

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN THE CURRICULUM: AN INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

David Kerr

*National Foundation for Educational Research
(NFER)
UK*

Introduction

In May 1996, as part of its work in monitoring the curriculum in England, the (then) School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA¹) commissioned the National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales (NFER) to undertake an international review of curriculum and assessment frameworks in 16 countries², to support its evaluation of different methods of curriculum organisation.

The aims of the International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks (IRCAF) Project are:

- to build a ready-to-use resource, comprising a succinct description of the educational aims, structure and organisation and the curriculum and assessment framework in each country, collectively referred to as *INCA*¹. The *INCA Archive* is now in place.
- to provide comparative tables and factual summaries in specific areas of interest.
- to provide detailed information on specific areas to enable QCA to evaluate the National Curriculum and assessment frameworks in England. Specific areas are addressed through *thematic studies*³. These *thematic studies* bring together the findings of *INCA* with additional research and include invitational seminars involving participants from most of the countries.

In 1999, with the area high on the political and educational agenda in

England, QCA commissioned a thematic study on citizenship education. The thematic study was designed to enrich *INCA* by examining six key aspects of citizenship education:

- curriculum aims, organisation and structure
- teaching and learning approaches
- teacher specialisation and teacher training
- use of textbooks and other resources
- assessment arrangements, and
- current and future developments.

The thematic study combined material from: the IRCAF Project (from *INCA* and previous thematic studies); specific enquiries about citizenship education addressed to the 16 countries; discussion at an invitational seminar on citizenship education held in London in 1999 and published sources, most notably National Case Studies from Phase 1 of the IEA Civic Education Study⁴ (Torney-Purta et al., 1999). The combination of what is contained in *INCA* about citizenship education and the findings of previous thematic studies, with the richer contextual information and analysis from those countries also involved in the IEA Civic Education Study, was intended to produce deeper insights into policy and practice in this area at individual country level, and to raise fundamental questions about aspects of citizenship education as they emerge from the comparative analysis. This article details the main findings about citizenship education in the curriculum which emerged from the thematic study.

Citizenship education

Citizenship or civics education is construed broadly to encompass the preparation of young people for their roles and responsibilities as citizens and, in particular, the role of education (through schooling, teaching and learning) in that preparatory process. The term 'citizenship education' is used deliberately throughout this article as it is the term, which describes this area in the curriculum in England. Though there is an attempt to draw a distinction between **citizenship education** and **civics education** later, the area of citizenship education is covered by a wide range of terms across the 16 countries and comprises many subjects. These terms include citizenship, civics, social sciences, social studies, world studies, society, studies of society, life

skills and moral education. The area also has links to curriculum subjects and options, including history, geography, economics, law, politics, environmental studies, values education, religious studies, languages and science. The range of terms and subject connections underlines the breadth and complexity of the issues addressed within this area.

Citizenship education is highly topical in many countries, at present, as the new century approaches and urgent consideration is given to how better to prepare young people for the challenges and uncertainties of life in a rapidly changing world (Ichilov, 1998). It is no coincidence that the majority of IRCAF project countries are undertaking major reforms of schools and the curriculum which will be in place by 2004. Citizenship education is very much part of this reform process. It is the varied responses of countries to the unprecedented level and pace of global change at the end of the twentieth century which made the thematic study so fascinating and timely. England is no exception to this process. Indeed, the place and purpose of citizenship education in schools is currently being examined in England, as part of the wider on-going review of the National Curriculum (Crick, 1998; Kerr, 1999 a, b and c; QCA, 1999 a and b). It made the thematic study particularly apposite to the English context.

Curriculum aims, organisation and structure

Citizenship education in context

The curriculum aims, organisation and structure of citizenship education can only be fully understood by recognising the important role of context. Context is particularly important in reviewing citizenship education. The complex and contested nature of the concept of citizenship leads to a broad range of interpretations. These interpretations mean that there are many different ways in which citizenship education can be defined and approached. This is underlined in a number of recent comparative studies on citizenship, civics and education for democracy (Torney-Purta et al., 1999; Hahn, 1998; Ichilov, 1998; Kennedy, 1997).

This diversity of approach came through very strongly in the presentations at the invitational seminar. However, participants agreed that through approaches and programmes in citizenship education it could be readily transported from one country to another, such approaches and programmes would only succeed if they took due account of the unique historical, cultural and social traditions of the new context. This is an important lesson

when citizenship education is being reviewed and renewed. What works in one context cannot simply be transported to another. Careful adaptation rather than wholesale adoption should be the watchword. A number of the newer democracies among the 16 IRCAF countries, reported difficulties when attempting to introduce ideas and practices from the longer established democratic countries into their schools. This was very evident in Hungary and Korea.

Broad contextual factors in citizenship education

A review of *INCA* and other literature sources reveals a number of broad contextual factors which influence the definition of and approaches to citizenship education in the 16 countries involved in the project. The main contextual factors are:

- historical tradition
- geographical position
- socio-political structure
- economic system, and
- global trends.

There is neither space nor time in this article to examine their relative influence and interplay within each country and across countries.

Detailed structural factors in citizenship education

The broad contextual factors, in turn, influence the nature of a number of detailed structural factors. These structural factors are important because they impact not only on the definition and approach to citizenship education but also on the size of the gap between the rhetoric of policy (what is intended) and the practice (what actually happens) in citizenship education. The main structural factors are:

- organisation of, and responsibilities for, education
- educational values and aims, and
- funding and regulatory arrangements.

The most important of these structural factors is that of educational values and aims.

