9

The Teaching of Civic Education

Bruno Losito and
Heinrich Mintrop

HIGHLIGHTS RELATING TO TEACHING CIVIC EDUCATION

- There is strong consensus among teachers in all countries that civic education matters a great deal for both students and the country and has its rightful place in the curriculum. However, except for a few countries, there is no overwhelming sentiment that civic education should be its own subject.
- According to teachers in many countries, civic education instruction emphasizes knowledge transmission in reality; by contrast, teachers tend to have a vision that emphasizes critical thinking or values education. Reality and vision are thus incongruent.
- The topics of civic education content that teachers deem important and feel confident teaching are those that receive the most coverage in their classes. This pattern holds across all countries. National history, human and citizens' rights, and environmental concerns are the top-ranking topics; international and social welfare topics are those at the bottom.
- Teacher-centered methods predominate in civic education classrooms according to teacher testimony across many countries. Use of textbooks and recitation are especially prevalent. Written essays and oral participation are the most frequently mentioned forms of assessment. Overall, the degree of standardization of assessment within countries is not very high. Teachers draw from official sources as much as from self-generated sources for civic education material. They heed official authorities, but also see room for negotiations with students.
- Teachers of civic education come to the field from a wide variety of subject-matter backgrounds. Across countries, they nevertheless feel quite confident about their ability to teach in the field. However, in many countries, teachers' most urgent needs for improving civic education revolve around core concerns of content, namely better materials and more subject-matter training.

The IEA Civic Education Study concentrates on students, their civic knowledge, skills and attitudes. Although the study's data from teachers cannot be used to explain student learning, they can illuminate conditions under which civic education instruction takes place in participating countries and thus help readers interpret findings from the previous chapters. Moreover, data collected from teachers are useful in that they can be read as glimpses into the world of civic education teaching.

THE SAMPLE

In a loosely bounded curricular field such as civic education, it is a particular challenge to draw a sample of teachers that is comparable across countries. We knew from Phase 1 case study data that in some countries civic education is affiliated with history; in other countries it is taught by teachers certified to teach mother tongue; or it may actually be integrated into mother tongue instruction. For some countries, civic education is lodged in the domain of religious instruction, while for others it has been developed as a specific amalgamated school subject called social studies that draws teachers from multiple social science disciplinary backgrounds. In some instances, civic

education is constructed as an encompassing cross-curricular concern of the whole school. In this case, teachers from all disciplinary backgrounds are seen as obligated to teach in the field.

To ensure a comparable sample across countries, a subject allocation grid was composed that listed the topics from which items for the cognitive part of the student questionnaire were drawn. National Research Coordinators were asked to identify which teachers, teaching which subjects, were primarily responsible for covering these topics in their countries. Each sampled school was asked to administer the teacher questionnaire to three such teachers. Schools were to choose their teachers in this sequence:

1. Three teachers of civic education-related subjects teaching the tested class of students.
2. If three teachers could not be selected this way, then other teachers of civic education-related subjects of a parallel, previous or following grade within the school.

The second condition applied to almost all countries. Selected teachers who declined to participate were not substituted. Thus, the questionnaire was administered to both teachers 'linked' and 'not linked' to the tested class. The analysis for this report, however, is restricted to teachers who reported that they were linked to the tested class.

Because the selection procedure for teacher questionnaires was based on participating students, the sampled teachers do not necessarily represent all teachers from civic-related subjects in a country, but the teachers of the representative samples of *students* sampled for this study. It is important to note that the unit of analysis for all results presented in this chapter is the student and not the teacher. Teacher results were weighted with the number of students they teach. If a student was taught by more than one teacher, the student's weight was distributed equally between the teachers who were teaching the student.[1] All means and percentages describe teachers' reports according to representative student samples and not a representative sample of teachers.

SUBJECT-MATTER BACKGROUND AND CONFIDENCE TO TEACH CIVIC EDUCATION

In the Phase 1 case study reports, experts from many countries described a tenuous disciplinary and subject-matter background of civic education teachers and voiced strong concern about the insufficient training of civic education teachers that leaves them lacking a solid knowledge base in civic education subject matter. The questionnaire therefore inquired about teachers' subject-matter background, their work experience in education generally and in the field of civic education specifically, their training, and their confidence in teaching the field.

What Subjects Constitute the Teaching of Civic Education?

Respondents were asked what civic-related subjects they were teaching at the time of data collection. Using as our basis the sampled teachers' responses, we composed a profile for each country that indicates from which subjects civic education instruction primarily draws. We identified four different profiles: (i) a strong focus on history, (ii) a strong combination of history and civic education, (iii) and (iv) a pattern with no clear emphasis among subjects or disciplines, but which we differentiated into two types, one with and one without religion/ethics in the mix. In most countries, civic education drew from a variety of subjects. Hungary is a prime example of a country in which the civic education teacher sample was very history-based. Australia and Greece are examples of a close combination of history and civics, while religion and ethics, according to teachers' responses, played a considerable role as constituting subjects in Belgium (French), Cyprus, Lithuania, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden.

Table 9.1 shows that for teachers in all countries, the mean number of years in education exceeds the mean number of years of teaching civic education. In all likelihood, a subject different from civic education brought many teachers into their career. While the discrepancies are small for most Western European countries, they are large for all of the participating Eastern European countries, except Bulgaria, Romania and the Slovak Republic. In many Eastern European countries as well as in Chile and Cyprus, there is a five- to ten-year gap, on average, between mean years of work experience in education and mean years of work experience in civic education instruction. Presumably, in the Eastern European countries, large numbers of experienced teachers switched into the civic education field during the last decade and a half when these countries experienced a major regime change. The Lithuania responses show an extreme case of a recently composed teaching force in civic education.

How Confident Do Teachers Feel about Teaching Civic Education Content?

For each country, we computed a score based on teachers' sense of confidence in 20 different civic education topics. We calculated the score by averaging national means for each topic and then computing an average across all topic means. The scale ranged from 1 to 4. The confidence scores in Table 9.1 show that in most countries teachers feel fairly confident teaching civic education. Confidence among sampled teachers from Belgium (French) and Hong Kong (SAR) is relatively low while it is relatively high among teachers from Australia, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Romania and the Slovak Republic. At the country level, confidence in teaching civic education does not seem to be related either to length of work experience in civic education or participation in professional development (Table 9.1). Countries with low mean work experience in civic education and low participation in professional development (for example, Cyprus and Greece) have a fairly high confidence score, as do countries with higher mean years of work experience and higher participation rates in professional development (for example, Australia and the Slovak Republic).

