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Preface

Dear readers,
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I suggest you start, logically, with Chapter One, then move to Chapter Eight and decide which other chapters are of interest to you. If you are not into methodology, you may skip Chapter Three. If you want to jump right to the country cases, go to Chapters Four, Five, or Six. For the comparison and general trends, go to Chapter Seven first and work your way back to the country cases. You may discover you need to go back to Chapter Two, in order to grasp the underlying analysis fully. If you have the time, you may read the book as intended, from the beginning to the end.

As it is the case with any project, many people have helped on the way. First, thanks to the University of Twente for granting me the time and the peace of mind to complete this study. Second, thanks to my promotor Prof. Dr. Ariana Need for her stimulating and friendly presence, for keeping my deadlines and for protecting me from my own perfectionism. A very special thanks to Anka Kostro. Without her contribution in the data collection and initial analysis, the Croatian case would not be possible. Moreover, many ideas around this research were first materialized on the proverbial restaurant napkin in Dubrovnik and lead to a lasting friendship and an agenda for the future. Special thanks also to Svetozar Yanev, who was an excellent host in Bourgas, Bulgaria, and to Tihomir Tilev who patiently drove me around the country at odd hours. Many thanks to all the teachers in the three countries who generously contributed their time, insight and experience to this study. They did this with a degree of modesty which I have not encountered elsewhere. All these wonderful, dedicated people inspire me to work further in the field of teacher education.

Thanks to my son for putting up with a busy mother and for offering me a fresh glimpse into school through a child’s eye, As for my husband Rob Hoppe, he is part of my life – the list of the ways he contributed, both intellectually and personally, is too long to complete here.

Finally, thanks to all colleagues and friends, you are too many to list in a preface, but I cherish and appreciate your support and feedback.

Margarita Jeliazkova

Enschede, October 2015
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Chapter One.
Main Questions

“Citizenship what?” replied most Dutch high school pupils when asked about citizenship education. My social science teacher trainees routinely asked this question at the beginning of their teaching practice at diverse Dutch schools. Most pupils had only a vague idea about citizenship education. It was ‘about the integration of immigrants’ or about ‘how to get a Dutch passport.’ Some students liked politics, some found it interesting, but none of them made the link to citizenship education. Research among Dutch secondary school students confirmed this impression (Veugelers & Schuitema, 2009).

Five years ago, I took over a Bulgarian colleague’s lessons at a high school for a day. The subject was “World and person”, the designated subject for citizenship education in Bulgarian schools. Asked about citizenship education, the pupils thought it was ‘something about joining the European Union and traveling without visa.’ They went on to state that politics was forbidden at school and that politicians were thieves and liars anyway. A recent study concluded that Bulgarian students, even when they were interested in politics, did not employ the conceptual apparatus of citizenship education lessons (Georgieva, 2011).

“Where were you when the wall fell?” Twenty-five years after the event, I can answer this question with an astonishing clarity. During a social media discussion around the anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, I realized that more than half of the participants were not even born on this date. For my generation, time is counted in ‘before’ and ‘after’ 1989. For the youth, it is vague history with a contested meaning.

For the hundreds of thousands of my generation who chose to migrate to the Western world, the two Europes are still a reality – the ‘old’ one, the uncontested, ‘established democracy’; and the other one, dazzlingly changing: from ‘the Communist Block’ to ‘transition countries’ to ‘pre-accession countries’ to ‘new EU-members’ to ‘post-communist countries’ (again); a constant shift back-and-forth between high hopes for a new impulse to democracy and the despair of becoming an irreparably corrupt periphery of ‘the real Europe.’ With this, the growing frustration that Eastern Europe fails to teach the West at least one hard lesson: that democracy cannot ever be taken for granted, that human rights and freedoms are not irreversibly guaranteed, and that young people must understand this. Somehow, how?
For ‘the old Europe’, however, at least initially, the focus was on teaching lessons to the newly democratized countries. From the very beginning, systematic efforts were made to start educating the new Europeans to become active, responsible, engaged democratic citizens. Governments across Europe placed high hopes on education to bring up young citizens who would be equipped with the political skills necessary to participate in this society. Even more so, because in the ‘established democracies’, concerns mounted about a ‘democratic deficit’, about voters passivity and volatility, and the disengagement of youth. Public education seemed the obvious path to seek a change of the tide (Nelson & Kerr, 2006; Schmitter & Trechsel, 2004).

For both worlds, the buzzword soon became ‘citizenship education.’ But it was a convenient concept, as everyone could have their own understanding and interpretation of its meaning and goals. For some, it was the tool to teach young people to be critical and engaged citizens, to bridge the two worlds and to educate the youth in Europe in the newly embraced and shared democratic values. For others, on both sides of the divide, it awoke shadows of the past. They saw it as ‘the same old thing’ (indoctrinations in various forms and shades), dressed up to meet the demands of the new European ‘bureaucracy’. And all were concerned about others not doing ‘the right thing’, not paying attention to ‘the real definition’ and ‘the real meaning’ of citizenship education. So, what was ‘the right thing’ to do? Was there ‘a right thing to do’?