Educational values and aims

How countries express their values has a marked influence on the definition of, and approach to, citizenship education. The earlier thematic study *Values and Aims in Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks* (Le Métais, 1997), categorised the 16 countries into three broad groups, according to the degree of detail with which national values are expressed or prescribed in education legislation. These categories are helpful when comparing approaches to citizenship education across the 16 project countries. The three categories were:

1. Minimal reference to values in education legislation

The countries in this group share a commitment to pluralism and devolved authority. Values are expressed in the Constitution and/or statutes, which provide a framework for the expression of values through devolved educational structures. They include Canada, England, Hungary, the Netherlands and the USA.

2. National values expressed in general terms

In this group of countries, general statements on values are made at national level, but the details are determined by authorities with devolved responsibilities. They include Australia, New Zealand, Italy and Spain.

3. National values expressed in detail

Countries with highly centralised systems tend to express very detailed aims and clear educational and social values. They include Japan, Korea, Singapore and Sweden.

'Values-explicit' and 'values-neutral' citizenship education

The three broad categories correspond with one of the major tensions countries face in approaching citizenship education, namely the extent to which it is possible to identify, agree and articulate the values and dispositions which underpin citizenship. This tension is both philosophical and practical. The response hinges in many countries on the answer to a simple question: Should citizenship education be 'values-explicit' and promote distinct values which are part of a broader nationally accepted system of public values and beliefs, or should it be 'values-neutral' and take a neutral stance to values and controversial issues, leaving the decision to the individual? The answer determines a great deal about a country's approach to citizenship education.

This tension is part of the broader debate about the balance between the 'public' and 'private' dimensions of citizenship, leading to what the educational philosopher McLaughlin (1992) has termed 'thick' and 'thin' citizenship education. Those who view citizenship as a largely 'public' concern see a major, or 'thick', role for education (through the school and formal curriculum) in the promotion of citizenship. Those who view citizenship as a largely 'private' affair see a much more limited, or 'thin', role for education (largely through the hidden curriculum). They advocate a much stronger role for the family and community organisations than for teachers. 'Values-explicit' approaches are commonly criticised for the associated dangers of bias and the indoctrination of students, while 'values-neutral' approaches are attacked for their failure to help students to deal adequately with real-life, controversial issues.

Examining the three broad categories it is clear that those countries in the first category take a 'values-neutral' approach to citizenship education (this has certainly been the tradition in England); those in the second category are somewhere between 'values-neutral' and 'values-explicit', depending on the decisions of devolved authorities; while those in the third category are very much 'values-explicit' in approach. The implications of the positions for the linkage between rhetoric of policy and actual practice in citizenship education came through very strongly at the invitational seminar. Those countries with a 'values-explicit' approach, such as Singapore and Korea, were much clearer than those from a 'values-neutral' tradition, as to what citizenship education is (aims and goals) and consequently the role of schools, teachers and the curriculum in achieving those goals.

The certainty of 'values-explicit' approaches is very alluring. Seminar participants were agreed that a clear, publicly accepted definition of citizenship was a tremendous benefit in facilitating effective practice in citizenship education. It enabled everyone involved in citizenship education - schools, teachers, students, parents, community representatives, public figures - to be clear about the aims and goals; to understand their roles and responsibilities in achieving those aims and goals; and provided a strong framework upon which approaches and programmes could be constructed with certainty and purpose. Without such a definition there was a danger that citizenship education became a 'catch-all' for numerous related topics and aspects and that this lack of focus made it a low status, low priority area in schools. One participant summed up the effect with a quote from the Jeremiah "Without a vision the people perish". A clear vision does not guarantee good practice but it is a vital starting-point.

The tripartite categorisation is particularly topical given the claims of some commentators that many countries, in response to the challenges and uncertainties in the modern world, are moving toward a more explicit statement of the values and aims underpinning their education systems. Indeed this is an interesting development in the current review of the National Curriculum in England. QCA have produced a draft statement of values, aims and purposes of the school curriculum as a potential way of helping schools to develop their own curriculum in a way which reflects the spirit of nationally agreed aims (QCA, 1999b). The challenges and uncertainties are forcing countries to re-examine and adjust many of their underlying cultural traditions, values and assumptions. It helps to explain the considerable debate about the values underpinning citizenship education, particularly in those countries with a tradition of a 'values-neutral' approach.

Common challenges in citizenship education

A review of *INCA* and the literature on citizenship education reveals concern in many countries about how to respond to a period of unprecedented global change. This concern was confirmed by the participants at the invitational seminar. The concern is both immediate - how to respond in the short term through current economic, social and political policies - and more long-term - how better to prepare current and future generations for their roles and responsibilities as citizens, parents, consumers, workers and human beings. Seminar participants agreed that there is no simple, 'quick-fix' solution. The unprecedented global change has thrown up a common set of challenges or issues for countries, which demand a response. They include:

- the rapid movement of people within and across national boundaries;
- a growing recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples and minorities;
- the collapse of political structures and the birth of new ones;
- the changing role of women in society;
- the impact of the global economy and changing patterns of work;
- the effect of a revolution in information and communications technologies;
- an increasing global population, and;
- the creation of new forms of community.

The last challenge is of particular relevance in many countries at the moment, with concern about the lack of interest in and involvement of young

people in public and political life; what has been termed a 'democratic deficit' (Janoski, 1998).

These challenges touch on complex issues concerning pluralism, multiculturalism, ethnic and cultural heritage and diversity, tolerance, social cohesion, collective and individual rights and responsibilities, social justice, national identity and consciousness, and freedom among others. The education system is a vital part of the response to these challenges. Although countries have similar sets of national aims in dealing with these challenges and issues, including the aim of promoting citizenship and democratic values, they approach those aims in many different ways (Gore, 1996). This is, in part, because of the influence of the broad contextual and more detailed structural factors highlighted earlier.

A continuum of citizenship education

The broad range of approaches to these challenges and issues and the subsequent discussion at the invitational seminar suggests the existence of a continuum of citizenship and citizenship education (see Figure 1). Indeed, political philosophers and commentators argue that citizenship is conceptualised and contested along a continuum, which ranges from a minimal to a maximal interpretation (McLaughlin, 1992). Each end of the continuum displays different characteristics, which affect the definition of, and approach to, citizenship education.

