

Education for Social Citizenship Perceptions of Teachers in the USA, Australia, England, Russia and China

Edited by W. O. Lee and Jeffrey T. Fouts



香港大學出版社

HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

Hong Kong University Press
14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong

© Hong Kong University Press 2005

ISBN 962 209 728 6

All rights reserved. No portion of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Secure On-line Ordering
<http://www.hkupress.org>

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

Printed and bound by United League Graphic & Printing Co. Ltd., in Hong Kong, China

The image shows the Chinese characters for '香港大學' (Hong Kong University) rendered in a square word calligraphy style. Each character is contained within a square frame, and the overall composition is vertical. The characters are '香', '港', '大', and '學' from top to bottom.

Hong Kong University Press is honoured that Xu Bing, whose art explores the complex themes of language across cultures, has written the Press's name in his Square Word Calligraphy. This signals our commitment to cross-cultural thinking and the distinctive nature of our English-language books published in China.

"At first glance, Square Word Calligraphy appears to be nothing more unusual than Chinese characters, but in fact it is a new way of rendering English words in the format of a square so they resemble Chinese characters. Chinese viewers expect to be able to read Square word Calligraphy but cannot. Western viewers, however are surprised to find they can read it. Delight erupts when meaning is unexpectedly revealed."

— Britta Erickson, *The Art of Xu Bing*

Contents

Foreword	vii
<i>John J. Cogan</i>	
Acknowledgements	ix
List of Contributors	xi
Part 1: Background and Introduction	1
1. Cross-national Citizenship Study: Background and Methodology	3
<i>W. O. Lee and Jeffrey T. Fouts</i>	
2. Concepts of Citizenship: From Personal Rights to Social Responsibility	19
<i>Jeffrey T. Fouts and W. O. Lee</i>	
Part 2: Country Cases	53
3. Teachers' Perceptions of Citizenship in the United States	55
<i>Carol Brown</i>	
4. Teachers' Perceptions of Citizenship in Australia	93
<i>Warren Prior</i>	
5. Teachers' Perceptions of Citizenship in England	131
<i>Ian Davies, Ian Gregory and Shirley C. Riley</i>	
6. Teachers' Perceptions of Citizenship in Russia	175
<i>Maria Jacobson Ellis and Carol Brown</i>	

7. Teachers' Perceptions of Citizenship in China <i>W. O. Lee</i>	209
Part 3: Cross-national Comparison	247
8. Cross-national Comparisons and Conclusions: Teachers' Perceptions Towards Social Citizenship <i>W. O. Lee</i>	249
References	263
Index	283

Contributors

Carol Brown is currently a research consultant and programme evaluator in Washington State, the United States, with a focus on educational technology and school restructuring. Prior to her work as a programme evaluator, she taught graduate research courses in the School of Education at Seattle Pacific University.

Ian Davies is Senior Lecturer in Educational Studies at the University of York, England. During recent years at York, he has been Chair of the Board of Educational Studies and Director of Undergraduate Studies in Education. He has written numerous articles on citizenship education and is the co-editor of *Developing European Citizens*, the editor of *Teaching the Holocaust*, the co-author of *Teaching Citizenship through Secondary History* and *Good Citizenship and Educational Provision*. He is editor of the forthcoming *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*.

Jeffrey T. Fouts is Executive Director of the Washington School Research Centre at Seattle Pacific University and is a professor of education in the School of Education at the university. He currently serves as the lead evaluator for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's Educational Initiative in Washington State. He has also held former positions as Director of Undergraduate Studies and Certification, Director of Graduate Studies, Associate Dean and Director of Doctoral Studies in the School of Education. Fouts has published numerous research studies in professional journals and is the co-author of three books on educational innovations and restructuring.

Ian Gregory teaches in Department of Education, University of York. His academic interests are in philosophy and law. He has written widely on philosophical and legal matters touching education. He is the co-author of *Good Citizenship and Educational Provision* (with Ian Davies and Shirley Riley).

Maria Jacobson Ellis, is Corresponding Professor at the University of the Russian Academy of Education. A former geophysicist in Russia and English teacher in Moscow's public schools, she presently serves as the Director of Russian/English Translators of Seattle, Washington. Her research interests include moral education and comparative education.

W. O. Lee is Professor and Head of the Department of Educational Policy and Administration and Head of the Centre of Citizenship Education at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. He previously served as Dean of Foundations in Education at the Institute and as Associate Dean of Education and Director of Comparative Education Research Centre at the University of Hong Kong. He has widely published in the areas of comparative education and civic and moral education. His recent publications include a chapter in the *World Yearbook of Education 2001*, a cross-cutting analysis of civic education across twenty-four countries involved in the IEA Civic Education Study; several co-edited books, including *Education and Political Transitions: Themes and Experiences in East Asia*, *Liberal Education in China* (in Chinese), *Citizenship in Asia and the Pacific*; and authored books, including *Equity and Access to Education in Asia*. In 2003, he received the Medal of Honour from the Hong Kong government, and the Bronze Educator Award from the Association of Educational Art in mainland China.

Warren Prior is a senior lecturer and Head of Social Education at Deakin University in Melbourne, Australia. His current teaching duties and research interests focus on issues relating to citizenship education, global education, and curriculum development and evaluation. He has been commissioned by the Australian government to serve as Victorian State Coordinator for a National Professional Development Project on "Informed Citizenship" and to evaluate the status of teaching and learning in civics and citizenship education in Victorian primary and secondary schools. In 2001, he was project manager for a World Bank project on enhancing social harmony and social cohesion in the Pacific Islands Region. His recent publications include "Teachers, students and their parents talk about what it means to be a 'good citizen' in Australia" in *Theory and Research in Social Education* and "Preserving the past or framing the future" in *Civilising the State: Civil Society, Policy and State Transformation*, edited by Susan Kenny.

Shirley C. Riley holds a doctorate in instructional leadership from Seattle Pacific University in Washington State, USA. She has worked as a teacher and administrator in locations ranging from the United States to East Asia, the Middle

East, South America and Europe. For the past several years, she has worked as a consultant in education with *Fouts and Associates*, conducting research and programme evaluation with school reform projects across the United States. Her publication directly related to social sciences research is *Good Citizenship and Educational Provision*, co-authored with Ian Davies and Ian Gregory.

1

Cross-national Citizenship Study: Background and Methodology

W. O. Lee and Jeffrey T. Fouts

Introduction

The past decade has witnessed massive changes in social, economic and political circumstances in many countries. In association with these changes was increased interest in the question of citizenship. During this period, many efforts were initiated to review concepts of citizenship and promote citizenship education by governments, as well as research on citizenship and citizenship education conducted by international organisations and academics.