TALKING TO TEACHERS ABOUT THEIR VIEWS

Amidst the unceasing discussions on what citizenship education is all about, there seems to be a self-evident agreement on the issue, who should do it: teachers. Teachers are the ones that teach everything, it sounds like a platitude. And yet, more often than not plans are made about grand aims in education under the assumption that teachers will implement them. Teachers, however, teach according to their own professional standards, beliefs, ideological convictions, and moral standards. All these factors influence directly and profoundly what they teach, how they teach it, and why they teach it.

Delving into teachers’ minds, therefore, would offer a key to a large portion of the success or failure of any educational endeavor. In particular, the teacher’s mind would be important to read when political education is at stake. Talking with teachers, not about what they should do, or what they should change for all possible reasons, but talking with them about their views: how they see citizenship education? Talking with teachers about their views, about the way they see their work and their contribution, the way they fulfill the expectations of policy makers and others in society is a logical and necessary step, if one was to understand why the pupils in the opening anecdotes responded the way they did.
Talking especially with social science teachers, who were directly engaged in citizenship education, seemed the obvious place to start exploring their views on citizenship education. Is it indoctrination or neutral teaching about how society works? Is it about helping students become good, law-abiding, adapted citizens, or should teachers encourage them to be critical towards the status quo? Should students be encouraged to participate in social and political life or to be distrustful to the powers that be? Should the teacher be their guide, supervisor, or mentor? Should schools provide mainly knowledge and leave its practical application to the outside world? Where does the responsibility of the teacher and the school end?

This introductory section is meant to state my research focus on teachers, as my contribution to a larger debate, in which also students, policymakers, experts and other actors should and do have a voice. The voice of teachers has not been strong enough, however. The book is intended to amend this by presenting the findings from a comparative exploration of secondary school social science teachers on citizenship in three countries.

In the following sections of this chapter, I will explain how I arrived at the specific issues addressed in the study. I will also explain how these specific questions are derived from and are contributing to the main questions posed above, and why I see them as a contribution to the general debate on citizenship education in Europe. In particular, my research focus is on teachers. At the end of the chapter, the reader will find a description of the structure of the book and the main topics of each chapter, as well as suggestions for some shortcuts in reading

**Comparative perspective**

Talking to teachers about their views on citizenship education in a comparative perspective felt as the natural thing to do by someone with an experience of moving between different cultures. As I stated, in my experience, the East-West divide is still very much alive and relevant, and bridges need to be built in both directions, with the hope that lessons will be learned, by both sides.

The most important advantage of a comparative perspective is that it works like what I call ‘the magnifying mirror’: since every country has its own specific set of challenges and success stories, the ones that are most manifest in one country may help expose similar issues in other countries. The sheer magnitude of certain problems in one country makes them accessible for exploration, and the exploration allows to detect similar problems elsewhere. Simultaneously, common themes will turn out to occur in different versions in different countries, therefore making the transfer of experiences possible.

Another advantage of a comparative perspective is the opportunity to avoid at least a number of blind spots, and discover mindsets which are ‘taken for
granted’ in a particular (national) cultural context. When one is confronted with different and equally feasible interpretations of seemingly similar phenomena or ideas, deeper explanations are needed and automatic assumptions and practical habits need to be scrutinized. This is particularly true for educational systems, which tend to be confined within their national language borders.

The main challenge of working from a comparative perspective is to find ways to balance skillfully between the Scylla and Charybdis of oversimplifying and stereotyping ‘national contexts’ on the one hand, and glossing over national differences for the sake of finding a common ground, on the other.

Another challenge of working in a comparative mode is the crucial importance of first-hand access to national language. I am convinced that this is true regardless of the research method, but when one chooses to engage in direct face-to-face dialogues with respondents, fluent conversation is a must. The access to language has thus determined to a very large extent the choice of the three countries in this study.

THE NETHERLANDS, BULGARIA, CROATIA

These three European countries were chosen to explore and compare teachers’ views on citizenship education. The following reasons played a role in this choice.

First, language and local context. My obvious personal point of departure was the Netherlands, due to my work as a teacher trainer and thus having direct contacts with Dutch teachers in the social sciences. Bulgaria, as my country of birth, formed another natural point of comparison. In both countries, the access to language and cultural context was obvious. Croatia was added to the mix, since there was a colleague1 who was prepared to do the interviews in Croatian, by this to assist my partial, but sufficient knowledge of the language and the local context.

Second, the countries’ EU membership: the Netherlands is an established Western democracy and a founding member of the European Union; Bulgaria joined in January 2007, and Croatia was preparing to join at the time of conducting this research. This means that the three countries were all subject to EU policy directed at citizenship education, but in different modes: in the Netherlands, national tradition in the area of citizenship education is well-established and of considerable influence to general EU ideas; Bulgaria had implemented a comprehensive citizenship education policy solely as a part of the accession and compliance effort; and Croatia was engaged in a pilot citizenship education program modeled after other East European countries, as a part of their preparation

---

1 Anka Kekez Kostro, University of Zagreb, Croatia
to join the European Union, which took place on July 1, 2013.

Third, the similar curriculum arrangements around citizenship education at the high school level: all three countries have a mix of one designated subject at the upper high school level, directly related to, but not called citizenship education, as well as a general curricular standard involving all school subjects throughout the duration of compulsory education. (Eurydice, 2012, p. 42; Zurstrassen, 2011, p. 86). This made it possible to choose for a comparable selection of teachers – the ones teaching this particular designated social science subject at the secondary school level - in all three countries.

**CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The following two sections are an overview of scholarly debates on citizenship education, to the extent they help to highlight and to refine the specific tasks of my study. Thus, I will first pay attention to what I learned from the other scholarly work on citizenship education, which I consider relevant to framing my own contribution:

I will start with a reflection on the types and definitions of citizenship education, particularly the link between democracy and citizenship education and the importance of the political aspects of citizenship education. The tendency to use arbitrary definitions and typologies of citizenship education, combined with the desire to impose a normatively preferred type of definition blurs the debate and blocks the ways to practical application of ideas. I argue that mapping teachers’ views and ideas can contribute to addressing this issue by creating a common ground for discussion without disregarding diversity.

Next, I will discuss relevant issues of citizenship education policy at the European level, in interaction with the nation states. The way major European institutions pursued and shaped citizenship education policy through a mix of soft power and often wishful thinking has direct consequences for the national practices in place throughout Europe. *I argue that the very moderate success of citizenship policy so far is at least partially attributable to two factors relevant to this study.*

First, *teachers’ crucial role as gatekeepers* in the process of shaping and implementing citizenship policy has been underestimated in practice and overlooked in mostly policy-driven research. *I argue that taking the time and making the effort to explore teachers’ views and positions can help considerably in future training and professionalization efforts.*

---

2 The names of the subjects are all versions of ‘social studies.’

3 I will be talking about only compulsory public schools, subject to government policy. Formal schooling goes with its own difficulties which are empirically documented, at least in Great Britain (Arthur, Davies, & Hahn, 2008; Faulks, 2006; Kerr, Ireland, Lopes, & Craig, 2004)
Second, national contexts in European citizenship policy have been insufficiently taken into account. National differences have been either ignored or exaggerated by focusing on differences between countries and neglecting intra-country variance. *I argue that using a comparative perspective at the individual teacher level can shed more light on success and failure factors in the future.* I will explain how the conversation with teachers in these three countries and the subsequent systematization of their views may hold new keys to a more successful practice of citizenship education in the future.

**Diverse views on citizenship education**

Citizenship education has been an object of increased interest in Europe in the recent 25 years (Brooks & Holford, 2009). This is hardly new: every society has its own reasons to promote citizenship education and does so with the same sense of urgency and inevitability. At least in the last six decades, there is virtually no article in the field which does not start with the declaration that citizenship education is increasingly important right now. But *what is citizenship education exactly?*

First of all, the definition of citizenship education is obviously derived from the concept of citizenship, through a traditionally strong link between schooling and citizenship (Fischman & Haas, 2012, p. 175). Already in 1576, Jean Bodin counted over 500 different definitions of citizenship (Bodin & Tooley, 1955; Heater, 2004a). The diversity in views about citizenship education reflects the diversity of views about how society should be organized, how youth should be educated, and what we consider desirable and feasible ways to participate in political life. Such well-established categories as community, identity, gender, and class are also taken into consideration against the uncritical acceptance of a ‘official’ depiction of citizenship education (Banks, 2009; Callan, 1997; Kymlicka, 2003; Parker, 1996; Richardson & Blades, 2001; Torney-Purta, 2002).

A brief excursion through the history of citizenship and citizenship education from different theoretical and ideological perspectives, through many excellent books on the subject (e.g. Abowitz & Harnish, 2006; Heater, 2004b; Ichilov, 2013; Kymlicka, 1996; Parker, 1996; Schudson, 1998) leads to one conclusion: the concept of citizenship through the years has been developing to include more people and expanding from a purely legalistic to a cultural, social concept. Consequently, the ideas about citizenship education also move into the direction of teaching individual, autonomous citizens, as opposed to stressing national identity. For Europe, the idea is particularly attractive as it allows the employment of citizenship education as an integration instrument for new East European members (Keating, 2009).
The general, common sense agreement is that citizenship education means to prepare young people to participate in society. The school has a task to equip youth with the necessary knowledge, attitudes and values, and skills. Knowledge about politics and society, a positive attitude towards democracy, values such as tolerance and respect for human rights, and critical thinking skills such as discussion and problem-solving are routinely named and undisputed. This agreement is only superficial, and under the surface, contested political ideas lead to diverse ideas of citizenship and citizenship education. Every element of this general definition is subject to multiple interpretations, depending on the particular ideological, political, and cultural preference, and on the particular discourse in which it is embedded (Abowitz & Harnish, 2006).

Every teacher I know would tell you that all three elements – knowledge, attitudes, and skills - are important. But these concepts are still overwhelmingly broad. In a limited lesson time, how to set priorities? Where exactly does the teachers’ responsibility end? If the school provides students with enough knowledge about society and politics and enough skills to participate in many different ways, and yet they remain passive and never use these skills, was the citizenship program successful or not? Further, what kind of knowledge is relevant to which students? Who decides that? Does anyone know which attitudes are desirable and which are not? Do participation skills include debating for television events, or shall we include a course in methods of civil disobedience? Who is to tell? What looks like a widely accepted description is nothing but a demarcation of a field, within which political discussion takes place at many visible and invisible levels.

As an effort to create homogeneity and a common language in a diverse field, in the last three decades in Europe, the running topic seems to be ‘the definition of citizenship education.’ (Barr, 2005; Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; Evans, 2006; Guérin, van der Ploeg, & Sins, 2013; Haste & Hogan, 2006; Kerr et al., 2004) This is a tempting and noble endeavor, but it is, at the end, misguided and counterproductive.