Fig.1 Citizenship education continuum

MINIMAL	MAXIMAL
Thin	Thick
Exclusive	Inclusive
Elitist	Activist
Civics education	Citizenship education
Formal	Participative
Content led	Process led
Knowledge based	Values based
Didactic transmission	Interactive interpretation
Easier to achieve and measure in practice	More difficult to achieve and measure in practice

Minimal interpretations are characterised by a narrow definition of citizenship. They seek to promote particular exclusive and elitist interests, such as the granting of citizenship to certain groups in society but not all. Minimal interpretations lead to narrow, formal approaches to **citizenship education** - what has been termed **civics education**. This is largely content-led and knowledge-based. It is centred on formal education programmes which concentrate on the transmission to students of knowledge of a country's history and geography, of the structure and processes of its system of government and of its constitution. The primary purpose is to inform through the provision and transmission of information. It lends itself to didactic teaching and learning approaches, with teacher-led, whole-class teaching as the dominant medium. There is little opportunity or encouragement for student interaction and initiative. As the outcomes of minimal approaches are narrow, largely involving the acquisition of knowledge and understanding, it is much easier to measure how successfully the outcomes have been achieved, often through written examinations.

Maximal interpretations are characterised by a broad definition of citizenship. They seek to actively include and involve all groups and interests in society. Maximal interpretations lead to a broad mixture of formal and informal approaches to what has been termed **citizenship education**, as opposed to narrower civics education. This citizenship education includes the content and knowledge components of minimal interpretations, but actively encourages investigation and interpretation of the many different ways in which these components (including the rights and responsibilities of citizens) are determined and carried out. The primary aim is not only to inform, but also to use that information to help students to understand and to enhance their capacity to participate. It is as much about the content as about the process of teaching and learning. It lends itself to a broad mixture of teaching and learning approaches, from the didactic to the interactive, both inside and outside the classroom. Structured opportunities are created for student interaction through discussion and debate, and encouragement is given to students to use their initiative through project work, other forms of independent learning and participative experiences. As the outcomes of maximal approaches are broad, involving the acquisition of knowledge and understanding, and the development of values and dispositions, and skills and attitudes, it is much more difficult to measure how successfully these outcomes have been achieved.

Although the interpretations are polarised when laid out in this way, nevertheless they provide a useful, if crude, scale for determining where each country broadly stands in its definition and approach to citizenship education. Certainly, seminar participants found the continuum useful in conceptualising approaches to citizenship education. However, it was pointed out that an equally valid way of conceptualising approaches is by intended aims or goals. Looked at in this way citizenship education comprises three strands:

- Education ABOUT citizenship
 - Education THROUGH citizenship, and
 - Education FOR citizenship
- **Education ABOUT citizenship** focuses on providing students with sufficient knowledge and understanding of national history and the structures and processes of government and political life.
- **Education THROUGH citizenship** involves students learning by doing, through active, participative experiences in the school or local community and beyond. This learning reinforces the knowledge component.
- **Education FOR citizenship** encompasses the other two strands and involves equipping students with a set of tools (knowledge and understanding, skills and aptitudes, values and dispositions) which enable them to participate actively and sensibly in the roles and responsibilities they encounter in their adult lives. This strand links citizenship education with the whole education experience of students.

Seminar participants agreed that it was much easier to deliver '**education ABOUT citizenship**', than the other two strands. However what was taught for one or two hours per week in the classroom was not sufficient to equip students with what was required for their future participation in '**education FOR citizenship**'. Instead countries needed to set out the values, dispositions, skills and aptitudes underpinning citizenship education and build in experiences (the '**education THROUGH citizenship**' strand) which complemented the '**education ABOUT citizenship**' strand. Though this was being attempted in some countries much more needed to be done before the goals of '**education FOR citizenship**' were achieved.

Applying this crude comparative scale to the 16 IRCAF countries places those countries in south-east Asia more toward the minimal, '**education ABOUT**' end of the continuum, those in southern, central and eastern Europe somewhere in the middle, and those in northern Europe and some of the

former British colonies such as the USA and New Zealand more toward the maximal '**education FOR**' end. However, this scale is indeed very crude and there are exceptions. Australia, interestingly, views itself as somewhere in the middle of the scale but striving for the maximal, while Hungary is attempting to move away from the minimal. Canada probably cannot be placed because of the variation across its provinces.

Approaches to citizenship education

How citizenship is defined in relation to the continuum affects how citizenship education is approached in schools. Tables 1 and 2 attempt to categorise the terminology, approach and amount of time per week given to citizenship education across the 16 countries. It must be emphasised that this is an attempt to quantify approaches in the formal curriculum. In most countries, citizenship education is broader than the formal curriculum, involving the hidden curriculum, whole-school and extra-curricular activities, as well as students' everyday experiences of life.

Some countries are attempting to build these activities into the formal curriculum. For example, Japan has special activities, while Singapore has developed a community involvement programme and learning journeys around the key institutions. Other countries have left the choice to schools. In the USA, there has been an expansion in 'service learning' education based on active partnerships between schools and their local communities (Nolin et al., 1997). It is a growing area of interest in England (Mitchell, 1999). Meanwhile some countries are strengthening the involvement of students in school or class councils.

Table 1 examines the curriculum for pupils' aged 5 to 11, what is termed in *INCA* as the primary phase. Table 2 looks at the curriculum for students' aged 11 to 16 or 18, what is termed in *INCA* as the lower and upper secondary phases.

