimes become a symbiosis? Do some democratic models handle it differently, better than others? In a possibly related point this volume makes me hope there are subsequent pieces that investigate the work in other jurisdictions; places like Australia which have done so much work in this field; other European examples to complement those covered here, but also examples from the South such as India or Brazil.

Wilkins’ conclusions to his chapter could very well serve as a suitable conclusion to this volume and a call to action for all citizenship educators:

“Effective citizenship education must be underpinned by a framework of human rights and an understanding of structural inequality, and this requires that teachers see themselves as agents of social change. If this opportunity is grasped, citizenship education can be employed as a catalyst for promoting equality, enabling children also to see themselves as genuine social agents who will shape society.” (p.169)

Reviewer:
Dick Holland
Coordinator: School, Community & Global Connections program OISE/UT
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1V6

Citizenship and Political Education Today


This volume is a welcome addition to debates on citizenship and political education. It includes contributions from Europe, North America, Asia, Australia and New Zealand. Its dust-cover claims that the twelve contributions ‘discuss vital and interesting issues involved in the engagement of citizens in politics and political institutions, and the role of education in encouraging education for citizenship’ – and the contents live up to the claim. The discussion covers a range of important contemporary themes, including identity, culture, difference, civic engagement, gender, democracy, the media, indigenous theories of community, and ecology. Contributors are: Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey; Nick Stevenson; Judith Torney-Purta and Wendy Klandl Richardson; Elizabeth Rata; Rob Gilbert; Kerry J. Kennedy and Cosmo Howard; Nigel Clark and Frank Hoffmeister; Barbara Thomass; Jo-Anne Dillabough and Madeleine Arnot; Ian Davies and Sylvia Hogarth; and Jack Demaine.
Among the strengths of the volume is the fact that the discussion is consistently sophisticated and well-theorised. It is also critical and politically astute in its analysis of policy, and contextualised effectively within the countries being examined. It was very good to see due attention paid to globalisation, and to the cosmopolitanism that is of increasing importance in debates about citizenship. As Stevenson argues:

...cosmopolitan thinking is concerned with the transgression of boundaries and markers, and the development of a genuinely inclusive cultural democracy and citizenship. Yet cosmopolitanism is not only concerned with intermixing and the ethical relations between the self and the other, but seeks and institutional and political grounding in the context of shared global problems. (p 25)

Contributions are well-written and accessible provided the reader has some familiarity with current debates. I was also pleased to see a reasonably comprehensive index: always a useful addition to an edited collection.

It would be unfair to consider the weaknesses, but I do have a short ‘wish-list’ of items that I feel might have improved the collection overall. Firstly, it would have been good to see more on actual practice, an area which is often neglected and which is really explored in depth only in the Davies and Hogarth chapter called ‘Political Literacy: Issues for Teachers and Learners’. Secondly, contributions from less developed parts of the world would have enhanced the international and comparative credentials of the book. Finally, perhaps most importantly, and a characteristic of many edited collections, there is little attempt to synthesise in an analytical way the arguments being presented across the different chapters. This would have been no small challenge, but it could have helped the book to move debates forward, and strengthened the sum total of its contribution to the field.

On balance this is a loose collection but an excellent one. It would be of interest particularly to academics and post-graduate students in the field of citizenship and political education, for whom it will be a useful resource.

Reviewer:
Dr Michele Schweisfurth (m.schweisfurth@bham.ac.uk)
Senior Lecturer in International Education
Centre for International Education and Research
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK
B15 2TT

Education and Citizenship in Liberal-Democratic Societies: Teaching for Cosmopolitan Values and Collective Identities


Public education systems in contemporary liberal democratic societies face increasingly taxing demands and specific challenges related to an increasing degree of cultural, ethnic and religious diversity and deep value pluralism. These challenges
and demands challenge the role of public education as one of the most important modern social institutions, particularly with regard to its contribution to the formation of the common citizenship identity and the development of “the surplus loyalty required to cement the particularistic and diverse religious and cultural components of a nation state together” (p. 1). On the other hand, public education is rather seen as an agent of colonization and oppression. This dilemma of public education, as the editors of Education and Citizenship in Liberal-Democratic Societies emphasize, “sets the stage for understanding the issues that addressed in this book” (p. 1).

This book, edited by Walter Feinberg and Kevin K. McDonough, brings together 16 essays (including an introductory chapter) and is grouped in three main sections. The first section addresses 'Cosmopolitanism, Liberalism and Common Education', with chapters by Jeremy Waldron, K. Anthony Appiah, Kenneth A. Strike, Joseph Dunne, Terence H. McLaughlin, and Harry Brighouse. The second section addresses 'Liberalism and Traditionalist Education' and includes articles by Shelley Burtt, Melissa C. Williams, David Blacker, and J. Mark Halstead. The third section addresses 'Liberal Constraints on Traditionalist Education', with chapters by Rob Reich, Susan Moller Okin, Kevin McDonough, Walter Feinberg, and Stephen Macedo.

The essays included in this collection examine the most important questions which spring from the persisting disagreement over some basic questions related to the place and contribution of citizenship education in a publicly mandated system of education, e.g. how should public schools in a liberal democracy treat the cultural identities of its students? What are the basic educational requirements within a polity of educating young people for citizenship? Should the civic agenda of public education take into account the various forms of pluralism, diversity and difference in order to bridge the tension between cultivating the basic civic virtues and shared democratic values of education for citizenship and paying respect to the cultural diversity of its students?

Kevin McDonough and Walter Feinberg brought together a group of today's most renowned scholars working in jurisprudence, political philosophy, race studies, philosophy of education and gender studies to address the issues of accommodation of diversity and recognition of difference in the organizational structure and the content of public education, the importance and legitimacy of a liberal educative project that shapes diversity for civic purposes, solutions to the way different religious identities might be reconciled with the demands of citizenship in contemporary liberal democracies, the cultivation of civic virtues and the promotion/facilitation of autonomy in public schools.

Education and Citizenship in Liberal-Democratic Societies offers a philosophically rigorous examination of the centrality of citizenship education and the civic aims of public schools and is thus a significant contribution to this area of scholarly research.

Reviewer:
Mitja Sardoc
Educational Research Institute
Ljubljana, SLOVENIA
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