As regards changes in social, economic and political circumstances, in the Western world, the most notable scenarios were the breakdown of communism in Eastern Europe; the emergence of the European Union and thus the notion of supra-nationalism; increased migration flows, both legally and illegally, that led to the expansion of multiculturalism and multiracial populations; tensions in welfare states; and low voter turnouts. In the Eastern world, the nineties witnessed the end of colonial rule, as Hong Kong and Macao returned to Chinese sovereignty; change in regimes in several Asian countries with some of them in political turmoil; widespread economic recession and increased economic competition among Asian countries; and economic liberalisation in China within the communist regime. All these events demarcated the world of the nineties quite distinctly from its past.

Worldwide, the end of Cold War has enhanced international collaboration, multinational economic exchange activities, and population movements. Environmental problems have reached the peak of concerns in human history.

Increasingly, there is an awareness that environmental protection can no longer be reliant upon voluntary groups but requires deliberated policy-making and implementation, and active collaboration and co-operation at both governmental and individual levels, as the world, perceived as the global village, is increasingly mutually dependent. While traditionally citizenship is focused upon the past and the present, the emergence of environmental concerns has brought about a future-oriented perspective of citizenship. That is, good citizenship is not only important for the present society but should be prepared for a better society to come.

Government Initiatives in Examining Citizenship

All these changes have “sparked interests in citizenship” according to Kymlicka (1999, 10); or, as Turner (1990, 190) says, have led to “a revival of interest” in citizenship. The nineties saw the publication of many official documents that deal with citizenship issues corresponding to these social, economic and political changes. In the United States, the Centre of Civic Education published two major documents: *Civitas: A Framework for Civic Education* (Bahmueller 1991) and *The National Standards for Civics and Government* (Bahmueller 1994). Also, the National Assessment Governing Board published the *Civics Framework for the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress* (NAEP 1996). As the titles of the documents indicate, they attempt to define or redefine the qualities of citizenship, by producing frameworks, by setting national standards, and even by attempting to develop assessment tools. Moreover, these documents address the knowledge, skills, values, and virtues needed by informed citizens for the preservation and improvement of the American democracy.

In Australia, the Civics Expert Group was set up by the Federal-Labour government in 1994, and a report was published at the end of the year, entitled *Whereas the People* (Civics Expert Group 1994). The report was a driving force behind many of the federal policy initiatives before the Liberal government came to power in 1996. The new government soon issued a citizenship-related document, *Discovering Democracy* (Kemp 1997). The document called for effective citizenship that requires an understanding of the history and operations of the government system and institutions, and a reshaping of citizenship education that directly contributes to improving the Australian economy.

In England, right at the beginning of the nineties, a couple of key reports on citizenship were published: *Encouraging Citizenship*, by the Speaker’s Commission on Citizenship (1990) and *Education for Citizenship: The Report of the National Curriculum*, by the National Curriculum Council (1990). Both documents emphasise that citizenship is central to the school curriculum. The former report asserts that the school should monitor citizenship across the curriculum. The latter report mentions the responsibility for the school to provide a balanced curriculum

covering the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils. The former report mentions the ideal of a good citizen, and the latter mentions the significance of having positive and participatory citizens. As in Australia, the change of government has led to a re-examination of the issue of citizenship. The Labour government set up the Advisory Group on Citizenship, which produced a report on citizenship in 1998, entitled *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (also known as the Crick Report) (Crick 1998). The report provides a definition for citizenship that includes three elements: social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy. The new definition clearly shifts towards emphasising the role of responsibility and the participation of citizens.

Russia, after becoming a state that split from the former Soviet Union, has made deliberate efforts to strengthen citizenship in the country. The Declaration of Rights and Freedoms of a Person and a Citizen was published in 1991, the new Law on Education was published in 1992, and the Ministry of Education launched a new programme of citizenship education in 1993. An NGO, the National Association for Citizenship Education, was formed in 1994, and the Union for Citizenship Education was established in 1995. There are strong emphases on human values and rights in citizenship, but at the same time such significant virtues as truthfulness and good behaviour (see Chapter 6, this volume).

China, in the face of the increased pace of the four modernisations and economic liberalisation, has made tremendous efforts to attend to the quality of citizenship that suits the changing circumstances of the country. Right at the start of the nineties, the State Education Commission (1990) published a document entitled "Further Strengthening of Moral Education Work in Primary and Secondary Schools." The document criticised bourgeois liberalisation and peaceful evolution, and reiterated the significance of patriotism and a decentralised system of principal responsibility in school administration. In 1994, the CCP (Chinese Communist Party) Central Committee (1994) issued a paper entitled "Some Opinions on Strengthening and Improving Moral Education Work in School." The paper called for educational reform to meet the new circumstances resulting from "open and reform" and modernisations. In 1996, the Central Committee (1996) published a paper known as "CCP's Decision on Some Important Issues Related to Strengthening the Construction of Socialist Spiritual Civilisation." The paper acknowledges the country's transformation of the economy and calls for ideology and political education that could cater for such circumstances. In Hong Kong, at the handover to Chinese sovereignty, citizenship became a sensitive issue (Lee and Sweeting 2001). The government formed a Working Group to review the previous civic education guidelines and to produce new guidelines for civic education. In 1996, a new document was issued, entitled *Guidelines on Civic Education in Schools* (Education Department 1996). The guidelines promoted such concepts of citizenship as active, responsive,

participatory and responsible citizens. After the handover, a new civic education syllabus was issued by the Education Department for junior secondary schools.

Judging from the government documents on citizenship produced in the above five countries, it is easy to project that, if such a review continues to include more countries, the list of similar government publications that appeared in the nineties can be quite long. It is very clear that citizenship was a common concern across countries in the nineties and has consumed tremendous national efforts to review, define, and redefine citizenship that could be suited to the new social, economic and political circumstances. All of the documents on citizenship address the changing circumstances facing the country, whether economic, social or political. All call for well-rounded education for citizenship. All call for the education of knowledge, skills and values that could help the young to become good citizens. All mention attributes that they would like to see the young possess in order that their countries progress. There are many mentions of such terms as good citizens, active citizens, participatory citizens, and social and moral responsibilities. It seems that there is also a general perception that the younger generation is not active, not participative, and that they lack a sense of identity and a sense of responsibility. It seems that the nineties was a decade during which the governments wanted to see citizens take a more active role in the society.

Cross-national Studies on Citizenship

Not only were governments active in working on redefining citizenship, but researchers also worked hard to understand current citizenship conceptions and practices in citizenship education. Voluminous research on citizenship was produced in the last ten years.