Table 9.1 Teacher Characteristics

Country	Mean Work Experience (years)		Participation in In-service (in percent)	Mean Confidence Score*	*N***
	Total	Civic Education			
Australia	15 (0.7)	14 (0.8)	62 (3.8)	3.0	261
Belgium (French)	19 (1.0)	17 (1.1)	12 (2.6)	2.3	202
Bulgaria	17 (0.6)	15 (0.5)	34 (4.7)	2.6	381
Chile	20 (0.7)	12 (0.8)	8 (1.4)	2.9	455
Cyprus	15 (0.5)	9 (0.7)	15 (2.1)	3.1	292
Czech Republic	19 (0.8)	11 (0.6)	41 (3.1)	2.8	379
Denmark	19 (0.7)	17 (0.6)	100 (0.0)	2.9	328
England	17 (0.6)	14 (0.6)	48 (2.8)	2.9	352
Estonia	21 (0.9)	11 (0.9)	24 (2.3)	2.5	305
Finland	15 (0.8)	14 (0.8)	72 (4.3)	2.9	158
Germany	20 (0.8)	17 (0.8)	22 (2.9)	3.0	246
Greece	13 (0.6)	11 (0.5)	2 (0.9)	3.0	282
Hong Kong (SAR)	12 (0.4)	8 (0.3)	28 (2.2)	2.4	442
Hungary	19 (0.9)	13 (0.8)	28 (3.9)	2.8	149
Italy	16 (0.6)	14 (0.6)	41 (3.1)	2.9	279
Latvia	19 (0.8)	12 (0.8)	56 (3.0)	2.7	342
Lithuania	17 (0.7)	5 (0.6)	49 (3.4)	2.7	303
Norway	18 (0.7)	16 (0.7)	6 (1.7)	2.8	329
Poland	18 (0.7)	13 (0.6)	99 (0.6)	2.8	377
Portugal	9 (0.4)	9 (0.5)	19 (2.0)	2.5	421
Romania	21 (0.7)	17 (0.8)	45 (3.2)	3.0	364
Russian Federation	19 (0.9)	8 (0.7)	42 (3.9)	2.9	233
Slovak Republic	20 (0.7)	16 (0.6)	43 (3.0)	3.0	371
Slovenia	17 (0.5)	8 (0.5)	26 (2.1)	2.9	392
Sweden	14 (1.9)	13 (1.8)	22 (3.7)	2.7	154
Switzerland	19 (0.8)	16 (0.8)	19 (3.3)	2.6	263

() Standard errors appear in parentheses.
Means and percentages weighted according to student weights.
* International mean = 2.8. Standard errors < 0.01 for all countries.
** Number of (unweighted) respondents.

Source: *IEA Civic Education Study,* Standard Population of 14-year-olds tested in 1999.

The teacher questionnaire contained other measures of teachers' training and disciplinary background, but for the most part the data we collected through open response questions were difficult to interpret outside the national context. The enormous variability among countries in the institutional arrangements for civic education made it impossible to standardize these data for the international report. We therefore refer readers to future country reports for further analyses.

CIVIC EDUCATION INSTRUCTION

We were able to gain a rough sketch of civic education instruction across participating countries by asking teachers and schools what content they cover, what methods they use, how they assess students in civic education and from what sources they draw when they prepare for their civic education lessons. To better understand the way civic education content is delivered to students, we asked teachers how frequently they use a variety of teaching methods. In case study reports from Phase 1, country experts ventured that civic education

lessons lack variety in instructional formats and are mostly teacher-centered. Phase 1 reports also alerted us to the problematic role of assessments in civic education. In some country reports, a lack of formal assessments was seen as an indication of the diminished status of the subject and the diminished importance attached to civic education knowledge.

It was noted in Phase 1 country reports that civic education content is often less codified and less formalized compared to other subjects. This, the reports suggested, leaves it to teachers to select materials that they deem appropriate. In the teacher questionnaire, we asked teachers about their use of teacher-made materials and unofficial sources versus packaged materials and official sources. Teacher discretion in the selection of materials may have the positive consequence of giving teachers increased autonomy, but it may also portend an insufficient material base for instruction, as some country reports noted. This question was further explored when we asked teachers to check those areas in which they saw the greatest need for improvement.

What Is the Content of Civic Education Instruction and How Do Teachers Gauge Students' Opportunity to Learn this Content?

The questionnaire asked teachers to respond to 20 civic education topics by assessing each topic's importance, their confidence in teaching it, and their students' opportunity to learn it. The topics covered areas such as history, political systems, citizens' and human rights, economic affairs, international affairs, and media.

Table 9.2 indicates that 16 of the 20 listed topics have mean importance ratings of 3.0 or higher, indicating that teachers think these topics are important ones to teach. Using the same mean criterion, teachers describe themselves as confident in teaching only five topics, and believe that students have considerable opportunity to learn only one topic (national history).

Topics vary with regard to teachers' coverage of them and students' opportunity to learn them (see Table 9.2 and Table E.1 in Appendix E). The topics teachers believe to be the most important are those they are most likely to cover with students. Teachers rank history and citizens' and human rights as well as environmental issues at the top of their importance list and estimated coverage list. They deem topics in the areas of international and economic affairs less important and are also less likely to cover them. In most countries, they deem international migration and labor unions very low in importance relative to other topics, and give them relatively little coverage. Teachers' low ratings for international organizations in many European countries contrast with the heightened concern that Phase 1 experts from these countries attached to the supra-national 'European dimension' in civic education content.

Which Methods of Instruction Do Teachers of Civic Education Use in Their Lessons?

Ten different methods were listed on the teacher questionnaire (eight of which appear in Table 9.3). The teachers were asked to rate these methods according to the frequency with which they use them in the classroom. In a large majority of the 26 countries, there is evidence of a preponderance of teacher-

Table 9.2 Teachers' Assessment of Civic Education Content: Importance, Confidence to Teach and Opportunity to Learn

	Topic	Importance[1]	Confidence to Teach[2]	Opportunity to Learn[3]
National History	National History	3.4	3.2	3.0
Constitution and Political Systems	National Constitution	3.3	2.8	2.4
	Conceptions of Democracy	3.1	2.8	2.3
	Electoral Systems	3.0	2.8	2.3
	Political Systems	3.0	2.8	2.3
	Judicial System	3.0	2.5	2.1
Citizen and Human Rights	Citizens Rights	3.6	3.1	2.7
	Human Rights	3.6	3.0	2.7
	Equal Opportunities	3.2	3.0	2.5
	Cultural Differences	3.2	2.8	2.5
International Organizations and Relations	International Organizations	2.9	2.6	2.3
	International Problems	3.1	2.7	2.3
	Migration	2.7	2.6	2.3
Economics and Welfare	Economic Issues	2.9	2.6	2.3
	Social Welfare	3.0	2.7	2.3
	Trade Unions	2.6	2.6	2.0
Media	Dangers of Propaganda	3.3	2.9	2.4
	Media	3.3	3.0	2.6
Others	Environmental Issues	3.4	2.9	2.9
	Civic Virtues	3.2	2.9	2.6

1 Mean of students' teacher ratings on four-point-scale (1='not important' to 4='very important') weighted according to student weights.
2 Mean of students' teacher ratings on four-point-scale (1='not at all' to 4='very confident') weighted according to student weights.
3 Mean of students' teacher ratings on four-point-scale (1='not at all' to 4='very much [opportunity]') weighted according to student weights.