It is misguided, because the idea of one consensual definition runs against the very political core of the concept. After all, at least since the ancient Greeks we know that education as a whole is political, and that that there are at least two contested views about the relationship between politics and education, presented in Plato’s “Republic” and Aristotle’s “Politics.” In his classic study on the concept of citizenship over three centuries, Marshall points out that citizenship from the

---

4 In a cross-reading of EU-policy documents, (Milana, 2008, p. 212) identifies the following elements of citizenship education: 1) Relevant knowledge of the political world, in terms of concepts such as democracy (what?), time-bound events and actors (who?), and procedures for political actions (how?); 2) attitudes that can influence both political decision-making and the trustworthiness of political institutions; 3) values such as tolerance, peace and non-violence, coupled with the acknowledgement of rule of law and human rights; basic language and critical thinking skills are included.
19th century on has to do with a claim on political power and the right to decide about political authority (Marshall, 1950). Politics is about power and managing conflict. Take the controversy out of political education and you will end up with docile propaganda. And this is exactly the opposite of what most proponents of citizenship education in Europe want to achieve.

The idea to establish a uniform definition is also counterproductive, as it eventually will lead to cynicism. Everybody feels free to jump on the bandwagon with all sorts of education, sometimes only remotely related to citizenship (Kennedy, K. J., 2014; Splitter, 2011). Without a serious discussion about its ideological premises, citizenship education threatens to become a catch-all phrase for various demands and criticism on contemporary education in general. As a result, we now have also difficult citizenship (Bickmore, 2005, p. 2-16) ecological citizenship (Houser, 2009), technological citizenship (Elam & Bertilsson, 2003), cosmopolitan citizenship (Linklater, 1998), different variations of global citizenship (Andreotti, 2006; Davies & Pike, 2008), intercultural citizenship (Tarozzi, Rapanà, & Ghirotto, 2013). Add to this the good old ideas about moral education, value education, character education (Althof & Berkowitz, 2006) that also claim to be a variety of citizenship education, add human rights, diversity, minorities (Banks, 2009), feminism (Lister, 2003; Stone, 1996), health and physical education (McLaughlin, 2000), and the list goes on. It is interesting to see what kind of compass teachers use to choose what is relevant and valuable for them.

The practical consequence of this ever-expanding vagueness is that citizenship education policy eventually ends up to be ‘based on an eclectic and contradictory amalgam of social democracy, liberalism, capitalism, communitarianism with a sprinkling of republican values. It is built round a truly impossible philosophical anthropology’ (Frazer, 2009, p. 780). No wonder some scholars say we should get rid of the concept of citizenship education altogether (Levinson, 2011, p. 280). For an outsider, the subtle differences between ‘citizenship education’, ‘education for democracy’, ‘education for civil society’, ‘European citizenship education’, ‘active citizenship’, ‘citizenship and life-long learning’, alongside with the good old ‘civic education’ and ‘value education’, each one with its own academic and policy tribes, in national, regional and international variations, can be dazzling indeed.

As a counter-reaction, scholars and practitioners alike are tempted to impose one particular view on teachers as the better, the more superior, the more desirable one, thereby assuming a certain value hierarchy among different political preferences (e.g. Biesta & Lawy, 2006). Thus is largely done under the tacit assumption that citizenship education would automatically promote democracy. And who would be against that?

The link between democracy and education has a long tradition. In the last century it is most systematically developed by John Dewey (Dewey, 1971), and
then echoed by many (Apple, 2004; Carr & Hartnett, 1996; Arthur, Davies, & Hahn, 2008; Gutmann, 1987; Halstead & Pike, 2006; Parker, 1996); most recently by Martha Nussbaum. (Martha C Nussbaum, 1997; 2006; 2012) In addition, at least starting from John Dewey, it is implicitly accepted that teaching citizenship could and should lead to a transformation of the school system, particularly in the area of more comprehensive teaching practices and in the direction of democratization of school practice (Gutmann, 1987; Parker, 1996). This line of thought has been undoubtedly fruitful, but if followed uncritically, it could lead to problems.

Without delving into political theory, it is important to keep in mind that democracy is not an equivalent of policy, and thus democratic citizenship education is not an automatic equivalent of political education. As Bernard Crick, one of the fathers of European citizenship education, warns us:

“Politics needs defending against democracy, as if democracy seems to be everything, it destroys politics. And this can lead to despotism and anarchy. The term democracy has come to mean all things bright and beautiful – a civic ideal, representative institutions, a way of life. It is also taken as a synonym of liberty, liberalism, equality and even individuals, rather than a necessary but not sufficient component of government.” (Crick, 2005, p. 59)

Democracy is not taught by default, this is just wishful thinking (Frazer, 2007). The track record of political education in promoting democracy is simply not very strong. Although the Weimar republic had civic education in its constitution, it did not prevent Hitler from coming to power. Throughout history, there have been enough examples of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes promoting their values through schools, and they have booked success. Citizenship education has been tied to nationalism for a long time (Gellner, 2008; Hobsbawm, 2012). Look at China, Soviet Russia, Nazi Germany and Japan (Ginsburg & Kamat, 2009, p. 233). Also fascist Italy had a form of successful citizenship education (Hobsbawm, 2012). Add to this the recent wave of patriotic education in the United States, in the aftermath of 9/11 (Althof & Berkowitz, 2006; Boyte, 2003)... It is not at all sure that when you introduce political education at school, it will automatically promote democracy (Karolewski, 2009); it can even implicitly act as ‘the agent of political structures and their reproduction’ (Haste, 2010).