Several large-scale and cross-national citizenship studies took place in the nineties. The most notable one was the Civic Education Study conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievements (IEA). Led by Judith Torney-Purta, the association launched a two-phase cross-national study in 1994. The first phase was a qualitative study aiming at tracking the changing social, economic and political circumstances in the participating countries and corresponding civic education policies and practices. The research team acknowledged the impacts of these changes on civic education; therefore, they felt it necessary to obtain information on the changing contexts that would provide information for the design of instrumentation in the second-phase large-scale quantitative survey. The first phase involved twenty-four countries; the second phase, twenty-eight. Apart from Hong Kong, all participating countries came from North and South America, Australasia and Europe, particularly Eastern Europe. The research team started the project by stating that it was the changing circumstances that required them to launch such a study:

During a single decade, beginning in the late 1980s, initiatives towards democratic reform took place across the world. New constitutional regimes came into being ... leaders realised that major changes in formal and informal civic education were required to prepare young people for this new social, political and economic order. ... During the same period, many well-established democracies recognized that their own methods of preparing young people for citizenship were far from ideal. ... These issues called for a rethinking of civic education, a challenge that many countries began to face during the 1990s. ... In light of these factors, questions were asked regarding the direction that should be taken in order to enhance the contribution of schools to citizenship (Torney-Purta et al. 2001, 12).

The study surveyed 90,000 14-year-olds in twenty-eight countries in 1999, on topics ranging from their knowledge of democratic principles to their trust in government. The study found that most students demonstrate knowledge of democracy, but their understanding is often superficial or detached from life; within countries there is positive correlation between students' knowledge of democracy and voting behaviour; schools with a democratic climate are effective in promoting civic knowledge and engagement; teachers in many countries believe that better materials, more training, and more instructional time would improve civic education; young people agree that good citizenship includes the obligation to obey the law and to vote; students are unlikely to think that conventional political participation is very important, except voting; students from homes with more educational resources possess more civic knowledge; and students are open to less traditional forms of civic and political engagement, e.g., non-violent protests and rallies (Torney-Purta et al. 2001, 176).

Another major study involved twelve countries in the Asia-Pacific Rim, mostly Asian countries, as well as the US, Russia and Mexico. The study was conducted in 1997 and led by William Cummings. It is a study on the views of the educational élite on values education, using a sigma international élite survey questionnaire. The sigma approach is a survey designed to acknowledge diversity in views across countries and cultural settings. While the study focused on values, the survey asked many values items related to citizenship. In the main, the study found that the educational élites placed a strong emphasis on critical thinking and autonomy; placed more emphasis on "understanding all political and social viewpoints" than on "teaching respect for hierarchy and support for the government"; agreed upon the importance of "promoting and understanding and love of the nation" rather than "venerating heroes and promoting national pride," which received less enthusiasm; gave more support to "fostering an understanding of all religions" than to "gain a deeper understanding of their own religion." Moreover, countries with multi-ethnic policies were more supportive of values related to tolerance (Cummings, Tatto, and Hawkins 2001, 14; 295-6).

A third major cross-national study on citizenship involved nine countries and was led by John Cogan. It was also a study on the views of country élites in respect to the direction of citizenship for the twenty-first century, using the Delphi study method. The study identified five citizenship attributes and eight citizenship abilities. The five attributes are: a sense of identity, the enjoyment of certain rights, the fulfilment of corresponding obligations, a degree of interest and involvement in public affairs, and an acceptance of basic societal values (Cogan 1998, 2–3). The eight abilities are: to look at and approach problems from global perspectives; to work with others in a co-operative way and to take responsibility; to understand, accept, appreciate and tolerate cultural differences; to think in a critical and systematic way; to resolve conflict in a non-violent manner; to change one's lifestyle and consumption habits to protect the environment; to be sensitive towards and to defend human rights; and to participate in politics at local, national and international levels. A significant contribution of this study is the development of a multi-dimensional model of citizenship, comprising personal, social, spatial and temporal dimensions. In particular, the temporal dimension opens up a future orientation of citizenship, i.e., citizens have to behave for the future well-being of our environment (Kubow, Grossman, and Ninomiya 1998, 116–7).

A fourth study was conducted by Cogan, Morris, and Print (Cogan and Morris 2001; Cogan, Morris, and Print 2002), a cross-national project focusing on the implementation of citizenship education in schools. The study, carried out between mid-1997 and early 2000, involved six countries in the Asia-Pacific region, each of which conducted a case study of two to three schools. Their cross-country analysis found complex pictures of implementation and that it was difficult to stereotype practices by geographical region. They identified differences in citizenship emphasis, some stressing the commitment to a preconceived set of “good citizens”; others on civic action and democratic processes. However, they identified a common gap between curriculum intentions and implementations, not because of unwillingness but because of schools having to satisfy the many competing demands placed on them. Moreover, they identified several challenges to civic education that will be exacerbated by the impact of globalisation and diversification: rights and responsibility versus deliberation and civic virtues, universal citizenship versus differentiated citizenship, and fixed citizenship versus flexible citizenship.

A fifth cross-national study was conducted by Carole Hahn (1998), who studied students' political attitudes and beliefs in five Western countries. The study took longer than the others mentioned above, starting in 1985 and ending in 1996. It covered a range of topics, including adolescent political attitudes and behaviours, gender and political attitudes, freedom of expression and civic tolerance, classroom climates, and teaching. One of Hahn's major findings was that of diversities and differences within Western democracies: “Yet, even among these Western democracies with many shared experiences and values relevant to this study, there are considerable differences in the ways that they prepare their

young people to participate as citizens. ... I am now more convinced than ever that the forms education takes reflect the distinct set of values of a particular culture and for that reason 'what works' in one cultural context cannot be simply adopted in another setting with different traditions, values, and meanings" (Hahn 1998, viii).

In addition to the cross-national empirical studies, other kinds of comparative analysis were taking place during the nineties. To cite a few, Kerr's (1999) thematic analysis of citizenship education in sixteen countries, Lee and Bray's examination of education and political transition in East Asia (Lee and Bray 1997; Bray and Lee 2001), and Ichilov's (1998) study of citizenship education in various countries in the context of political changes. Moreover, Garner, Cairns, and Lawton's (2001) *World Yearbook of Education 2001* covers a series of country chapters on the education of values, morality, culture, etc. Unlike the cross-national projects mentioned above, most of these are collective works by authors from the respective countries.

Background of This Study

The cross-national citizenship studies reviewed above have certain common emphases. Most of these studies are interested in policies and policy-makers. For example, the studies of Cummings (2001) and Cogan (1998) and their associates, though using different methodologies, focused on investigating the views of the policy-makers and social élites in the participating countries. This kind of study is important, as it provides information on what the leaders of the countries are thinking about, and portrays what the direction of citizenship development would be like under their leadership or influence. The special issue on "Civic Education in Pacific Rim" (1999) is basically a historical review of citizenship policies; and the works of Lee and Bray (Lee and Bray 1997; Bray and Lee 2001) and Ichilov (1998) are, in the main, policy analyses.

A second major focus of these works is students. The IEA civic education study is one example of this kind, announcing an impressive account of 90,000 students in twenty-eight countries (Torney-Purta et al. 2001). Hahn's (1998) study is also focused on students' attitudes and beliefs.

A third focus is school and the curriculum. Examples are studies conducted by Cogan, Morris, and Print (2002) and Kerr (1999). The former examined implemented curriculum in schools, and the latter, intended curriculum.