Standard errors < 0.01 for all countries.

Source: *IEA Civic Education Study,* Standard Population of 14-year-olds tested in 1999.

centered formats. A combination of textbooks with recitation (and sometimes worksheets) is used with the highest frequency. In Australia, Chile, Denmark, Hong Kong (SAR), Norway, Poland, Slovenia and Sweden students are also taught using group work. Across countries, teachers testify to a fairly frequent occurrence of discussions of controversial issues in their civic education classrooms, and a far less frequent occurrence for role-plays and projects.

How Do Teachers of Civic Education Assess Their Students?

Teachers were asked to check which forms of assessment they primarily use in civic education. The questionnaire gave respondents six options of which they were to select two. This forced-choice format resulted in a fairly high number of missing values in some countries. Data from these countries therefore were omitted from the analysis.

Across countries, the most common form of assessment is a combination of written composition and oral participation (see Table E.2 in Appendix E). Although overall not as popular as essays and oral participation, multiple

Table 9.3 Teachers' Reports on Frequency of Instructional Methods*

Country	Textbooks	Recitation	Lectures	Worksheets	Group Work	Projects	Role Play	Controvers. Issues
Australia	2.6(0.07)	2.9(0.06)	2.3(0.05)	2.7(0.06)	2.8(0.05)	2.7(0.06)	2.4(0.06)	2.8(0.05)
Belgium (French)	1.6(0.08)	2.9(0.07)	1.7(0.08)	2.7(0.09)	2.3(0.08)	2.2(0.07)	1.6(0.07)	2.5(0.06)
Bulgaria	3.4(0.05)	3.3(0.03)	2.7(0.06)	3.0(0.06)	2.3(0.06)	2.3(0.07)	2.0(0.06)	2.9(0.05)
Chile	3.0(0.08)	3.1(0.05)	2.6(0.06)	3.1(0.05)	3.2(0.06)	2.8(0.06)	2.8(0.07)	3.0(0.06)
Cyprus	3.7(0.04)	3.2(0.05)	2.7(0.06)	2.7(0.05)	2.3(0.05)	2.2(0.04)	1.7(0.04)	2.7(0.06)
Czech Republic	2.7(0.05)	3.1(0.04)	2.3(0.06)	2.1(0.05)	2.2(0.04)	2.1(0.04)	2.2(0.05)	2.7(0.07)
Denmark	2.6(0.04)	2.5(0.04)	2.1(0.05)	2.1(0.05)	2.9(0.04)	2.7(0.04)	1.9(0.05)	2.8(0.05)
England	2.4(0.05)	2.9(0.04)	1.9(0.04)	2.8(0.05)	2.5(0.05)	2.4(0.04)	2.3(0.04)	2.7(0.04)
Estonia	3.1(0.04)	3.1(0.04)	2.3(0.06)	2.6(0.06)	2.3(0.05)	2.1(0.03)	2.2(0.05)	2.7(0.04)
Finland	2.8(0.06)	3.1(0.05)	2.4(0.06)	1.9(0.07)	2.4(0.06)	2.1(0.04)	1.6(0.06)	2.9(0.07)
Germany	3.0(0.06)	2.8(0.04)	1.5(0.05)	3.0(0.05)	2.3(0.05)	2.0(0.05)	1.9(0.06)	2.9(0.06)
Greece	3.5(0.04)	3.5(0.04)	2.7(0.07)	2.9(0.06)	2.0(0.05)	2.2(0.05)	1.3(0.03)	3.1(0.06)
Hong Kong (SAR)	2.8(0.06)	3.7(0.02)	2.6(0.06)	3.4(0.04)	3.0(0.04)	2.7(0.04)	2.5(0.04)	3.0(0.03)
Hungary	3.1(0.06)	2.9(0.06)	2.3(0.06)	2.0(0.06)	2.3(0.05)	2.1(0.05)	1.9(0.05)	2.9(0.05)
Italy	3.1(0.05)	3.2(0.04)	2.9(0.05)	2.4(0.05)	2.4(0.05)	2.0(0.05)	1.6(0.05)	3.0(0.04)
Latvia	3.1(0.05)	3.0(0.04)	2.3(0.04)	2.7(0.05)	2.4(0.04)	2.2(0.03)	2.1(0.04)	2.6(0.04)
Lithuania	2.8(0.05)	2.9(0.05)	2.1(0.05)	3.0(0.06)	2.5(0.05)	2.0(0.04)	2.3(0.05)	3.0(0.04)
Norway	3.2(0.03)	2.7(0.05)	2.5(0.04)	3.0(0.04)	2.7(0.04)	2.6(0.05)	2.0(0.04)	2.5(0.04)
Poland	3.1(0.08)	3.3(0.06)	2.8(0.08)	2.5(0.06)	3.1(0.05)	2.9(0.06)	2.7(0.08)	3.2(0.07)
Portugal	3.3(0.04)	3.1(0.04)	2.5(0.04)	2.9(0.03)	2.3(0.02)	2.2(0.02)	1.9(0.03)	2.5(0.03)
Romania	3.5(0.05)	3.5(0.04)	3.2(0.05)	2.5(0.05)	2.2(0.06)	1.9(0.04)	2.1(0.05)	3.0(0.05)
Russian Federation	3.1(0.07)	3.3(0.04)	2.9(0.05)	2.6(0.07)	2.1(0.05)	2.2(0.05)	2.1(0.05)	2.8(0.05)
Slovak Republic	3.3(0.04)	3.1(0.04)	1.8(0.05)	2.1(0.05)	2.3(0.04)	2.2(0.03)	2.4(0.05)	2.4(0.04)
Slovenia	2.7(0.05)	2.6(0.04)	1.9(0.05)	2.8(0.05)	2.7(0.04)	2.2(0.03)	2.3(0.04)	3.0(0.03)
Sweden	3.0(0.07)	2.6(0.10)	2.2(0.07)	2.5(0.08)	2.7(0.07)	2.7(0.07)	2.0(0.06)	2.5(0.09)
Switzerland	2.6(0.07)	2.6(0.05)	1.6(0.05)	2.9(0.05)	2.5(0.06)	2.2(0.04)	1.9(0.06)	2.5(0.05)
International Sample	**3.0(0.01)**	**3.0(0.01)**	**2.4(0.01)**	**2.6(0.01)**	**2.5(0.01)**	**2.3(0.01)**	**2.1(0.01)**	**2.8(0.01)**

() Standard errors appear in parentheses.