What patterns, if any, are discernible? An examination of both tables enables four points to be made. The first point is that citizenship education and its related issues are addressed in the formal curriculum across the whole age range in every country. The second point to note is the broad range of terms used to describe this area. The third point is the existence of three main curriculum approaches to citizenship education, namely separate, integrated and cross-curricular. In the separate approach, citizenship education or civics is a specific subject or aspect. In the integrated approach, it is part of a broader course, often social sciences or social studies, and linked to other subjects and

curricular areas. In the cross-curricular approach, citizenship education is neither a separate subject or topic, nor is it part of an integrated course, but instead it permeates the entire curriculum and is infused into subjects. Some countries adopt a mixed approach to citizenship education, with a broad integrated approach more prevalent in the primary curriculum, giving way to more specialised citizenship education or civics courses in the secondary curriculum. The fourth point is the mixture of statutory and non-statutory approaches to citizenship education. In some countries it is a statutory part of the core national curriculum, while in others it is non-statutory, with greater freedom left to states, districts, municipalities, schools and teachers. However, the non-statutory nature of provision in some countries means that not all students may encounter citizenship education in their curriculum experience.

The primary curriculum (ages 5 to 11)

Table 1: Organisation of citizenship education in the primary phase

Country	Terminology	Approach	Hours per week
England	Education for Citizenship	Non-statutory Cross-curricular	Schools to decide
Australia New South Wales	Human society and it's environment (HSIE)	Non-statutory Integrated	Not specified
Canada	Social studies	Non-statutory Integrated	Not specified
France	Civics as part of 'Discovering the World'	Statutory core Separate and integrated	4 hours out of 26
Germany	Sachunterricht	Non-statutory Integrated	Not specified
Hungary	People and society	Statutory core Integrated	4 to 7% of curriculum time
Italy	Social sciences	Statutory core Integrated	Not specified
Japan	Social studies, living experience and moral education	Statutory core Separate and integrated	175 x 45 minutes per year
Korea	A disciplined life and moral education	Statutory core Separate	Varies dependent on year
The Netherlands	Social structures and life skills	Statutory core Integrated	80 to 100 hours per year
New Zealand	Social studies	Statutory core Integrated	Not specified
Singapore	Civics and moral education	Statutory core Separate and Integrated	3 x 30 minutes lessons
Spain	Knowledge of the natural, social and cultural environment	Non-statutory Integrated	170 hours per year
Sweden	Social sciences	Non-core Integrated	885 hours over 9 years of compulsory schooling
Switzerland	Social studies	Non-statutory Integrated	Not specified
USA Kentucky	Social studies	Statutory core Integrated	Time specified per week varies among states

The major pattern in the primary curriculum is the organisation of citizenship education through an integrated approach of domains or 'brigades' in many countries. It suggests a deliberate emphasis in the intended curriculum, particularly in the early years of this phase, on the integrated learning of the child's understanding of themselves with respect to topics and aspects. For example, France links civics with sciences, technology, history and geography under the heading 'Discovering the World'. Hungary has eight curricular areas, one of which is 'People and Society', while Spain uses the term 'Knowledge of the natural, social and cultural environment'. Moral education is also an important component of citizenship education in many countries, particularly those in Southeast Asia.

The striking example is that of Korea, which addresses citizenship education through the domain of 'a disciplined life'; an integrated course covering social studies and moral education. Time allocations indicate that moral education features heavily in early education. The same is true for Singapore, where moral education is part of mother tongue teaching, and for Japan. In some countries, the range of the curriculum is extended as the primary phase progresses and there is increased time and focus on citizenship education. In Singapore, for instance, the seven-area curriculum from grade 1 (including civics and moral education) is supplemented by the addition of social studies from grade 4, with subjects increasingly taught through the common medium of English as pupils progress.

The secondary curriculum (ages 11 to 16 or 18)

Table 2: Organisation of citizenship education in the lower and upper secondary phase

Country	Terminology	Approach	Hours per week
England	Education for Citizenship	Non-statutory Cross-curricular	Schools to decide
Australia New South Wales	Human society and it's environment (HSIE)	Non-statutory Integrated	Not specified
Canada	Social studies and also history, law, political sciences and economics	Non-statutory Integrated	Not specified
France	Civics linked to history and geography	Statutory core Separate and integrated	3 to 4 hours out of 26
Germany	Social studies linked to history, geography and economics	Non-statutory Integrated	Not specified
Hungary	People and society with specific social studies, civics and economics courses	Statutory core Integrated and specific	10 to 14% of curriculum time
Italy	Civics linked to history and geography	Statutory core Separate and integrated	4 hours
Japan	Social studies, history, geography and civics and moral education	Statutory core Integrated and specific	175 x 50 minutes per year (Grades 7 & 8) 140 x 50 minutes per year (Grade 9) 140 x 50 minutes per year (Upper secondary)
Korea	Social studies and moral education	Statutory core Integrated and specific	Ranges 170 x 45 minutes to 204 x 45 minutes per year
The Netherlands	Civics and citizenship and social studies	Statutory core Integrated	180 hours over 3 years (age 12 – 15) 2 to 4 hours per week (age 16 –18)
New Zealand	Social studies	Statutory core Integrated	Not specified
Singapore	Civics and moral education	Statutory core Integrated and specific	2 x 30 minutes lessons
Spain	Civics linked to history, geography and social sciences	Non-statutory Separate and integrated	3 hours per week
Sweden	Social sciences including history, geography and social studies	Non-core Integrated	885 hours over 9 years of compulsory schooling
Switzerland	Social studies	Non-statutory Integrated	Not specified
USA Kentucky	Social studies including civics and government	Statutory core Separate and integrated	Time specified per week varies among states

Citizenship education in the secondary curriculum is still organised through an integrated approach in most countries, but often as a discrete, explicit component alongside other subjects and aspects. The most common approach is through social studies or social sciences courses, where citizenship or civics is closely linked to the subjects of history and geography. For

example, in Hungary, the domain is still entitled 'People and Society' but incorporates specific reference to social studies, civics and economics courses. In Japan, in junior high school (age 12+-15), social studies is divided into three subjects; geography, history and civics to be taught from 2002 alongside a new general studies course: and in high school (age 15+-18), social studies is divided into two subjects; civics, and geography and history, where civics is further subdivided into modern society, ethics and politics and economics. In the Netherlands, citizenship education is part of history and civics at lower secondary (age 12 to 15) and is an integral part of social studies (*maatschappijleer*) courses, while in some Canadian provinces, social studies is linked with history, law, political sciences and economics.