Obviously, there is a lack of cross-national studies on teachers. It is this gap that the present study aims to fill. This is an important gap to fill, because teachers are the key players in citizenship education. They are the key figures in implementing government policies in school. They are the key bridge between the intended and implemented curriculum. They are both the recipients and the providers of citizenship education — recipients in the sense of doing what is

expected of them by the society, the education body, the official curriculum and the school; providers in the sense that in actual practice they are the ones making all the decisions on what to teach and how to teach, and in determining what is important for what groups of students. Teachers thus play a key role in citizenship education.

The statement of a lack in cross-national studies on teachers has to be qualified here by acknowledging that there is indeed some coverage on teachers in the various studies mentioned above. The IEA civic education study does have a section on teachers, and Cogan and his associates' Delphi study on leaders and their cross-national study on schools have covered teachers in one way or another. However, teachers comprise only a small part of the IEA study, and teachers are not the target of Cogan's Delphi study. The study of Cogan, Morris, and Print on schools does cover teachers, but their basic focus is school climate and the implemented curriculum. Likewise, the coverage on teachers in Hahn's work is focused on teaching rather than on the teacher.

This study focuses on teachers' perceptions of good citizenship and their perceptions of factors that can facilitate or hinder the preparation of good citizens. We choose to study teachers' perceptions, as we realise that teachers' behaviour in the classroom is inherently influenced by their personal philosophy of education. Therefore, understanding their concept of citizenship is fundamental to the examination of how they implement the curriculum. It helps to cast light on how and why the emphases of some government or policies are implemented or not. This is an important question to ask, as if we focus only on the school factor, we may easily be guided by the empowering or constraining factors affecting the implementation of the curriculum. However, a more fundamental question is what the teachers see as important. Are their views different from those of the government, the society in general, the principals, and the parents? Are constraining factors for reform seen by teachers as constraints, or opportunities, for educational reform? Are they convinced of what they are asked to do? If not, it will be unrealistic to expect them to implement the curriculum. Again, we regard a focus on studying teachers' perceptions of citizenship as helping to fill a significant gap in citizenship study.

In attempting a citizenship study, Albala-Bertrand (1995, 3) comments, "To proceed with some coherence and efficacy with the frame of this very complex subject, a natural starting point would be to explore what is citizenship about? What could be considered 'in various contexts — a good citizen?' and, correlatively, what could be considered — in different contexts — as efficient approaches to an education forming a citizen able to deal with the challenges of the world today?"

In this project, we are concerned primarily, although not exclusively, with the first question: What is a good citizen in various contexts? There are many limitations associated with this effort, but our intent is to help clarify the challenges faced by the teachers, and to help educators and policy-makers at all levels develop

a conceptual framework by which to understand citizenship and citizenship education. Specifically, we focused on these questions:

1. What are seen as the characteristics of a “good citizen?” Is there a general consensus within a country about what constitutes good citizenship? What forces in society are seen as influencing citizenship? What forces in society are seen as a threat to a child’s citizenship? What types of activities are seen as helpful in developing a child’s citizenship? Do various constituencies (such as teachers, university professors, students, parents, government officials, etc.) view good citizenship differently?
2. How is citizenship addressed in each country’s school curricula? Does the curricula correspond with the consensus, or reflect a particular segment of society?
3. What do teachers believe are the characteristics of a “good citizen?” What forces in society are seen as influencing citizenship? What forces in society are seen as a threat to a child’s citizenship? What types of activities are seen as helpful in developing a child’s citizenship?
4. Are there good citizenship qualities that are universal, or at least shared, among these countries?

The interpretation and comparison of the quantitative and qualitative data we obtained require some frames of reference and definitions. The next chapter describes several theoretical models of citizenship offered by various individuals that we have used to understand and explain the resulting conceptions of citizenship given by teachers in the five locales.

Research Design

Considerations for international comparative studies

While there are many challenges to cross-national research, several should be noted at the outset. Two specific and closely related challenges to this kind of study are, first, to do with the problem of conceptual constraints, and second, the problem of measurement. The problem with conceptual constraints is stated succinctly by Thomas (1990): “Many educational [and other] concepts do not have equivalent meanings across social or cultural groups or even across nations.” Indeed, this fact is the basis for the project “Good citizenship” and it means different things to different people. But in a narrower sense, the problem is one of ensuring that we are all talking about the same thing, not just about “good citizenship” but also about concepts used to define “good citizenship,” such as moral education and patriotism. In essence, the problem is one of basic communication and the subtleties of language.

The problem with conceptual constraints is closely linked to the second

challenge, that is, the problem of measurement. In the words of Thomas (1990), "The primary task of a comparative researcher is to identify an acceptable level of conceptual equivalence across cases regarding the idea, institution, or process being studied." In this study, we are attempting to define the abstract concept of "good citizenship" with other equally abstract concepts. Comparable linguistic translations of the instruments are very important, but exact equality is inherently impossible. It is with the recognition of this limitation that we proceed, a limitation inherent in comparative studies, particularly in studies involving instrument translations.

A problem can emerge in comparative studies such as this one when the exact nature of a specific project may not meet the exact needs or desires of a particular individual or institutional participant. For example, an intended survey may address only some of the questions of interest in a particular country while ignoring others. This presents the challenge of finding a balance between allowing for some variation by country, but at the same time remaining true to the established procedures, to insure that comparability is not lost.

In selecting the instrumentation and interview questions for this study, we did so with the recognition that the more complex the instruments and procedures, the greater the likelihood of translation difficulties and loss of comparability. For this reason, we have attempted to keep the survey and interview questions as basic and straightforward as possible. While the instruments and interview questions may not be ideal or as elaborate as might be used in a single country study, we believe they will be adequate for our purposes, with some limitations, and allow for translations that will allow comparisons across countries.

Instrumentation

Questionnaire

To assess the perceptions of the qualities of good citizenship and related information, a questionnaire was developed based on the work done by Greene (1987), Dynneson (1992), and Dynneson, Gross, and Nickel (1988; 1989). Elements of the questionnaires used by these researchers were combined and modified, and new questions were added to fit the specific purposes of this study.

The initial version field tested for this study focused on perceptions in six areas: (1) the qualities of a good citizen, (2) the influences on a person's citizenship, (3) threats to a child's citizenship, (4) helps to a child's citizenship, (5) responsibility for developing good citizens, and (6) classroom activities that would be helpful in developing a child's citizenship. The specific items in each area were either developed by Greene (1987) or were added by the project researchers after additional literature review of theoretical models of citizenship. Following the addition of these items, the instrument was reviewed by four project researchers, and all concurred to the acceptability of the instrument's face validity.

The instrument also contained six demographic and background questions about each respondent. This version of the instrument was field tested with forty teachers at the elementary and secondary levels, checking for clarity of understanding and clear terminology. Several items were then modified to improve clarity.