* Mean of students' teachers' ratings on four-point-scale (1 'never' to 4 'very often') weighted according to student sample weights.

Source: *IEA Civic Education Study,* Standard Population of 14-year-olds tested in 1999.

choice tests are a more popular feature in a number of Eastern European countries but are a negligible feature in most Western European countries. Within participating countries, variety prevails over uniformity in the forms of assessment used in civic education. Teachers seem to have wide discretion in selecting an appropriate way of assessing students. Hence, no category was chosen by the large majority of teachers in a given country, a pattern that could have been expected if mandatory forms of assessment existed for this field, as they may exist in core subjects. The strength of oral participation bolsters the view of civic education as a pragmatic and highly communicative field of instruction.

What Sources Do Teachers Use to Prepare for Civic Education-Related Activities?

The questionnaire asked respondents to rate the level of importance they would attribute to eight different sources. Some of these are more externally generated (for example, official curricula, textbooks) while others are more internally generated (for example, teachers' own ideas, self-produced materials).

When teachers plan for civic education, they draw from a variety of sources. The extent to which they draw from internally and externally generated materials is in balance in most countries (see Table E.3, Appendix E). Media and original sources are sometimes even more important than official curricula and textbooks. Materials provided by publishers or foundations seem to be relatively less important to sampled teachers from all countries in this sample. Experts from some post-Communist countries interviewed during Phase 1 mentioned civic education materials provided by foundations, especially from Western Europe and North America. But there is not a corresponding difference between regions in teachers' reports of the use of commercial or foundation-provided materials. In summary, teachers of civic education seem to have a high degree of flexibility as to the sources for their lesson planning, and they draw from both external and internal sources.

What Needs to Be Most Urgently Improved about Civic Education?

The teacher questionnaire listed ten areas in which respondents might wish for improvement. Teachers were asked to select the top three choices (see Table 9.4).

The top-ranked need encompassed 'better materials and textbooks' followed by 'additional training in content' and 'more time for instruction'. Thus, in many countries, teachers' most urgent needs refer to core activities of the subject, and more strongly to concerns relating to content than to instructional methods. Extension of time for instruction is a priority in some countries. Assistance with special projects and activities is of lesser concern. Some

Table 9.4 Teachers' Reports on Needed Improvements*

Country	Better Materials	More Materials	More Instructional Time	Training in Teaching	Training in Content	More Collegial Cooperation	Special Projects	More Autonomy
Australia	55 (4.0)	19 (3.2)	38 (3.9)	27 (3.4)	36 (3.9)	25 (2.6)	29 (3.7)	10 (2.2)
Belgium (French)	10 (2.7)	27 (5.1)	45 (5.2)	32 (4.9)	43 (5.1)	25 (4.2)	26 (4.5)	13 (2.9)
Chile	37 (3.8)	24 (3.3)	43 (3.7)	44 (3.4)	55 (3.5)	28 (3.0)	14 (2.0)	16 (2.9)
Cyprus	58 (3.1)	9 (1.8)	31 (3.4)	27 (2.6)	31 (3.1)	24 (2.8)	22 (3.0)	27 (3.2)
Czech Republic	51 (4.2)	33 (4.4)	6 (2.1)	29 (2.8)	40 (3.4)	23 (3.3)	17 (3.1)	15 (2.6)
England	40 (2.6)	25 (2.5)	23 (2.3)	32 (2.6)	47 (3.0)	33 (3.0)	26 (2.3)	15 (2.2)
Estonia	61 (3.4)	25 (2.9)	12 (2.6)	36 (3.7)	36 (3.3)	34 (3.4)	19 (2.5)	17 (2.7)
Finland	34 (4.4)	11 (2.7)	55 (5.0)	27 (4.1)	19 (3.4)	26 (3.8)	37 (4.6)	2 (1.1)
Germany	42 (4.8)	6 (1.8)	43 (4.0)	41 (4.7)	25 (3.9)	22 (3.5)	37 (4.4)	24 (3.9)
Greece	55 (3.5)	8 (1.7)	27 (3.0)	36 (3.2)	54 (3.2)	11 (2.1)	31 (3.6)	12 (2.2)
Hong Kong (SAR)	53 (2.3)	23 (2.4)	39 (2.6)	41 (2.4)	50 (2.9)	22 (2.2)	8 (1.4)	17 (1.9)
Hungary	72 (3.7)	9 (2.3)	53 (4.6)	29 (3.9)	52 (4.0)	18 (3.3)	17 (3.2)	7 (2.2)
Italy	19 (2.5)	6 (1.6)	50 (3.4)	41 (3.4)	14 (2.1)	55 (3.6)	26 (3.4)	16 (2.5)
Norway	26 (2.9)	10 (1.9)	13 (2.2)	55 (2.9)	52 (3.2)	41 (3.0)	18 (2.8)	17 (2.2)
Romania	71 (3.0)	25 (2.6)	23 (2.6)	17 (2.2)	20 (2.5)	34 (3.3)	17 (2.5)	26 (2.6)
Russian Federation	57 (3.7)	46 (4.4)	55 (4.0)	38 (3.7)	36 (2.6)	13 (2.0)	3 (1.2)	12 (2.3)
Slovenia	47 (3.1)	23 (2.4)	9 (1.5)	41 (2.9)	54 (3.2)	31 (2.6)	28 (2.5)	13 (2.1)
Sweden	23 (4.9)	12 (4.2)	46 (6.0)	27 (5.1)	54 (6.2)	38 (5.5)	44 (5.5)	8 (3.4)

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Percentages based on valid responses.
* Percentage of students whose teachers chose a specific improvement as one of their three choices.
Data are not available for Bulgaria, Denmark, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Switzerland.