In many countries, the range of subjects that relate to citizenship education is extended as the secondary phase progresses, taking in economics, law, commerce and political sciences. Moral education continues to be an important component in some countries, particularly those in Southeast Asia. The other feature of the secondary phase is the increased time given to citizenship education particularly in the upper years of this phase. This reflects the growing maturity of students and their ability to handle complex, topical issues. It is spurred by the proximity of students to the end of their compulsory or post-compulsory period of education and to their entry into the world as full citizens, with legal, political, economic and social rights and responsibilities.

Teaching and Learning Approaches

Influences on teaching and learning approaches in citizenship education

The three major influences on teaching and learning approaches are culture, content and climate. The interplay between them is very complex and subtle but can have profound consequences. Culture, in particular is broad and pervasive. It ranges from the cultural traditions and norms in a society, to the particular culture of specific groups (such as teachers, parents and students), of organisations (such as schools, government departments and businesses) and of institutions (such as parliaments, courts and churches). Indeed Hahn (1998) found in her comparative study of citizenship education that there are significant differences between countries in terms of their pedagogic traditions and cultural norms. It explains why approaches and programmes of citizenship education cannot readily be transported from one country to another and

expect to be successful. In some countries there are also differences between the prevailing civic and classroom cultures. This underlines the profound influence that teacher culture and beliefs has on approaches to citizenship education.

Content covers the various components of citizenship education in the formal and hidden curriculum. For example, in Korea this comprises four aspects: work in curriculum subjects; optional activities based around 15 cross-curricular themes; cross-curricular activities and service work. These aspects are identifiable in many countries. Content is vital to effective citizenship education. Research shows that students who take citizenship/civics courses in schools are more knowledgeable about political life (both formal and informal) and therefore more likely to participate in the future (Hahn, 1998; Niemi and Junn, 1998). Climate includes the ethos in schools, classrooms and impacts, for example on ability to tackle controversial issues and values with students.

These three main influences impact on policy and practice at three levels. The first level is the general structure and aims of education, including the organisation of schooling. The second level is the organisation of the curriculum, including content and teaching and learning methodologies. The third level is what students experience in schools and the balance between the formal and hidden curriculum and individual classroom and school ethos.

At the first level, the broad contextual and structural factors outlined earlier in this article clearly have a major influence on teaching and learning approaches. They set the official tone and determine the degree of flexibility available to schools and teachers as to how they approach citizenship education. As might be expected among 16 countries, there are variations in the scope and nature of that influence. For example, teachers in Germany are obliged by law to teach values. Legally speaking, this commitment is just as important as the teaching of knowledge. However, in conformity with the basic law of educational freedom, teachers are free to choose their own methods. In contrast, teachers in Singapore operate within a tightly controlled framework. Civic and moral education are compulsory throughout primary and secondary education, based on a structured syllabus and prescribed textbooks. This learning is reinforced through service programmes (e.g. voluntary work in welfare homes) and by encouraging students to participate in out-of-school club activities. Sweden is interesting in the extent to which the school's responsibility for 'inculcating' values associated with citizenship education is explicitly defined in terms of the development of skills and attitudes, as well as the acquisition of knowledge. The Swedish system also puts great emphasis on the whole school community as a vehicle for learning.

At the second and third levels the role of the teacher, collectively and individually, is crucial. Actual classroom practice is critical to the successful achievement of the aims of citizenship education, whether those aims are the transmission of formal historical and political knowledge and/or the encouragement of active participation among students. Teachers have to strike the right balance between the content being covered, the chosen teaching methodology and the learning environment that ensues.

The power of teachers in determining the learning environment in schools was underlined by seminar participants. Teachers are themselves influenced, in their beliefs and actions, by the cultural traditions and norms in a country. This can be both positive and negative. It means that they are generally one or two generations removed from the students they teach. Indeed they often have more in common with parents than with students. This can lead to a gap in some countries between teachers and students, and also between teachers and the prevailing civic culture. The latter occurs particularly where significant and rapid change in policy is attempted. Research shows that the culture of schools and classrooms is very slow to adapt to change (Fullan, 1991). There was clear evidence of this from the seminar presentations. For example, in Switzerland, teachers in the secondary phase view their primary duty in citizenship education as providing information about national history and politics and describing relevant situations in a didactic and non-controversial way. There is little room or encouragement for other approaches in the classroom.

Countries with a tradition of a formal, knowledge-based approach to this area can also find it difficult to change teacher attitudes and opinions. This is the case in Hungary, where official moves to a more discussion-based approach to citizenship issues in classrooms are being frustrated by the deep-seated belief of teachers that controversial or sensitive issues should be kept out of the classroom. Japan and Korea are encountering similar problems in their official attempts to promote more creativity in schools in what are traditionally conformist and centralist societies. The new teaching and learning approaches which are being encouraged at an official level are viewed as having a western basis which does not fit with what people feel in their hearts. The power and durability of teacher culture should not be underestimated in attempts to review and renew citizenship education. While it may be true that 'the people will perish without a vision', it is equally true that 'the people will perish if they do not share and support the vision'.