In Europe, an effort to democratize societies through citizenship education has been a sustained policy effort in the last three decades, initialized and implemented mostly top-down. The question remains open, whether citizenship education in its current form indeed contributes to promoting democracy, particularly in countries, which go by the name ‘emerging democracies.'
EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION POLICY: A FEW HIGHLIGHTS

The 1990s mark the time in Europe when the importance the political education to young people came to the forefront. It was felt that the newly democratizing countries needed a process of democratic education, a re-education of sorts, as young people did not have any example of what it is like to behave as a citizen of a democratic country. This was so strongly felt that democratic citizenship education was made a prerequisite for East European countries to become members of the European Union (Abs & Werth, 2013; Keating, Ortloff, & Philippou, 2009).

Simultaneously, in the West, young people seemed to get increasingly detached from politics, uninterested and inactive. The fall of the Berlin wall and the subsequent transition to Western democratic models of the former communist countries coincided with a broader process of a growing ‘democratic deficit’. Both the European Union and the Council of Europe started to promote citizenship education as a part of an effort to increase the interest and participation of youth in politics, and to create a new, European democratic identity (Eurydice, 2012; Ross, 2008).

The current working notion of the European Union, as formulated in key policy documents5, is that ‘active citizenship education’ is a tool to foster participation, and thus to empower young citizens as public agents, contrary to raising ‘law-abiding, authority-driven, patriotic citizen subjects.’ (European Commission, 2013; Georgi, 2008; Kerr, 2008). The ideas have been mainstreamed by large international comparative studies, in which a broadly descriptive and multi-interpretable idea of citizenship education is employed. Citizenship education is seen as encompassing four areas – literacy; critical thinking and analytical skills; values, attitudes and behaviors; and active citizenship (Eurydice, 2005, 2012; Kerr, Sturman, Schulz, & Burge, 2010). Since 1997, and particularly after the Lisbon Summit in 2000, the European Union links citizenship education to national educational goals in all member countries (Milana & Tarozzi, 2013).

The optimistic reading of these policy efforts is that it stems from actual developments and it is aimed at empowering the young citizens as public agents, as described by Schudson (Georgi, 2008; Schudson, 1998). Critics would say that the European Union promotes citizenship education as a means to sustain

---

5 The definition of the Council of Europe is also carefully translated in all the member country languages and is as broad as possible: ‘Education for Democratic Citizenship: Education, training, dissemination, information, practices and activities which aim, by equipping learners with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behavior, to empower them to exercise and defend their democratic rights and responsibilities in society, to value diversity and to play an active part in democratic life with a view of the promotion and protection of democracy and the rule of law.’ (Kerr & Losito, 2010, p. 46)
its own legitimacy (Hedtke, Zimenkova, & Hippe, 2008) and promotes mainly formal and structured political activity (Olssen, 2004).

In Eastern Europe, both the European Commission and the Council of Europe exerted considerable influence on the individual countries, especially in the pre-accession periods and shortly afterwards. Although there their policies are gradually converging, these two powerful institutions take distinctly different roads to promoting citizenship.

The European Commission initiative to develop programs and indicators for civic competence and active citizenship linked citizenship education to the 2000 Lisbon Objectives in education and training. Among the key competences for European citizens, social and civic knowledge take a prominent place. The citizenship education project gradually became a broad educational effort, with joint initiatives and projects involving teachers, schools, and national policies within Europe. The idea of linking citizenship to life-long learning is very popular in Europe and is quite prominent in a number of important policy documents (European Commission, 2013). The Council of Europe took a different road and launched the idea of promoting ‘democratic citizenship education’. In 2010, all EU countries signed the Charter of Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education. This authoritative document was set up as declaration and adopted as a recommendation (Council of Europe, 2010).

Citizenship education was steered and influenced by European actors in a complex, but predominantly top-down way (Bîrzea, 2004). Because educational policy is a national prerogative of the member-states, there were various sources of soft power. In the case of Eastern Europe, the power was not even that soft, as citizenship education was made a conditionality of the accession effort (Abs & Werth, 2013). To monitor the effort, the European Union developed a complex system of indicators in order to compare and rank countries. The indicators are designed to describe the educational provisions of members-states and to differentiate maximally between countries. The Council of Europe focused on school evaluations and check-points identifying best practice (Abs & Werth, 2013).

Consequently, the focus has been, and still is, on teaching and training materials produced by Western experts, within widely-accepted frameworks, mostly Anglo-Saxon (Hahn & Alviar-Martin, 2008, p. 85). Often, the materials produced and disseminated through the networks were practically identical in all countries, the attempt to adapt good practices to local circumstances notwithstanding (e.g. Keen & Tirca, 1999; Kopas-Vukašinović & Lazarević, 2008). Also, much of the research on citizenship has been implicitly located within the assumptions of stable societies (Haste, 2004, p. 414).