Source: *IEA Civic Education Study*, Standard Population of 14-year-olds tested in 1999.

countries, however, differ from this pattern. For example, teachers in Italy are especially concerned about improved collegial cooperation. In Sweden, the number of teachers expressing need for support in special projects is relatively high. Teachers in most countries express relatively little concern with autonomy in decision-making, an area that has received much attention from policy-makers. According to civic education teachers, improvements should be made that have an impact on daily classroom experience by enhancing their subject-matter expertise, the quality of materials available to students, and time available for instruction.

THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF CIVIC EDUCATION

A repeated theme in the case study reports from Phase 1 was the precarious status held by civic education as a subject in schools. This issue is related to the uncertainty in conceptualizing civic education knowledge due to the amalgamated disciplinary base of the subject and teachers' varied subject-matter backgrounds that we discussed earlier. How, then, do teachers frame civic education in the institutional context of the school? We explored the status and broader conceptualization of civic education in the school by looking at teachers' beliefs about the place of civic education in the curriculum, about the solidity and orientation of civic education knowledge, and about the effect of civic education instruction on students. With regard to its place in the curriculum, civic education may be structured as its own subject, as a field integrated into the social sciences or into the curriculum as a whole, or as a primarily extra-curricular endeavor. Each model may have considerable repercussions for the kinds of knowledge and methods that become emphasized in civic education instruction. Thus, teachers' preferences as to the place of civic education in the curriculum may indicate the degree to which they construct civic education as a traditional subject or as an interdisciplinary set of civic skills or dispositions.

To pursue this line of inquiry further, we explored how teachers conceptualized civic education knowledge and its pedagogical purposes. One dimension of knowledge conceptualization is the degree to which civic education knowledge is seen as contested or consensual. Comparative studies of school subjects (for example, Stodolsky, 1988) have shown that social-science-based subject matter is highly contested relative to other subjects. It is conceivable that this situation may be especially true in countries that have undergone political transitions in the recent past.

Teachers engage in civic education instruction with certain pedagogical purposes in mind. Phase 1 reports mentioned a number of them: transmission of knowledge, exercise of critical thinking, encouragement to undertake political action, and strengthening of values. Many country experts concluded that the prevailing goal of civic education in their country was knowledge transmission.

What Should Be the Place of Civic Education in the Curriculum?

The questionnaire asked respondents to rate the extent of their agreement to four options: should civic education be taught as a separate subject, be integrated into the social sciences, be integrated into all subjects, or be an

extracurricular activity? The responses are shown in Table 9.5. It is apparent that the extra-curricular model is the least popular among teachers, and that a model that integrates civic education into other social sciences is the most popular. Civic education as a separate subject is particularly appealing to teachers in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Romania, the Russian Federation and the Slovak Republic, while it holds very little appeal in Denmark and Norway. Generally, when respondents envision a place for civic education in the curriculum, they in some respects reflect the institutional status quo in their countries, that is, they advocate a version of civic education that leans on another social science-based subject while not completely rejecting other options. Overall, the support for civic education as its own subject is overshadowed by teachers' support for the integration model.

How Do Teachers Conceptualize Civic Education Knowledge?

The study inquired about competing versions of civic education knowledge. Civic education knowledge can be constructed as contested. A corresponding emphasis of civic education instruction might be the fostering of critical thinking or political activism. Civic education knowledge can also be constructed as consensual, in which case knowledge transmission may be a more likely emphasis of instruction.

When civic education teachers were asked whether there was broad consensus in their society as to what is worth learning in civic education, they tended to doubt societal consensus. Skepticism about societal consensus regarding civic education knowledge prevails among teachers from established western democracies as well as post-Communist countries. This skepticism notwithstanding, respondents believe that agreement on what is worth learning is nevertheless possible. A great majority of teachers across many participating countries stress official curricula as points of orientation. This orientation, however, does not stand in the way of teachers' willingness to negotiate with students over what is to be studied in civic education (see Table E.4, Appendix E).

Another way of understanding teachers' conceptualization of civic education knowledge is to look at the broad objectives of instruction revolving around knowledge transmission, critical thinking, political participation, and values. The questionnaire asked respondents to share their perceptions of which of these four broad objectives is currently emphasized in their schools and which they would like to see emphasized. The question was presented in a forced choice format with only one possible choice for the '*is*' and '*should*' columns respectively. Many teachers presumably felt unable to make a single choice of which objective is and which should be accorded the most emphasis. As a result, the number of missing cases is quite high.

Table 9.6 reveals an interesting pattern. It can be seen that teachers overwhelmingly report that most emphasis in civic education instruction is placed on knowledge transmission. By contrast, the percentages of teachers who think that this ought to be the case are very low, making the differences rather stark between responses on what is and what ought to be. In 14 countries not even 10 percent of responding teachers feel that the greatest

Table 9.5 Teachers' Reports on their Preference for the Place of Civic Education in the Curriculum

Country	Percentage of Students whose Teachers 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' that Civic Education Should Be Taught...			
	as a specific subject	integrated into social sciences	integrated into all subjects	as an extra-curricular activity
Australia	46 (3.7)	89 (2.2)	58 (3.5)	14 (2.8)
Belgium (French)	57 (4.6)	92 (2.3)	72 (4.8)	28 (4.5)
Bulgaria	56 (3.4)	76 (3.1)	40 (4.5)	26 (3.8)
Chile	64 (3.1)	84 (2.5)	80 (2.9)	13 (2.3)
Cyprus	72 (2.9)	78 (2.4)	49 (3.2)	34 (3.2)
Czech Republic	86 (2.3)	67 (4.0)	49 (3.9)	12 (2.1)
Denmark	4 (1.4)	94 (1.6)	64 (3.3)	6 (1.6)
England	33 (3.0)	90 (1.7)	79 (2.1)	23 (2.9)
Estonia	85 (2.3)	88 (2.1)	58 (3.6)	26 (3.3)
Finland	61 (4.4)	77 (4.0)	54 (4.9)	7 (2.6)
Germany	66 (3.9)	75 (4.2)	59 (4.2)	85 (3.4)
Greece	73 (3.5)	82 (2.8)	63 (3.3)	26 (3.1)
Hong Kong (SAR)	68 (2.8)	84 (1.9)	69 (2.1)	57 (2.4)
Hungary	49 (4.1)	78 (3.2)	28 (3.7)	6 (2.1)
Italy	50 (3.5)	80 (2.5)	59 (3.3)	63 (3.5)
Latvia	45 (2.8)	92 (1.7)	69 (2.6)	41 (3.4)
Lithuania	73 (2.3)	81 (2.6)	50 (3.4)	35 (3.0)
Norway	5 (1.3)	97 (0.9)	82 (2.5)	5 (1.4)
Poland	71 (3.7)	71 (2.5)	43 (2.7)	5 (1.4)
Portugal	56 (2.8)	71 (2.6)	90 (1.5)	16 (2.1)
Romania	85 (2.2)	64 (3.7)	41 (2.9)	10 (1.8)
Russian Federation	88 (2.5)	83 (3.5)	50 (3.4)	59 (4.8)
Slovak Republic	94 (1.4)	40 (3.6)	28 (3.2)	7 (1.5)
Slovenia	57 (2.8)	83 (2.1)	67 (2.4)	11 (1.7)
Sweden	33 (6.2)	94 (3.7)	85 (4.6)	4 (1.6)
Switzerland	24 (2.8)	95 (1.4)	46 (3.9)	78 (3.1)

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Percentages based on valid responses.