Range of teaching and learning approaches in citizenship education

The IEA Citizenship Education Project national case study chapters highlight the wide range of teaching and learning approaches employed by teachers in covering citizenship education. While a number of countries are still dependent on a passive, didactic, transmission approach as the dominant teaching methodology, there are others who encourage a more interactive, participative approach with room for classroom discussion and debate supported by project and inquiry work, fieldwork, visits and extra-curricular learning. There is evidence in Australian classrooms of structured classroom discussion and debate as the most favoured approach, while in the USA, there are many opportunities for learning through extra-curricular activities and through service learning programmes, national competitions and mock elections. There is an equal range of opportunities available in England through the work of the main citizenship organisations and in the encouragement given to school and class councils.

Some countries have developed specific curriculum programmes which encourage a mixture of approaches to ensure the goals of '**education FOR citizenship**' are achieved. They include the Civic, Social and Political Education (CPSE) course in the Republic of Ireland, the Junior Citizenship project in England, the Opening the Schools project in Germany and the 'Discovering Democracy' initiative in Australia among others, but there are far too many to list here. There is an urgent need to map these curriculum projects where they lead to effective practice and to make this practice more widely available both within and across countries. This would also include reference to what is known from effective practice about how students learn best in citizenship education. A number of seminar participants urged the development of a database of projects and resources in order to provide what one participant termed 'effective and inspiring examples from actual practice'.

However, it should be noted that, even in countries with curriculum projects and effective practice, it is accepted that there is still tremendous variety in approach from school to school and classroom to classroom. This means that not all students experience all approaches. Indeed, in most countries, citizenship education teaching still proceeds from the use of the textbook as the predominant teaching resource. Structured teacher exposition of textbook passages and follow up opportunities for student discussion and questioning is a very common teaching approach.

Some countries are recognising the need for increased encouragement of active and participatory learning in citizenship education through formal

structures and policies. For example, in the Netherlands, there is a move in upper secondary schools to a 'study house' concept, where students are encouraged to move away from traditional teaching methods and organise other forms of working. Elsewhere, there are attempts to achieve greater coherence between what students learn in the formal subject curriculum with what they experience through the hidden curriculum. For example, in Sweden, schools must use democratic working methods with teachers and students deciding in advance the learning goals in each subject. Meanwhile, the province of Ontario in Canada has recently redefined the word 'curriculum' to include all the learning experiences that students have in school.

There are also opportunities in some countries for students to learn about democracy through active participation in school life. In Spain, there are school councils comprising teacher representatives, parents and students that decide, among other things, on curriculum plans, finances and student behaviour. The current reform of the lycée in France aims to give students more say in how their education is conducted, while in England there is growing support for school and/or class councils in every school. However, not all countries have such opportunities. In Australia school representative councils and youth parliaments are rare. There is a distinct lack of such developments in Hungary, while in others, notably Italy, their existence does not mean they function satisfactorily. It is important to note that such opportunities are often open to only a small percentage of students in a school.

Gap between policy and practice in citizenship education

To a degree, practice often lags behind policy in all areas of education. The issues in citizenship education are the size of the gap, how far is it an accepted part of the education system, and what, if anything, is being done to address it where it exists. The gap between policy and practice can exist at many levels, from national policy all the way to policy and practice within an individual school. Indeed, Kennedy (1997) has suggested that the loftier a country's ideals for citizenship education, the less likely it is to have any meaningful practice. As already mentioned, a gap can appear where national policy is attempting to bring a significant shift in teacher attitude and classroom practice in a relatively short period of time. This is the case currently in Hungary, Japan and Korea, with the shift in central policy to encourage more discursive and creative elements in schools. It may well take a generation before new teachers, comfortable with the changed emphasis in practice,

begin to close the gap in these countries. Indeed, there is tacit acceptance of this in Korea, where the compulsory retirement age for teachers has been reduced from 65 to 62 in an attempt to increase the number of younger teachers employed in schools.

In other countries, there is a gap which is accepted as part of the system. For example, in Italy, there is a marked contrast for students between the open, participative climate within the hidden curriculum in schools, and the non-participatory climate in the formal curriculum in the classroom. A similar situation exists in Germany, but in reverse. The hidden curriculum in German schools, with its strong emphasis on 'studying for tests' and 'conforming to authority', has a powerful influence on the formal curriculum. Meanwhile, in Canada, it is recognised that actual practice in many provinces is much more conservative and traditional than official policy mandates.

However, these observations should be tempered by a recognition that one of the key points to emerge from the literature in this area is that we have only a limited knowledge and understanding of what actually happens in citizenship education in schools, both in classrooms and elsewhere. Little systematic research has been conducted since the 1970s. Though the research base is growing rapidly with the renewed interest in citizenship education in many countries, it will take some time before research findings and examples of effective practice filter through at international, national, school and classroom level.

Assessment Arrangements

Assessment arrangements for citizenship education

Assessment arrangements for citizenship education show considerable variation across countries, depending on the formal assessment arrangements in operation, attitudes to the purposes of assessment and the particular phase involved. For example, all of the countries with a centralised government and education system have some sort of formal, though not always compulsory, assessment arrangements. Singapore and Italy have compulsory primary school leaving examinations, but these do not involve an assessment of citizenship education. Italy also has a lower secondary school leaving examination at age 14, which includes an oral combined test for civics, history and geography. Indeed, citizenship education is more likely to be part of a formal assessment system in the lower and upper secondary phases because of

the way those phases are organised in many countries around formal examination qualifications such as the *baccalauréat* in France and the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) and General Certificate of Education Advanced 'A' Levels in England.

Beyond these, the purpose of the assessment affects the structure adopted. Sweden has national tests for students aged 12 and these illustrate that perceptions of purpose may differ. The Government sees the role of these tests as supporting teachers and influencing the allocation of funding to pupils who do not pass, while the National Agency for Education (*Skolverket*) stresses diagnosis for the individual pupil and encouraging reflection on teaching by the teacher. There are also concerns in Sweden about tests influencing the curriculum and the use of item banks to provide tests is seen as a solution. Some of the development work on these is being carried out in co-operation with other Scandinavian countries.