The instrument was then, as a pilot test, administered to 201 secondary and elementary teachers from rural, urban, and suburban schools in Seattle, to further establish construct validity and reliability. The instrument created by Greene and used by Dynneson (1992) had primarily relied on face validity and had been modified for this project. In spite of the face validity, we were concerned with the factor structure, because of apparent overlap of the constructs and the redundancy of specific items appearing in more than one of the six general areas. A principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted, to verify the factor structure and to establish stronger construct validity. In fact, we hypothesised that the factor analysis data reduction technique would not lead to six factors, which was in fact the case. The evidence showed that only four of the six factors had construct validity. The remaining four factors and specific item loadings from this initial analysis are presented in Table 1.1. Two items in factor 2 (parents and religious leaders) and two items in factor 3 (television and/or movies and family conflict) did not meet the minimum factor loading criteria of .30.

From the results of this initial analysis, two of the six factors, “(4) helps to a child’s citizenship” and “(5) responsibility for developing good citizens,” were dropped from the questionnaire, and a second factor analysis was conducted to examine the factor structure once these nineteen items had been removed. This reduction in the overall variance in the instrument produced new factor loadings for the remaining four factors. The highest factor loading for forty-two of the forty-three items was on the appropriate factor and at the minimum criteria of .30. The one item not meeting these criteria, parents on factor 2, loaded on that factor at .30 but had a higher loading on factor 1 at .47. These factor loadings are also presented in Table 1.1.

Split-half and alpha reliabilities were calculated for each of the remaining four factors and for the entire four-factor instrument. Those results are presented in Table 1.2. The research findings presented in the following chapters are based upon results from factor 1 of the citizenship questionnaire, i.e., qualities of a good citizen.

Interviews

While the survey identifies the most and least important characteristics of good citizenship, influences on and threats to citizenship and appropriate activities for developing good citizenship, we are also interested in understanding in more depth how and why people think of citizenship as they do. To get this information, we have chosen to interview a selection of individuals about their views on good citizenship. The considerations for international comparative studies mentioned

Table 1.1: Factor Loadings for the Citizenship Questionnaire

Factor 1: The following characteristics are important qualities of a good citizen			Factor 2: The following have influenced my citizenship:		
Item	6 areas ¹	4 factors ²	Item	6 areas ¹	4 factors ²
	F. loading ³	F. loading ³		F. loading ³	F. loading ³
Knowledge of current events	.31	.60	Parents	.14	.30
Participation in community or school affairs	.39	.44	Friends	.49	.38
Acceptance of an assigned responsibility	.47	.43	Brothers and/or sisters	.44	.50
Concern for the welfare of others	.58	.46	Religious leaders	.09	.42
Moral and ethical behaviour	.59	.53	Television and/or movies	.42	.43
Acceptance of authority of those in supervisory roles	.42	.41	Grandparents and/or other relatives	.48	.54
Ability to question ideas	.55	.67	Guardians	.36	.47
Ability to make wise decisions	.70	.75	Teachers	.36	.52
Knowledge of government	.36	.63	Principals or other school officials	.45	.63
Patriotism	.37	.48	Extracurricular activities	.60	.52
Fulfilment of family responsibilities	.66	.64	Other students	.60	.58
Knowledge of world community	.38	.62	Coaches	.53	.59
Tolerance of diversity within society	.34	.42			
Factor 3. I believe the following are a threat to a child's citizenship			Factor 4. I believe that the following classroom activity(ies) would be helpful in developing a child's citizenship		
Television and/or movies	.26	.45	An activity in which the child learns about the traditions and values that shaped his/her community and country	.67	.68

(continued on p. 15)

(Table 1.1 — continued)

Drugs and/or alcohol	.32	.51	An activity dealing with current events	.74	.78
Peer pressure	.52	.64	An activity in which the child learns about the history and government of his/her country	.76	.80
Sexual activity	.53	.65	An activity in which the child works on a community project with community leaders	.76	.71
Negative role models	.42	.63	Problem-solving activity	.63	.65
Family conflict	.26	.50	An activity using constitutional and legalistic processes	.81	.83
School environment	.68	.55	An activity that aims at the child's individual needs and interests	.71	.66
Excessive leisure time	.66	.60	An activity in which the child looks at worldwide needs and responsibilities	.71	.69
Unearned material rewards	.62	.57			
Community environment	.65	.56			

¹Questionnaire with six general areas. ²Revised four-factor questionnaire. ³Factor loading.

Table 1.2: Split-half and Alpha Reliabilities for the Citizenship Questionnaire

	Alpha	Split-half
Factor 1	.84	.88
Factor 2	.75	.72
Factor 3	.79	.81
Factor 4	.90	.85
Entire Instrument	.88	.90

above apply equally to interview formats as they do to written and translated questionnaires. Consequently, we have attempted to keep the questions, format, length of interview, and interpretation procedures as basic as possible.

A series of interview questions for a semi-structured format was developed by a team of four researchers at Seattle Pacific University. The goal was to keep the interview sessions to no longer than thirty minutes. The questions were field

tested with five teachers, and minor revisions in the questions and format were made following the field test. The questions were designed to determine how individuals perceive good citizenship, and which various institutions and experiences are influential in the development of good citizenship. Following the field test, four general areas of questions were finalised as follows:

1. When you hear the word "citizenship," what comes to your mind? What characteristics (or words to describe) do you think of?
2. When you hear the term "good citizen" in school, what characteristics come to your mind? Good citizen in adult life? Why are these particular qualities important? (especially if they differ).
3. How/Are you a good citizen? In what ways? ... Or how are you a good citizen? Who helped you to develop or acquire these characteristics?
4. How/Are you rewarded or reinforced in any way for being a good citizen? In school? In life? By your family? i.e. Why are you a good citizen? (Who or what in the society or culture causes them to want to be a good citizen? — Systems of rewards or sanction?)

A second and larger field test of the questions then took place, to provide for a model of the analysis procedures. Twenty teachers were interviewed using the questions. The interviews were tape-recorded and then transcribed. The transcriptions were read independently by two researchers, to identify code words and phrases that represented teacher perceptions of good citizenship. After initial coding, the researchers compared findings, coming to common agreement. They then jointly identified common themes that emerged from the transcripts.

The process and results of the pilot study were shared with the country representatives, who also applied a similar pilot study in their own cities. The questionnaire was administered, the expectation being of around 500 teachers in each city. In China and Russia, the questionnaire was translated and back translated to ensure correct interpretation. All questionnaire data were processed by the data processing centre in Seattle Pacific University, and descriptive observations were fed back to the country representatives with suggestions for the next steps of study. Examples of suggestions or questions given are as follows:

The next task then, will be to combine this set of information with the results of the interviews. Probably one of three things will happen: (1) The interviews will support or reinforce this questionnaire data, explaining it in further depth and adding to it. (2) The interviews will add all new information that may not seem related. (3) The interviews will contradict all of this.