Source: *IEA Civic Education Study,* Standard Population of 14-year-olds tested in 1999.

emphasis should be placed on knowledge transmission. In most of these countries, the majority feels that knowledge is the current emphasis, however. In Italy, the tension between reality and vision is more acute than in any other of the participating countries: Teachers, teaching 82 percent of the Italian students, think that knowledge transmission guides instruction, but a proportion of teachers, teaching only 2 percent of the students, feel this is the ideal.

Across countries, *critical thinking* is the most often selected vision, but not decidedly so. Values and, to a lesser degree, *political participation* find approval among sizable numbers of teachers as well. In a few countries, such as Belgium (French), Bulgaria, Chile, England and Slovenia, a plurality of teachers report that, instead of knowledge transmission, values are in fact emphasized. The discrepancy in these countries between reality and vision is not as great as for countries in which knowledge transmission is reported as the prevailing mode of instruction.

Table 9.6 Teachers' Reports on Emphasis in Civic Education*

Country	Knowledge		Critical Thinking		Participation		Values	
	Is placed	Should be placed	Is placed	Should be placed	Is placed	Should be placed	Is placed	Should be placed
Belgium (French)	24 (7.3)	24 (6.5)	29 (6.5)	23 (6.1)	12 (5.9)	25 (6.5)	34 (7.0)	28 (6.0)
Bulgaria	33 (4.0)	18 (3.3)	22 (4.9)	22 (3.6)	6 (2.0)	25 (4.0)	40 (4.3)	35 (4.7)
Chile	41 (5.6)	13 (3.3)	7 (2.5)	33 (6.5)	6 (2.8)	25 (4.6)	45 (6.2)	29 (5.3)
Cyprus	78 (5.1)	7 (4.2)	4 (2.2)	11 (5.8)	4 (2.0)	59 (9.7)	15 (4.0)	23 (8.1)
Czech Republic	51 (3.3)	3 (1.0)	18 (3.1)	42 (3.5)	4 (2.4)	18 (4.1)	27 (3.7)	38 (3.9)
Denmark	48 (4.1)	10 (2.0)	27 (3.8)	44 (4.3)	2 (1.1)	17 (3.2)	22 (3.3)	28 (3.3)
England	35 (4.0)	12 (2.8)	14 (3.1)	35 (4.2)	9 (2.6)	17 (2.7)	42 (4.6)	37 (4.4)
Estonia	61 (4.8)	5 (1.9)	18 (3.9)	35 (4.7)	4 (1.6)	24 (4.2)	16 (3.5)	36 (5.3)
Finland	79 (3.5)	15 (3.4)	13 (2.5)	59 (4.6)	3 (1.8)	6 (2.2)	5 (1.8)	20 (3.9)
Germany	59 (6.0)	4 (2.5)	21 (5.5)	30 (5.5)	1 (0.1)	44 (5.5)	19 (5.0)	22 (4.9)
Greece	65 (2.9)	9 (2.0)	17 (2.6)	39 (3.2)	5 (1.4)	24 (3.1)	13 (2.0)	28 (3.2)
Hong Kong (SAR)	49 (4.4)	9 (2.9)	10 (2.1)	42 (5.5)	12 (2.7)	6 (2.2)	29 (3.9)	43 (4.9)
Hungary	71 (4.2)	10 (2.7)	12 (2.8)	39 (4.2)	4 (1.8)	23 (3.5)	13 (3.0)	28 (3.8)
Italy	82 (2.7)	2 (0.9)	12 (2.3)	69 (2.8)	1 (0.7)	10 (1.9)	5 (1.6)	19 (2.4)
Latvia	52 (3.6)	8 (1.8)	14 (2.7)	41 (4.5)	11 (2.2)	18 (3.1)	22 (3.3)	32 (3.3)
Lithuania	40 (5.4)	6 (2.2)	16 (3.9)	31 (3.8)	14 (4.4)	32 (4.0)	30 (4.8)	31 (4.2)
Norway	80 (3.6)	7 (2.7)	3 (1.7)	41 (4.8)	3 (1.3)	25 (3.9)	14 (2.9)	28 (3.9)
Portugal	63 (2.9)	40 (2.6)	13 (2.0)	29 (2.6)	4 (1.2)	19 (2.1)	21 (2.6)	12 (2.0)
Romania	77 (2.5)	3 (1.0)	16 (2.5)	43 (4.0)	2 (0.7)	24 (4.3)	5 (1.5)	31 (3.3)
Russian Federation	58 (3.6)	10 (2.2)	11 (3.0)	19 (3.0)	5 (1.7)	11 (2.3)	26 (3.8)	59 (4.3)
Slovak Republic	60 (5.1)	9 (2.0)	17 (3.5)	34 (4.8)	1 (0.9)	17 (3.3)	22 (4.2)	39 (4.7)
Slovenia	30 (3.7)	8 (1.9)	30 (3.5)	34 (3.0)	5 (1.8)	18 (2.4)	35 (3.7)	40 (3.2)
Sweden	71 (6.6)	18 (5.0)	16 (5.0)	60 (6.3)	0 (0.2)	0 (0.2)	13 (4.3)	22 (5.3)
Switzerland	54 (9.0)	9 (4.1)	23 (6.7)	46 (9.2)	5 (3.2)	10 (4.1)	18 (5.5)	36 (7.6)

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Percentages based on valid responses.

The Australian questionnaire used a different format for this question.
Because of the low number of valid responses, data from Poland were omitted.

* Percentage of students whose teachers chose one out of four answers.

Source: *IEA Civic Education Study,* Standard Population of 14-year-olds tested in 1999.

How Much Does Civic Education Matter?

Fairly uniformly across countries, students are taught by teachers who strongly affirm that schools are places where civic education ought to be taught and can be taught effectively (see Table 9.7). For large proportions of respondents, civic education matters a great deal in facilitating students' civic development, and teachers therefore fulfill an important role for their country.