Periodic surveys are used to assess the state of citizenship education in several countries, including Hungary, the USA and the Netherlands. The 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NEAP) in the USA looked at civics and government in a representative sample of schools, based on the voluntary national standards for civics and government. The results should be made public at the end of 1999. Other countries favouring this approach include Korea (at ages ten to 12) and Spain (at age 12). New Zealand has recently set up the National Educational Monitoring Project (NEMP), while the federal government in Australia has announced a baseline survey of student knowledge in civics or citizenship education as part of the 'Discovering Democracy' initiative. Meanwhile, in the Netherlands the National Institute for Educational Measurement (CITO) selects a representative sample of primary schools each year to evaluate pupils' progress in different school subjects, including social structures and life skills. Two-thirds of pupils in the Netherlands also take a voluntary test at the end of the primary schooling, which among other things assesses their knowledge of world studies.

Most of the IRCAF Project countries have a mixture of summative and formative assessment arrangements in citizenship education. Continuous student assessment is the responsibility of the individual class teacher in many countries, with formative assessment introduced at a number of natural end points across the school year, often the middle or end of terms. These sometimes coincide with points of transition and exit in the school system, where formative assessment may be part of more formal national procedures. Summative assessment comprises a number of components, including student

performance in class tests, the standard of a student's written work and his/her oral contribution in lessons. Indeed, in Sweden, in most grades, schools are free to report on student progress in terms of their creativity, personal conduct and ability to co-operate.

The purposes of assessment are varied. Assessment often helps to inform the teacher and the individual student and may also include some reporting to parents. In Sweden, for example, regular oral and written reports are made to parents, while in Spain, written reports are made to parents every three months. However, assessments may also be increasingly used to monitor the state of citizenship education performance. A number of countries are moving in this direction, through the establishment of national standards for all subjects, with accompanying statements, learning outcomes and testing instruments. This is the case in New Zealand, Sweden and in some Australian and American states. For example, the states of New South Wales and Victoria in Australia are to begin to formally assess civics with history and geography for Year 10 students. Meanwhile in the US state of Kentucky, 57 'Student Academic Expectations' define what students should be able to know and do in five major content areas, including social studies. The social studies expectations stated as learning outcomes, include students' demonstrating effectiveness in community service. There are similar developments afoot in Maryland and Wisconsin.

However, it is vital to give careful consideration to the purpose of assessment in citizenship education and its impact on teaching and learning approaches. Seminar participants saw clarity of purpose as the crucial issue concerning assessment arrangements for citizenship education. What was being assessed, how and for what purpose needed careful consideration. Some participants called for an in-depth discussion of the relationship between citizenship education and assessment, and for assessment issues to be a more explicit part of teacher training. They felt that this was long overdue. In some countries, citizenship was only taken seriously as a recognised and valued part of the curriculum when it became an examination subject. This was the case in the Netherlands with the use of end of year written exams at national school level alongside assessment of practical or experiential components (often in project form). There may be a need for more formal, written examinations as part of the assessment of citizenship education in order to raise its status in the curriculum. However, in some countries, the formal assessment system has a negative influence, both direct and indirect, on citizenship education. For example, in Japan, the senior high school entrance exam, which include social studies, encourages 'teaching to the test'. The same phenomenon is noted in

Germany. In Australia, however, the pressure to report on student performance in the Year 12 public examinations is one factor in inhibiting the introduction of citizenship education as a discrete curriculum component.

Current and future developments

Current position of citizenship education in the school curriculum

In a comparative study of 16 countries, there are bound to be variations in the position of citizenship education in the school curriculum. However, looking across the countries as a whole, the general position of citizenship education is a healthy one, in that it is a recognised and accepted part of the school curriculum in the majority of IRCAF Project countries. The only exceptions are England, and to a lesser extent Australia, where it has yet to establish a firm hold in the curriculum and Canada, where reforms threaten to severely weaken its curriculum status and position.

Developments in the near future also offer hope. Citizenship education is part of the major reforms of the curriculum currently underway in Spain, France, Hungary, Italy, New Zealand and the Netherlands. It is subject to a change of official emphasis in Japan, Korea and Singapore, as a vehicle for the introduction of more creativity, debate and discussion into the curriculum. The situation is relatively stable in Germany, Switzerland and the USA, with some interesting developments concerning the establishment of standards for citizenship education in a number of US states. Meanwhile, there are promising developments in those countries where citizenship education has yet to take a hold in the curriculum. In England serious consideration is being given to the introduction of citizenship education as a discrete component in the revised National Curriculum from September 2002 while in Australia the federal government is attempting to increase the status and take-up of citizenship education across the states and territories. Only in Canada is there cause for concern where citizenship education is being marginalised in many provinces by the national emphasis in education on technology, mathematics and science.

Conclusions

The thematic study, upon which this article is based, drew the following conclusions, with reference to citizenship education:

- the topical nature of citizenship education and the breadth, depth and complexity of the issues it addresses. The area is under review with planned revisions in most IRCAF countries, as part of the overall reform of the school curriculum;
- the important role of context and culture in understanding aims and approaches to citizenship education. What works in one cultural context cannot simply be adopted and expected to achieve the same ends somewhere else. It requires careful adaptation to suit the new cultural context;
- broad agreement among countries on the common challenges facing citizenship education, even if national responses to those challenges vary;
- a recognition that the explicit statement of shared values underpinning citizenship education can make a difference to policy and practice and may make a difference to outcomes. However, it should be noted that clarity of aims does not guarantee successful outcomes;
- a move in many countries away from a narrow, knowledge-based approach to citizenship education, to a broader approach encompassing knowledge and understanding, active experiences and the development of student values, dispositions, skills and aptitudes. However, this transition was proving difficult to manage because of the impact, in particular, of teacher culture and beliefs and the slow adaptation of schools to change;
- the continuing gap between the rhetoric of policy and the reality of practice in many contexts, from a national level to individual schools and classrooms. There is still a long way to go to ensure that effective practice in citizenship education is developed and sustained within and across countries;
- agreement on the centrality of the teacher in citizenship education and on the need for better targeted training for teachers and the development of a broader range of teacher-friendly resources;
- the need for further discussion about assessment arrangements for citizenship education and the importance of clarity of purpose when deciding what arrangements to make. There is a growing debate in some countries about the desirability of terminal, written exams for citizenship education, as part of compulsory, national assessment systems, and their balance with other types of assessment;
- calls for the urgent co-ordination and dissemination of approaches, programmes and initiatives in citizenship education which are developing

effective practice. This could be effected through the establishment of a citizenship education database within each country and across countries.