To add to the mix, the World Bank has also been a major force in providing funds for school construction and restoration of the education system. (Buckland,
2005; Weinstein, Freedman, & Hughson, 2007). The World Bank was particularly active in post-conflict Balkan societies. UNESCO, as well, actively explored ‘the role of educational policy change in shaping social and civic identities and in redefining or reconstructing national citizenship within the context of identity-based conflicts’ (Tawil, Harley, & Braslavsky, 2004). Most of their work was focused on the untested assumption of symbolic power of immediate textbook reform (Weinstein, Freedman, & Hughson, 2007). In addition, the influence of the US in the region was considerable. American NGOs such as CIVITAS have been very active in promoting their own teaching materials, mostly with minimal adaptation. (Hamon, 2003)

When we take into account the unprecedented breach of tradition in all East European countries, combined with the promise to innovate the whole education system with the help of citizenship education, we can imagine that the influence of Western dominated ideas in these countries has been considerable and at times overwhelming.

At the same time, little to no serious adaptation of policies, teaching materials, or recommendations for training and practice has taken place. Not the least, because, due to the largely top-down mode of work, teachers have been seen mainly as recipients and were insufficiently involved in policy and curriculum change. And we know that any transformation of curriculum depends heavily on teachers’ academic and professional adaptation (Michaels & Doyle Stevick, 2009; Tupper, Cappello, & Sevigny, 2010) The result is confusion and mixed messages for the implementers at national level and ultimately at ‘street level’, in the everyday classroom practice of teachers.

Obviously, the issue about the effectiveness of citizenship education yielded academic discussion and research. The diversity of citizenship education practice is however insufficiently examined (Nicoll, Fejes, Olson, Dahlstedt, & Biesta, 2013). The bulk of research is policy driven, with occasional curiosity-driven exceptions (Brooks & Holford, 2009, p. 86; Schuller & Desjardins, 2007) Also, the discussion about what counts as effect and how it is to be measured has produced a considerable body of scholarly work. (e.g. reviews by (Hedtke et al., 2008; Neubauer, 2012; A. Osler & Starkey, 2005). The studies seek mostly a correlation between different types of curricula and various indicators of changed political attitudes in young people (Isac, Maslowski, & van der Werf, 2012; Schulz, Fraillon, Ainley, Losito, & Kerr, 2008; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001); see also a recent review on the effects of citizenship education (Geboers, Geijsel, Admiraal, & ten Dam, 2013). Alternatively, studies focus on

---

6 The benchmarks set up by the Council of Europe in 2000 which determined the levels of EDC to be accomplished in 2010, were not met. European countries fell by far with respect to four out of five indicators. Therefore, the new “Education and Training Strategy” set up in 2009, partly amended the indicator selection and benchmarks and determined 2020 as being the new deadline.
curriculum analysis (Zimenkova, 2008; Hranova 2011; (Philippou, Keating, & Ortloff, 2009) mostly based on an overestimation of the role of curriculum and books alone in promoting educational change (Scott & Lawson, 2002).

Indications of a “compliance and implementation gap” (Bîrzea, 2004) between what was intended and what was achieved attract the attention. Particularly the development of ‘sustainable teacher-training mechanisms’ lags behind (Bîrzea, 2004; Harrison & Baumgartl, 2002) (Kerr & Losito, 2010). It seems that even by traditional criteria this considerable effort has led to modest results: voter turnout continues to decrease, radical right and populist parties are gaining support, and the subject of citizenship education still holds a modest, not to say marginal position in national educational systems. A major factor for these modest results identified by a number of studies turns out to be the lack of confidence among teachers, which can be attributed to a great extent to a non-existent or inappropriate teacher training system (Neubauer, 2012).

The 2005 and 2012 Eurydice reports (Eurydice, 2005, 2012) and the 2009 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) (Kerr et al., 2010) analyzed pupils’ competencies on citizenship education and school practices. Both the Eurydice and the ICCS reports conclude that measuring the success of citizenship education remains a challenge. The Eurydice study (Eurydice, 2012, p. 31) found out that teachers across Europe were not very keen on ‘preparing students for future political engagement.’ These and other preferences were not influenced by the age or the school affiliation of teachers. The ICCS report (Kerr et al., 2010) concluded that the enacted curriculum was never implemented, as a rule, depending on teachers’ preferences and background, particularly their understanding of the aims of citizenship education.

This brief overview points to one direction – teachers’ crucial role in the implementation and success of citizenship education policy is acknowledged, on the one hand, and underexposed, on the other.

**TEACHERS AS GATEKEEPERS AND PROFESSIONALS**

Instead of addressing teachers’ views and beliefs about the very core of citizenship education, policymakers focus again on teachers training and fixing teachers (Hedtke et al., 2008). Too often, teachers are talked about as not living up to expectations. They do not have the time and the capacity to understand the big picture:

‘[…] Teachers do not share the same visions of educational reforms, not only because they do not know the ‘big’ picture of the reform ideals and goals, but also because the conditions and demands of their everyday lives and teaching.’ (Skukauskaité, Stevick, & Levinson, 2007, p. 153)
As one example only, in the official Policy Tool of the Council of Europe (Kerr & Losito, 2010) the teachers are mentioned exclusively in combination with ‘teacher training’, and only in the implementation stage of the Education for Democratic Citizenship Policy. In a part directed especially to teachers, they are assisted to answer four key questions about teaching democratic citizenship: What can we do? How can we do it? With whom can we do it? How can we do it better? (Brett, Mompoint-Gaillard, & Salema, 2009, p. 17) The question ‘Why?’ addressing the underlying rationale, political and ideological choices behind the policy, is rarely posed to the teachers:

“Too often, elite policy makers take the high ground when it comes to the production of educational policy as though the creation of a new policy is enough to make it successful. Yet a truly sustainable policy process has to both recognize and celebrate the contributions that teachers make for they are the final arbiters of policy and its true success depends on them.” (Kennedy, Jimenez, Mayer, Mellor, & Smith, 2002, p. 80)

The implication from this brief overview of European citizenship policy is that teachers have not been a sufficient part of the policy making process, at least at supra-national level. They are confronted with many demands, many of them contradicting, far-fetched and unrealistic. They need to take care of the acquisition of political knowledge, but also work on critical thinking and democratic attitudes. Teachers need to employ innovative teaching methods which foster participation (though no one seems to know how exactly it would work). Teachers are supposed to apply good practice from other European countries and adjust them to their own local context to the best of their ability.

The question is: how do teachers do that? What guides teachers’ daily practice and ultimately leads to diverse implementation outcomes?

Because teaching is a political act (Freire, 1998), it is inevitable that teachers’ diverse personal political experience of teachers will influence their professional choices. Teachers make choices about what counts as knowledge, what counts as relevant. They shape the curriculum daily but choosing or avoiding discussion topics, by highlighting some concepts and leaving out others, but ignoring some political events and analyzing others at length. Teachers have agency in their professional roles and a key factors at school (Myers, 2009). Also Hess (2005) established the influence of political beliefs of teachers in what and how they teach later, particularly when it comes to controversial issues. Not only are these political beliefs and moral values important, they are often seen as the core of the teaching profession and are put at the center of what is seen as the ‘normative professionalism’ of the teacher (Klaassen & Maslovaty, 2010).

Teachers are key players in the process of citizenship education. Teachers are the ones who implement the task of citizenship education daily, in the context of implicit or explicit school policies and broader national objectives. Obviously,
they do this according to their own understanding and skill. Faced with the task to implement a demanding and often deliberately broadly defined curriculum in citizenship education, social studies teachers have to find a workable balance of conflicting demands upon their work: how to teach a subject according to their professional criteria and beliefs, while fulfilling the obligation to contribute to citizenship education? Should they educate students mainly about their rights or about their obligations? How do they find a balance between learning about freedom and about taking responsibility for a local and also increasingly global community? Should teachers remain neutral or propagate their own political and ideological preferences? Are they obliged to remain loyal to state policies or, to the contrary, systematically criticize them? Should they shield children from political controversy or use it in the classroom? And finally, what kind of citizens would they educate – good and adapted ones or critical and caring citizens?

In handling these questions, it is important to recognize the role of teachers as professionals. Educational research on teacher professionalism tends to focus on the relationship between the pedagogical dimensions and the content knowledge dimension of teaching, or on the teacher as a professional in the school as an institutional setting (Hargreaves, 2000). National educational policy is often seen as an interfering factor and an impediment to professionalism, not part of it (Day, 2002; Day, Flores, & Viana, 2007). Research has emphasized the way teachers, as employees in hierarchical, engage in a power struggle for resources (Ginsburg, Bermeo, Desai, & De La Garza, 2012, p. 6). A more holistic approach (Korthagen, 2004) tends to deemphasize the institutional context of teaching at the expense of developing all-round self-reflective qualities of a professional, ideally conceived as autonomous.

Looking at the junction of teachers' views, teachers' practice, and policy implementation, two concepts help us to depict the role and the attitude of teachers: the teacher as a street-level bureaucrat and the teacher as a gatekeeper.

The classic concept of 'street-level bureaucracy' (Lipsky, 1979) comes from policy sciences. The notion of street-level bureaucrat is important as it stresses the large discretionary powers of teachers as policy implementers to determine and even reverse the intended policy outcomes. In this, teachers are led by their own conviction, principles and beliefs, which may or may not overlap with the officially stated ones. In fact, they almost never completely overlap, as this is true for any type of policy involving professionals. (Elmore, 1979; McLaughlin, 1998; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1984)

The conception of the teacher as a neutral street-level bureaucrat in this context has a serious limitation: it tends to ignore the inherently political aspect of teaching in general and particularly of teaching citizenship. While in other settings professionals are expected to put their political beliefs under control,
the teaching profession is political in its heart. Education is always a political act (Apple, 1992; Freire, 1998). To expect a teacher to behave apolitically is to ignore the very core of her work. The notion of street-level bureaucracy tends to be useful in describing bias in spite of the professional irrelevance of political views. In education, specifically in political education, political views are at the heart of what teachers do. They are a key component in the complex of teachers’ views as I use it further in the study.

The concept of ‘gatekeeper’ is akin to some ideas in critical educational philosophy, most notably those of Apple (Apple, 1992; Ozga, 1988). Specifically for the field of social science teaching, the notion of the teacher as a ‘gatekeeper’ of the curriculum is important (Thornton, 2005). The notion of gatekeeper emphasizes the crucial role of teachers in filtering and shaping the curriculum as a crucial part of any educational policy. Teachers are quite literally the gatekeepers of curriculum. In his work, Thornton discusses the intricate relationship between different ‘curriculum theories’ and the role of teachers in implementing them.