When asked to assess specific attitudes and skills that make up civic education instruction, the majority of teachers attest to their own effectiveness (see Table E.5, in Appendix E). They agree that students learn to understand people, to cooperate, to solve problems, to protect the environment, to develop concern about the country, and to know the importance of voting. These attitudes are learned in school, according to teachers' judgment, despite the perceived emphasis on knowledge transmission in many countries. An exception is the development of feelings of patriotism and loyalty. A majority of teachers in Western European countries (and Hong Kong/SAR) see little effect of civic education instruction in this area. Attitudes towards patriotism seem to

Table 9.7 Teachers' Reports on the Relevance of Civic Education

Country	Percentage of Students Whose Teachers 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' that...		
	teaching civic education makes a difference for students' political and civic development	teaching civic education matters a great deal for our country	schools are irrelevant for the development of students' attitudes and opinions about matters of citizenship
Australia	98 (1.0)	90 (2.0)	5 (1.9)
Belgium (French)	99 (0.5)	94 (1.8)	5 (1.9)
Bulgaria	98 (0.9)	91 (2.3)	15 (4.0)
Chile	83 (2.8)	98 (0.8)	27 (3.6)
Cyprus	65 (2.8)	96 (1.3)	18 (1.9)
Czech Republic	53 (4.3)	81 (2.8)	6 (1.5)
Denmark	94 (1.5)	91 (1.7)	4 (1.4)
England	90 (1.7)	81 (2.3)	9 (1.7)
Estonia	98 (0.9)	94 (1.4)	17 (2.4)
Finland	98 (1.0)	93 (2.3)	2 (0.8)
Germany	88 (3.1)	97 (1.4)	9 (3.0)
Greece	94 (1.6)	86 (2.2)	11 (2.0)
Hong Kong (SAR)	96 (1.0)	96 (1.2)	12 (1.7)
Hungary	94 (2.1)	70 (3.9)	1 (1.0)
Italy	97 (1.0)	95 (1.5)	7 (1.6)
Latvia	99 (0.5)	95 (0.9)	5 (1.2)
Lithuania	99 (0.5)	95 (1.3)	5 (1.5)
Norway	98 (0.7)	96 (1.2)	2 (0.8)
Poland	96 (2.3)	92 (2.4)	7 (2.1)
Portugal	99 (0.4)	98 (0.6)	3 (0.9)
Romania	98 (0.9)	97 (1.0)	15 (2.2)
Russian Federation	98 (1.1)	96 (1.6)	7 (1.2)
Slovenia	87 (1.8)	81 (2.2)	12 (1.9)
Sweden	97 (2.4)	100 (0.5)	14 (2.8)
Switzerland	82 (3.7)	86 (2.5)	12 (3.6)

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Percentages based on valid responses.
Data are not available for Slovak Republic.

Source: *IEA Civic Education Study,* Standard Population of 14-year-olds tested in 1999.

differentiate teachers from this region from other participating countries. In general, however, teachers across all participating countries testify to the worth of their work and the important status of civic education instruction in schools and society.

VIEWS OF CITIZENSHIP

Teachers' views on what students should learn to become good citizens may strongly influence civic education instruction. The value that teachers place on specific civic behaviors may translate into learning goals and objectives that teachers pursue in their classrooms. Some of these behaviors speak to conventional forms of political allegiance and participation. Others imply a more activist stance. Teachers, as well as students (see Chapter 4), were asked to give their opinion on the same civic behaviors so that cross-referencing would be possible.

What Should Students Learn to Become Good Citizens?

Teachers rated the importance of 15 items that described qualities of a good citizen (eight of which appear in Table 9.8). The item that receives nearly unanimous approval among teachers across all countries is 'knowing about the country's national history'. This response corresponds with the history background of many teachers, and the importance they attach to historical events as a topic of civic education. Students, in contrast, do not see history as such a high priority (refer to Chapter 4). Students and teachers across countries agree, however, about the importance of obedience to the law. Agreement that this item is highly important is almost universal across countries. Protecting the environment and promoting human rights are other highly important qualities of a good citizen according to teachers across most participating countries.

'Joining a political party' is the item universally perceived as least important among the 15 choices. Except for Cyprus, large majorities of teachers reject the importance of party membership. Students also rate party membership as a low priority for good citizenship for adults (see Chapter 4). Responses to 'willingness to serve in the military to defend the country' differ among countries. Ratings from most Western European countries are low. Probably as a reflection of the political situation, willingness to defend one's country receives its highest rating in Cyprus. Teachers in Greece and some Eastern European countries also give a relatively high rating to this item.

SUMMARY

The IEA Civic Education Study was begun with a set of policy-relevant questions. For the teaching of civic education, these questions revolved around teacher preparation and training, characteristics of classroom instruction, the institutional framework of civic education in the organization of schools, and democratic citizenship. We found that subject matter background, work experience in civic education and participation in professional development vary widely across the participating countries. Nevertheless, in most countries, teachers' level of confidence in teaching major civic education topics is fairly high, even though their greatest articulated needs have to do with the provision of better materials, more subject-matter training, and more instructional time. This study seems to suggest that, in a large number of countries, improvement efforts need to concentrate on instructional essentials.

A look at markers of classroom instruction reveals a fairly high level of uniformity across countries and a fairly low level of standardization within countries. In civic education, it seems that teachers have discretion in emphasizing specific topics, choosing materials and forms of assessments and employing instructional methods. Content that teachers deem important tends to get more coverage. In many countries, teachers express willingness to negotiate curricular topics with students. Teachers use self-produced materials and materials gleaned from the media as well as official sources. Teachers across countries also use a variety of assessments, but essays and oral participation prevail. Civic education classrooms appear to be largely teacher-centered, but, according to teachers, this does not preclude discussions of controversial issues.