What the thematic study showed, above all, is the commonality of interest, challenge and approach to citizenship education across countries. Once you get beyond the differences in context and in curriculum and assessment frameworks countries have much more in common concerning citizenship education than they think. Awareness of and in-depth analysis of this commonality is the key to developing more co-ordinated and effective policy and practice in citizenship education. Indeed, active and participatory citizenship requires active and participatory dialogue between all those with an interest in citizenship education - researchers, teachers, policy makers, curriculum designers, government officials, parents and students. It is to be hoped that this central message will live on beyond the thematic study. It is perhaps fitting to end this article with the final contribution to the invitational seminar from the Canadian representative.

'We know enough about how students learn in citizenship education to put in place programmes which are based on the growing research and practice base. We need to draw out what this research and practice base tells us and then create a partnership with policy makers and curriculum designers'.

This spirit of partnership is surely the best way to respond to the current challenges in citizenship education in the curriculum across the world.

Notes

- [1] On 1 October 1997, the School Curriculum and Assessment Authority merged with the National Council for Vocational Qualifications to form the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA).
- [2] The original IRCAF countries are Australia, Canada, England, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the USA. The Republic of Ireland and Hong Kong will join IRCAF in 2000. The INCA Archive is available in CD-ROM form (O' Donnell et al. 1998) and also on-line at <http://www.inca.org.uk>
- [3] Four thematic studies have been completed to date. They are those on Values and Aims (Le Metais, 1997), Primary Education (Tabberer, 1997), Mathematics (Ruddock, 1998) and Citizenship Education (Kerr, 1999d). A further study on Lower Secondary Education is nearing completion (Greenaway, 1999 forthcoming). The thematic studies are available on-line at <http://www.inca.org.uk>
- [4] Of the 16 INCA countries nine participated in Phase 1 of the IEA Civic Education

Project. Australia, England, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Switzerland and the USA participated in Phase 1 and are also participating in Phase 2. Canada and the Netherlands participated only in Phase 1. The outcome of Phase 1 was a national case study report from each country. These case study reports have been used to supplement INCA.

References

- Crick Report. Great Britain. Department for Education and Employment. Advisory Group on Education and Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools (1998). *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship*. London: QCA.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. London: Cassell.
- Gore, J. (1996). *Citizens of the Pacific: are regional concepts of citizenship relevant in a global community?*. Paper presented to the Conference of the Pacific Circle Consortium, Sydney, Australia.
- Great Britain. Qualifications and Curriculum Authority and Department for Education and Employment (1999a). *The Review of the National Curriculum in England: The Secretary of State's Proposals*. London: QCA/DFEE.
- Great Britain. Qualifications and Curriculum Authority and Department for Education and Employment (1999b). *The Review of the National Curriculum in England: The Consultation Materials*. London: QCA/DFEE.
- Greenaway, E. (1999 forthcoming). *Lower Secondary Education: An International Comparison*. (International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Paper 4). London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Hahn, C. (1998). *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Ichilov, O. (ed.) (1998). *Citizenship and Citizenship Education in a Changing World*. London: Woburn Press.
- Janoski (1998). *Citizenship and Civil Society: A Framework of Rights and Obligations in Liberal, Traditional and Social Democratic Regimes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, K. (ed.) (1996). *New Challenges for Citizenship Education*. Canberra: Australian Curriculum Studies Association.
- Kennedy, K. (ed.) (1997). *Citizenship Education and the Modern State*. London: Falmer Press.
- Kerr, D. (1999a). Re-examining citizenship education in England. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille and J-A Amadeo (eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: 24 Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Amsterdam: Eburon Publishers for the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Kerr, D. (1999b). Changing the political culture: the advisory group on education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25, 1 and 2, pp. 25-35.

- Kerr, D. (1999c). *Re-examining Citizenship Education: The Case of England*. Slough: NFER.
- Kerr, D. (1999d). *Citizenship Education: An International Comparison*. (International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Paper 4). London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Le Métais, J. (1997). *Values and Aims in Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks*. (International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Paper 1). London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority.
- McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: a philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21, 3, 235-46.
- Mitchell, P. (1999). *Education for Citizenship: The Contribution of Active Learning in the Community*. London: Community Service Volunteers.
- Niemi, R. G. and Junn, J. (1998). *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Nolin, M. J., Chaney, B., Chapman, C. and Chandler, K. (1997). *Student Participation in Community Service Activity*. NCE 97-331. Washington DC: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Studies.
- O'Donnell, S., Le Métais, J., Boyd, S. and Tabberer, R. (1998). *INCA: The International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Archive* [CD-ROM]. Second edn. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. On-line at: <http://www.inca.org.uk>
- Ruddock, G. (1998). *Mathematics Education in the School Curriculum: an International Perspective*. (International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Paper 3). London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Tabberer, R. (1997). *Primary Education: Expectations and Provision*. (International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Paper 2). London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA).
- Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J. and Amadeo, J-A (eds.) (1999). *Civic Education Across Countries: 24 Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Amsterdam: Eburon Publishers for the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