The next step will be to consider these findings in light of the three theoretical models and other definitions in the theoretical framework.

Next will be to compare these ideas of the teachers to the school curriculum being used, suggested, or planned.

1. Does it correspond, or conflict?

2. Do teachers' concepts of citizenship reflect a degree of depth and understanding necessary to teach such a topic?
3. Can teachers teach something to which they are in philosophical opposition? For example, can these teachers teach a conservative citizenship curriculum or agenda when it is evident many do not believe it should be the primary focus? How about those teachers who not only rated it lower than other things but have a negative view of it?

The process of research was interactive between the data processing centre and the country representatives, until both sides agreed with the data analysis and preliminary observations.

Organisation of the Book

This book is organized into three sections. Part One includes this introductory chapter and a chapter reviewing concepts of citizenship. This chapter provides the background to this study, giving information about the development of the field, major features of the study, and specific contribution to the field of citizenship study. The second chapter examines concepts of citizenship, firstly illustrating the diverse and complex nature of the field, and secondly summarising major emphases of citizenship concepts developed in the nineties. The objective of this chapter is to introduce readers to major arguments on citizenship, but at the same time it highlights the latest discussions that will form the frameworks for discussion in the country chapters.

Part Two comprises chapters by the country representatives: the US, England, Australia, Russia and China. Each chapter in this section provides a historical review of the concepts of citizenship in the country of the authors. This gives both the historical and cultural context for understanding the concepts of citizenship in each of the countries. Building on that is a description of the research findings based on the common questionnaires developed, as well as analysis of the interviews. The analyses highlight concepts of citizenship of the teachers who participated in the study.

Part Three is the concluding chapter of the book. It outlines the major findings across the participating countries, provides a comparative analysis of teachers' conception of citizenship, and discusses lessons learned from this study. In particular, readers will soon discover, after reading through the country cases, some very interesting findings. For example, teachers across nations are very alike in their citizenship concerns that seem to have transcended and cultures and politics. All are concerned about the quality of their students' attitudes and behaviours rather than their knowledge, as far as citizenship quality is concerned.

Index

Authors

- Albala-Bertrand, L., 10, 19, 21, 36, 39
Angell, A. V., 20, 32
Aristotle, 19, 22–4, 27, 33, 35–6, 133–4
- Bahmueller, C. F., 4, 36–7, 51, 66, 69–70, 79
Banks, James, 61, 72
Berdiaev, Nikolai, 186–7
Blair, Tony, 156
Blunkett, David, 156
Bodin, Jean, 19
Boyer, Ernest, 69–70, 79
Boyte, H., 73, 81
Bray, Mark, 9, 219
Briggs, LeBaron Russell, 64
Butts, R. Freeman, 55–8, 60–3, 65–6, 68–70, 76–7, 79
- Carr, W., 132–3, 135, 137, 148, 150, 155
Cairns, J., 9
Cheng, H. K., 241
Cogan, John J., 8–10
Cremin, Lawrence, 56–62
Crick, Bernick, 5, 49–50, 132, 144, 157
Cummings, William, 7, 9
- Davies, Ian, 49, 131, 148, 257
Dewey, John, 62, 68, 144
Downer, Alexander, 111
Dynneson, Thomas L., 12–3, 20, 32, 55–7, 65–6, 68, 70–1, 75–6, 79–80, 90–2
- Eckersley, R., 112
Entwistle, Harold, 20, 26
- Foster, V., 112
Franklin, R., 20, 26
- Gamarnikow, E., 35, 49–51
Gergen, K. J., 21
Gladman, F. G. J., 102
Green, A., 35, 49–51
Greene, D., 12–3
Gross, R. E., 12, 20, 32, 56–7, 66, 70–1, 75–6, 79–80
Grossman, David, 8, 42
- Hahn, Carole, 8–10, 20, 32, 146
Heater, Derek, 35, 37–44, 46–7, 74, 92, 132–45, 147–8, 154, 158, 162, 171–2, 207–8, 218, 223, 225, 240, 251
Hepburn, Mary, 55, 61, 77–8
Hobbes, Thomas, 22, 134–7, 150

- Howard, John, 111, 113
 Howitt, Richard, 94
- Ichilov, O., 9, 110
 Ilyin, I.A., 185–7, 192
- Janoski, T., 35, 48, 49, 51, 228–9, 261
 Jefferson, Thomas, 25, 33, 36–7, 57, 63
- Kapterev, P. F., 177, 180, 184–5, 188
 Keating, Paul, 109–11
 Kerr, D., 9, 132, 157
 King, Martin Luther, 69
 Kireyevsky, I., 183
 Kluchevsky, V. O., 176
 Kohlberg, Lawrence, 28, 68, 91
 Kornetov, G. B., 177–8, 188
 Kozhokar, V. I., 179, 189, 194
 Kubow, P., 8, 42–3, 47
 Kwan, Y. H., 241
 Kymlicka, W., 4, 36–7
- Lawton, Dennis, 9
 Lee, Wing On, 3, 5, 9, 19, 22, 209, 218–20, 223, 249
 Lei, Feng, 211
 Lenin, V. I., 190
 Lickona, T., 66–8, 90–1
 Lincoln, Abraham, 69
 Locke, John, 23, 34, 37, 134–7, 150
- Marsden, S., 98
 Marshall, T. H., 49–50, 132–3, 135, 137–8, 142, 147, 149, 228, 261
 Marx, Karl, 23, 29
 McLaughlin, T. H., 35, 44–7, 51, 92, 158, 162, 171–2, 208
 Mellor, S., 114–5, 124, 126–7
 Mencius, 22, 29
 Mill, John Stuart, 134–7
 Monomakh, Vladimir, 176
 Morris, Paul, 8–10, 221
 Musgrave, P., 124
- Newmann, Fred, 71, 74, 77, 79, 91
 Ninomiya, A., 8, 42
- Oliver, Dawn, 132–7, 139, 141, 143, 145, 147–8
- Orwell, George, 30–1
 Oushinsky, K., 183, 188
- Paine, Thomas, 23, 42
 Patten, Chris, 219
 Patten, John, 155
 Print, M., 8–10
- Rauner, Mary, 35, 46–7, 51, 92, 158, 162, 171–2, 208
 Riesenberg, P., 24, 42
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 34, 134–7, 150, 187
- Schwille, John, 113
 Steenbergen, van, 132, 134, 137–9, 141–2, 147–8, 150
 Stone, L., 31–2
- Tate, Nick, 140
 Thomas, R. Murray, 11–2, 40–1
 Tibbitts, F., 30, 34
 Torney-Purta, Judith, 6–7, 9, 113
 Tse, W. L., 241
 Turner, Bryan S., 4, 48, 132–4, 136–8, 142
 Tyack, D., 61
- Von, Glaserfeld, E, 21
- Washington, George, 57
 Webster, Noah, 57, 63
 Wong, S. W., 241
- Xunzi, 22