Table 9.8 Teachers' Perceptions of the Effects of Selected Learning Goals for Good Citizens*

Country	Percentage of Students whose Teachers 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' that to Become a Good Adult Citizen Students Should Learn to Recognize the Importance of...							
	knowing national history	obeying the law	joining a political party	serving the military	participating in peaceful protest	promoting human rights	ignoring a law that violated human rights	protecting the environment
Australia	98 (1.2)	97 (1.2)	16 (2.7)	20 (2.9)	83 (2.9)	94 (1.7)	63 (3.8)	98 (1.1)
Belgium (French)	98 (1.0)	98 (1.3)	8 (2.3)	16 (3.6)	74 (4.3)	97 (1.4)	93 (2.2)	97 (1.5)
Bulgaria	99 (0.4)	100 (0.4)	12 (2.3)	89 (1.9)	81 (3.4)	96 (1.0)	84 (2.4)	99 (0.6)
Chile	100 (0.0)	99 (0.6)	18 (2.3)	49 (3.5)	68 (2.9)	96 (1.1)	60 (3.8)	99 (0.9)
Cyprus	100 (0.0)	99 (0.3)	51 (3.4)	98 (0.8)	96 (1.3)	100 (0.0)	85 (2.5)	98 (0.8)
Czech Republic	99 (0.8)	100 (0.3)	6 (1.9)	81 (2.5)	84 (1.9)	95 (1.5)	85 (2.4)	98 (0.9)
Denmark	95 (1.5)	95 (1.3)	16 (2.2)	23 (2.6)	58 (3.1)	84 (2.5)	73 (3.1)	84 (2.5)
England	94 (1.2)	96 (1.3)	16 (2.3)	23 (2.6)	76 (2.5)	81 (2.3)	56 (3.4)	94 (1.5)
Estonia	100 (0.4)	100 (0.4)	11 (2.0)	92 (1.8)	75 (2.6)	93 (1.2)	87 (2.6)	n.a. (n.a.)
Finland	100 (0.0)	100 (0.3)	6 (1.7)	61 (4.5)	58 (4.6)	94 (2.2)	68 (3.9)	92 (2.6)
Germany	99 (0.5)	97 (1.3)	18 (3.3)	44 (4.2)	81 (3.7)	93 (2.1)	74 (4.3)	94 (2.3)
Greece	100 (0.3)	97 (1.2)	19 (2.9)	95 (1.7)	93 (1.7)	99 (0.5)	56 (3.3)	98 (0.8)
Hong Kong (SAR)	97 (0.9)	100 (0.0)	11 (1.4)	55 (2.4)	75 (2.1)	87 (1.8)	46 (2.7)	97 (0.8)
Hungary	100 (0.0)	100 (0.0)	3 (1.4)	60 (3.9)	64 (4.2)	93 (2.1)	30 (3.6)	94 (2.6)
Italy	98 (0.8)	97 (1.0)	13 (2.1)	59 (3.3)	90 (2.1)	96 (1.3)	80 (2.7)	96 (1.4)
Latvia	100 (0.2)	99 (0.4)	13 (2.5)	80 (2.4)	80 (2.7)	94 (1.8)	81 (2.6)	97 (1.3)
Lithuania	99 (0.7)	95 (1.4)	10 (1.8)	85 (2.5)	77 (2.3)	96 (1.4)	85 (2.1)	74 (2.6)
Norway	98 (0.9)	98 (0.6)	21 (2.8)	46 (3.0)	67 (2.7)	86 (2.0)	98 (0.9)	93 (1.7)
Poland	96 (2.5)	98 (0.8)	10 (2.5)	84 (3.2)	79 (3.2)	95 (1.3)	100 (0.4)	99 (0.5)
Portugal	96 (1.0)	99 (0.5)	8 (1.2)	40 (2.4)	85 (1.8)	99 (0.4)	57 (2.9)	100 (0.0)
Romania	99 (0.4)	100 (0.2)	32 (2.9)	95 (1.1)	88 (2.1)	97 (1.0)	64 (3.5)	99 (0.7)
Russian Federation	100 (0.0)	100 (0.0)	15 (2.8)	94 (1.5)	74 (3.3)	95 (1.9)	78 (3.2)	n.a. (n.a.)
Slovak Republic	99 (0.6)	100 (0.3)	5 (1.2)	84 (2.3)	85 (2.1)	97 (0.9)	85 (2.8)	100 (0.2)
Slovenia	99 (0.6)	97 (0.8)	4 (1.0)	65 (2.9)	72 (2.7)	96 (1.0)	69 (2.5)	98 (0.9)
Sweden	93 (2.8)	99 (0.5)	20 (5.5)	30 (5.4)	86 (5.0)	97 (2.3)	83 (4.4)	87 (4.8)
Switzerland	96 (1.4)	93 (1.8)	11 (2.4)	42 (4.1)	65 (3.7)	82 (3.0)	76 (2.9)	81 (3.0)

() Standard errors appear in parentheses. Percentages based on valid responses.

* Percentage of students whose teachers chose one out of four answers.

Source: *IEA Civic Education Study,* Standard Population of 14-year-olds tested in 1999.

These discussions notwithstanding, civic education is reportedly a matter of knowledge transmission in most of the countries that participated in the study whereas critical thinking and political engagement are said to receive less attention. Teachers in most countries see this state of affairs negatively. For those who advocate a different kind of civic education, the gap between reality and vision might be a good leverage point for reform and for the development of materials and training.

Content related to national history and human and citizens' rights tops the agenda in almost all countries. While the teaching of history speaks to the traditional connectedness of civic education to history in many countries, teachers, it seems, have moved away from the traditional pattern of civic education involving instruction about government institutions. Human rights and the environment are topics of importance. But the fairly low profile of international concerns may worry those who see civic education as a prime area of instruction that should prepare students for a life in a globalized world.

Lower perceived importance and less coverage of economic issues might give rise to similar concerns. It is conspicuous that civic ideals, attitudes and concerns for individual citizens and the community are favored and tend to receive agreement across countries, while traditional institutions are either less favored (for example, political parties, unions) or rated differently across countries (for example, the military).

For teachers from the participating countries, there is widespread consensus that civic education is a curricular field that belongs in schools and matters a great deal for the well-being of students and country. In the survey, teachers give testimony to the meaningfulness of their work and the relevance of their field for society. To play this important role, civic education does not necessarily have to be a separate subject according to teachers' sentiments in many countries, but civic education knowledge should be part of the regular curriculum. Society's contestations make it difficult, in the eyes of many teachers from many countries, to ascertain what should be learned in civic education, but official curricula and standards can rally consensus. Thus, despite much teacher discretion and autonomy, policy plays a crucial role in orienting teachers and forging a firm base for the field.

Many civic education teachers across the participating countries see themselves as autonomous instructors who do not eschew controversy, who wish to emphasize the pragmatic and critical aspects of the field and who attach themselves to an agenda of individual rights. Yet they also feel beholden to national traditions and constrained to teach in a way that makes knowledge transmission central.

NOTE

1 Teacher data from Colombia and the United States have been omitted from all tables in this chapter due to country-specific problems in ascertaining the linkage between teachers and classes of students. Data from one or more countries with many missing or uncodable responses have been omitted from single tables.