Subjects

- adult literacy and lifelong learning, 78
 apolitical, 44, 219
 Australia, 93–129
 Aboriginal, 94–7, 103, 107, 110
 Adelaide Declaration, 126
 Auchmuty National Inquiry into
 Teacher Education, The, 108
 Australian Constitution, 103
 Australian history, 102, 105, 107, 111,
 113, 125

- Blackburn Report, 108
 Christian moral training, 101
 Commonwealth of, 97
 colonial, 95, 97, 101
 Commonwealth Reports of the
 Senate Standing Committee on
 Employment, Education and
 Training, 108
Curriculum and Standards Framework,
 120
Discovering Democracy, 4, 113–4, 121,
 125–6
 Education Acts, The, 99
 Education for Active Citizenship in
 Australian Schools, 109
 Federal Constitution, 97, 107, 112
 “Free, Compulsory and Secular” Act,
 99
 Gilding Report, 108
 Hoy report, 105
 “imagined communities”, 124
 moral regeneration, 98
 National Citizenship Indicators, 108
 Native Title Act 1993, 112
 “new education”, 104–5
 New Wave, 94, 106
 Report of the Australian Education
 Council, 10
 Report of the Centenary of
 Federation Advisory Committee,
 108, 111
 Report of the Civics Expert Group,
 108, 1108
 Report of the Republic Advisory
 Committee, 108, 111
Terra Australis Incognita, 93
 “The Parliament Pack”, 108
Whereas the People, 4, 110
 authoritarianism, 195, 197, 260–1
 autocracy, 179, 181–4
- Bill of Rights, 60, 70, 103, 147
- capitalism, 38, 61
 centralisation, 62
 character education, 34, 63–4, 66–7, 71,
 78, 81, 91
 child-centred pedagogy, 105
- China, 209–46
 anti-bourgeois liberalization, 210
 anti-spiritual pollution, 210
Basic Education Curriculum Guide, 223
 Chinese cities, 209, 227–9, 240, 243–
 4, 252
 “cultural” citizenship, 223
 decentralisation, 211
 depoliticisation, 218, 221
Guidelines on Civic Education, 221–3
 intra-cultural study, 240
 liberalisation-oppression, 211
 market mechanisms, 210
 “party education”, 234, 237–8
 “private sphere”, 228–9
 psychological health, 218
 regionalisation, 211
 Sino-British Joint Declaration, 219,
 222
 “state sphere”, 229
- citizen
 bad, 163
 concerned, 84, 225–6, 246, 251
 dutiful, 84, 225–6, 245, 251, 260
 future, 60, 120, 134, 143, 169
 global, 42, 123, 142, 250–1, 260
 good, 5–6, 8, 10–4, 16, 19, 26–9, 31–
 3, 40–2, 76, 83, 86–9, 99, 105,
 113–4, 118–24, 131, 133–4, 149–
 50, 158–9, 161–6, 168–71, 173,
 175–6, 178–9, 182–3, 186–7, 203–
 7, 220, 228, 232–6, 238, 242, 251,
 255–60
 ideal, 182, 187, 193
 identity, 27, 223
 informed, 4, 70–1, 79, 84, 109, 114,
 126, 225–6, 245–6, 251
 liberal, 39, 225–7, 245, 250–1, 260
 obedient, 225–6, 233, 251, 260
 passive, 48
 responsible, 6, 61, 69
 rights, 97
 socially aware, 119, 225–6, 240, 245,
 251
 socially concerned, 225–6, 246, 251
 traditional, 225–7, 245, 251
- citizenship
 active, 48–9, 87, 109, 142, 153

- apoliticised version of good
 - citizenship, 172
- classical, 35, 37, 175, 223, 234
- dual, 28, 41, 133
- education, 3–6, 8–11, 19–20, 22, 27, 32, 34, 42, 55–63, 65–8, 70–81, 85, 90–2, 102, 104, 107–15, 121, 123–9, 131, 133, 139, 141–8, 150, 154–8, 167, 173, 180–1, 183, 187, 189, 192–7, 206, 208–9, 222, 241, 243
- effective, 4, 95, 113, 142
- European, 141–2
- moral qualities of, 177, 179, 182, 190, 233, 258
- multiple, 25, 35, 41–3, 47, 132, 140–2, 223, 228, 240
- national, 35, 40–1, 46, 65, 108, 218, 223, 234, 236, 238, 240
- participatory, 37, 77, 137, 152
- political, 49–50, 63, 92, 137–8, 261
- post-national, 35, 223
- social, 35, 38–40, 43–4, 49–50, 91–2, 134, 137–8, 147, 153, 223, 225, 240, 249, 251, 261
- social dimensions of, 227, 240–1, 243, 251–2, 255–6, 260
- student achievement and, 78
- World Citizenship, 42, 63, 133, 140, 142, 144, 158, 166
- civic
 - and moral, 210
 - knowledge, 7, 69, 110–1, 114, 120–1, 125, 128, 236
 - learning, 67–71, 78–80, 90–1, 128
 - responsibility, 63, 69, 90, 222
 - virtues, 8, 36–7, 43, 69, 79, 97, 101, 107, 121, 124–5, 132–4, 136, 147, 234, 259
- civics
 - and/versus “citizenship”, 114
 - as a separate subject, 106, 221
 - information-based, 143
- civil
 - and political rights, 37–8, 132
 - and social rights, 138
 - disobedience, 260
 - rights, 95–7, 102–3, 137, 147, 179, 185
 - society, 50, 179, 184–6, 194, 196, 228
- cognitive moral development, 68
- collectivism, 61, 190, 193, 207, 240
- common
 - attitudes, 62
 - good, 25, 57, 59, 67, 92, 114, 162–3, 166, 172, 256–8, 260–2
 - language, 59–60, 62
 - law, 95, 97
 - values, 60, 62, 260
- communitarianism, 48, 50, 66–7, 72–3, 133
- community
 - participation, 56, 70, 85, 87, 90, 227
 - service, 30, 65, 70, 78–80, 91
- consciousness raising, 72
- consumerism, 147, 206
- CRASTE Report, 108
- critical thinking, 7, 66, 166, 168, 195
- cultural
 - freedom, 61
 - hegemony, 100
- democracy, 4, 7, 24, 26, 30, 33, 36, 39, 44–5, 48, 50, 56–8, 61–3, 65, 67–71, 73, 75–6, 79, 87–8, 101, 103, 105, 109–10, 113–4, 121, 125–8, 153, 156, 167–8, 184, 186, 190, 195, 197, 207, 219, 222, 263
 - and human rights education, 222
 - “living democracy”, 68
- democratic
 - ideals, 60
 - schools, 62, 68, 78
- discipline, 60, 63–4, 66–7, 69, 75, 77, 102, 125, 180–1, 187, 191–2, 261
- disciplinary normalization, 105
- disciplines approach, 67, 74–5
- dominant culture, 61
- England, 131–73
 - 1944 Education Act, 143
 - Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT), 158
 - “coalition for citizenship”, 157

- Commission on Citizenship, 4, 132,
 134–5, 144, 148–51, 153
 Council of Education, 144
 Crick report, 5, 49–51, 148, 156–7,
 261
 “Euro-citizenship”, 141, 148
 European Awareness, 141
 “global ecological citizen”, 145
 “Green” citizenship, 145
 Legal Competence model, 144
 National Curriculum Council
 (NCC), 4, 141, 148–51, 153–5
 National Forum for Values in
 Education and the Community,
 156
 Personal and Social Education, 153,
 167
 Qualification and Curriculum
 Authority [QCA], 155–6, 158
 Speaker’s Commission on
 Citizenship, 4, 135, 149
 Swann Report, 140
 enquiry learning, 66, 124
 equal rights, 49, 97
 equality, 12, 26, 35, 37–8, 48–9, 56–9, 61,
 67–8, 90, 101, 103, 149, 179, 185, 261
 European
 Union, 3, 42, 141, 164

 family influence, 86

 global
 education, 74, 144–5
 interdependence, 20, 39, 42, 46–7,
 55, 74

 history, 3–4, 15, 24–6, 34–6, 42, 46–7, 49,
 57, 60–1, 65–6, 69, 74–6, 80, 91–2,
 100–3, 105–7, 111, 113, 119, 125,
 127, 134–5, 137, 139, 143, 151, 154–
 5, 167, 172, 177, 180, 183–5, 205,
 211, 220, 223, 239
 English, 102
 human rights movement, 164
 humanitarian reform, 185

 ideological education, 209
 immigrants, 47, 56, 58, 60, 62, 94, 97, 218
 immigration, 55–6, 64
 “inclusive”, 80, 110, 146
 “individualism”, 29, 48, 60–1, 73, 206
 inequality, 23, 61, 72
 inequity, 72
 informed citizenry, 134
 injustice, 72, 75, 120

 justice, 22, 26, 28, 36, 39, 43, 45, 50, 63,
 67–9, 71, 79, 90, 97, 101, 118–9, 126,
 137, 194

 law-related education, 67, 70–1, 77, 144
 legal definition, 138
 legalistic, 15, 113, 184–5, 239
 liberalization, 3, 5, 192, 210–1, 218

 Marxism, 192, 216
 middle class, 60, 99, 104, 182
 migration, 3, 94
 modernisation, 5, 60, 63–4
 moral
 action, 63, 67
 component of good citizenship, 172
 education, 11, 28, 33, 68, 91, 180,
 183, 193, 209–11, 233–4
 feeling, 63
 knowing, 63, 67
 training, 59, 63, 101
 multicultural education, 66

 national identity, 40, 43, 46–7, 63, 104,
 122, 132, 140–1, 148, 208, 218, 222–
 3, 229, 234, 258–9
 nationality, 40, 45, 47, 103, 181–4, 186,
 229
 nation-states, 25, 31, 40, 42, 46, 48, 139
 new ideology, 101

 orthodoxy, 178, 181–4

 participation in the community, 165
 Patriotic Education, 211
 patriotism, 5, 11, 14, 40–1, 43, 46–7, 55,
 57–8, 65, 69, 75, 79–81, 83–5, 90,
 100–1, 105, 118, 122–3, 159–61, 169–
 70, 193, 195, 199–203, 208, 218, 223,
 227–8, 233–6, 241–2, 253–4, 257–61

- pedagogy, 98, 105–6, 120, 177, 193, 211, 258
- personal
and skill dimension, 252, 255, 260
identity, 44, 123, 257, 261–2
- political
consciousness, 72
education, 5, 34, 46, 91, 134, 143, 146, 153, 209–10, 221, 237–8
involvement, 40, 43–5, 47, 137, 172, 234
literacy, 5, 50, 111, 144–5, 156–7, 261
rights, 133
- poverty, 64, 71–2, 112, 166
- propaganda, 104, 111, 193
- public
education, 56–8, 63, 71, 81, 180, 183–4, 188, 190, 222
sphere, 50, 228–9, 240
work, 73–4
- racism, 72, 167
- role models, 15, 85–6, 89, 121, 194, 237, 239, 256, 259, 262
- Russia, 175–208
All-Russian Congress on Education, 190
“citizen of the Cosmos”, 187
collective personality, 175, 193
Declarations of Rights and Freedoms of a Person and a Citizen, The, 5, 194
Dzerzhinets, 194
Emancipation, 183–5, 197
free schools, 188
“Granat”, 185
grazhdanin (citizen), 175
Marxist-Leninist teachings, 193
moral decline, 184, 207
National Association for Citizenship Education, 5, 196
nationalistic view of citizenship, 182
patriarchal morality, 186
predmetnost, 187
Pro-nationalists, 182–3
Programme of the Communist Party, 193
Progressive Russian, 182
Russian intelligentsia, 182
Russian Orthodoxy, 178
“school of labour”, 190–2
self-realisation, 178
totalitarian state, 186, 191–2
Ubezhdennost, 193
- self-discipline, 69, 187, 232–3
- self-government, 70, 177, 186, 189–90, 197
- self-interest, 36, 43, 133, 163, 218
- self-management, 218
- sense of community, 58–9, 73, 92, 107, 122–3, 138, 163
- sense of identity, 6, 138
- service learning, 67, 70–1, 73, 79, 90
- sexism, 72, 167
- social
education, 90–1, 120, 128, 152–3
prerequisites, 44–5, 47, 172
stability, 222
- social problems approach, 67, 71–2
- spiritual civilisation, 5, 216, 242
- standard for good citizenship, 91
- Terra Nullius*, 93, 96
- United States, 55–92
American Federation of Teachers, 56, 74–5
“Americanisation”, 60–1
Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, 63
Centre for Civic Education (in California), 4, 69–70, 79
Centre for Civic Learning, 78, 80
Child Development Project, 77
Citizenship Development Study Centre, 80
Citizenship Education Project (CEP), 65, 76
Civitas: A Framework for Civic Education, 4, 36–7, 51, 70, 79, 91
Close-Up Foundation, 77
Constitutional Rights Foundation, 77, 80
Declaration of Independence, 69
Detroit Citizenship Study, 65

Foundation for Teaching Economics
and the Law, 80
Hubert Humphrey Centre for
Democracy and Citizenship, 73
Improving Citizenship Project
(ICE), 77
Iowa Plan, 64
Kansas Study of Education for
Citizenship, 65
middle-class values, 60
National Council for the Social
Studies (NCSS), 77

*National Standards for Civics and
Government*, 4, 70, 78, 91
“new social studies”, 66
Progressive Movement, 61–3
*Purposes of Education in American
Democracy, The*, 63
September 11, 81
Stanford Social Education
Investigation, 65

values clarification, 66, 75

welfarism, 147, 166