“Teachers can and do interpret what counts as successful passage through the gate, open the gate wide or narrow, based on what they believe students can or should profit from on the other side, allow innovation through or block it based on their estimation of its educational and practical worth.”(Thornton, 2008, p. 16)

Thornton points out that it is far easier to trace official curricula than to capture the way they take a life of their own in classrooms and beyond. Most important, there is little evidence that the official curriculum reaches the classroom as intended at all (Ross, 2000; Thornton, 2008, p. 17). The key is always to be found in the classroom of the individual teachers. Two camps can be distinguished – one guarding the disciplinary boundaries of the social sciences and the other directed at education, with a ‘focus directly on the individual and societal dimensions of associated life.’ Thus, at least two distinct views on implementing the curriculum can be found among teachers. From other perspectives, other views can be possibly discerned, equally legitimate. None can be ignored at the expense of the other. (Levstik & Tyson, 2008)

Thus, it is necessary to zoom in to teachers’ individual conceptions of implementing citizenship education curricula. A map of the diverse views and approaches employed by teachers will give more substance to the debate about success and failure factors and about teachers’ professional development.

**Exploring teachers’ views**

Obviously, there have been studies on teachers in citizenship education so far. Some studies look at teachers’ views, but they focus on the cross-country differences and neglect intra-country diversity, others fail to acknowledge substantial
differences in interpreting key-terms and literally get ‘lost in translation.’ Yet another group measures predispositions formulated in advance.

Let us have a look, without any claim on being exhaustive. A number of international academic teams have conducted large-scale longitudinal comparative studies on citizenship education, mainly on the effect on youth (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010; Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2013; Torney-Purta et al., 2001), with teachers playing a marginal role. The studies are related to the big policy initiatives of the Council of Europe7 and the European Union (see for an overview (Brooks & Holford, 2009; Keating, 2009). The studies are useful in highlighting the various national contexts and regions in Europe.

However, usually the whole country gets a particular label, and is then juxtaposed to other countries in Europe. Within-country diversity tends to get overlooked (Hahn, 2010). This is quite unfortunate, as diverse views held by teachers are to be expected by definition. Even in a tightly controlled centralized system, a citizenship education landscape cannot be completely homogeneous and prescriptive and thus also within a country uniformity of views cannot be expected (Sim, 2008). In such a way, the studies say more about a country’s general political climate than on the effects on teaching citizenship.

The comparisons of teachers among different countries exhibit another limitation: too much context is missing to be sure that when teachers, for example, say that they value critical thinking, or political judgment, or democratic participation, they mean the same thing (Zurstrassen, 2011). In fact, they certainly do not mean the same thing. Taking into account the different interpretation of concepts is a challenge to a comparative study. Further on, in chapter Three, I will explain how my methodological choices address this issue.

On the other extreme, teachers’ views are studied in depth, but usually within a single country or by comparing individual cases. Admittedly, there have been a few studies specifically aimed at teachers’ views on citizenship education. (Alviar-Martin, Randall, Usher, & Engelhard Jr, 2008; Anderson, Avery, Pederson, Smith, & Sullivan, 1997; Araújo, 2008; Arthur et al., 2008; Evans, 2006; Leenders, Veugelers, & De Kat, 2008; Ortloff, 2009; Patterson, Doppenn, & Misco, 2012; Ross, Fülöp, & Kuscer, 2007). An exception is a comparative study by (Lee & Fouts, 2005), but it is not directed to European countries. Most of these studies concentrate on particular aspects of citizenship education, or depart from preset theoretical models. Some studies zoom into teachers’ views on citizenship and reveal a complex pattern with multiple sources of influence and describe the findings as ‘ambiguous’ and ‘eclectic.’ (Evans, 2006; Patterson et al., 2012).

---

7 For a list of the major policy documents on Education for Democratic Citizenship see appendix 2 in (Kerr & Losito, 2010)
Again, we see a broad acknowledgement of the importance of studying teachers’ views, combined with mixed results due to various difficulties and ‘blind spots.’ In the following section, I will present the way I think some of these omissions can be addressed.

THE MAIN TASK AND THE ADDED VALUE OF THE STUDY

The main task of the study is to map the diverse views of secondary school teachers on citizenship education in Bulgaria, Croatia, and the Netherlands, to explore these views and to compare them, in order to arrive at a richer understanding and possibly to suggest ways to improve practice.8

Let me state this, just in case: in spite of criticism, I think that citizenship education in Europe is a worthy cause. This is why I want to look at the ways teachers think and talk about it, because this may help us improve our efforts and our results. If we know what teachers think, we might be able to work together with them to educate young people for living and participating in today’s modern and complex societies. Although the direct causal link between beliefs and practice is notoriously difficult to establish, on the other hand, it is an epistemological postulate that beliefs and intentions inform and guide practice. Thus, the study will inform practice, ultimately, by offering good entry points to engage teachers in improving their practices, on the grounds of taking their views seriously.

The added value of the study is the choice of a different level – individual teachers instead of countries – and the attention to local context in an explanatory, but not deterministic manner. At this level, the complexity and diversity of views on citizenship education is addressed without the extremes of labeling countries, on the one hand, and drowning into the chaos of individual views, on the other. The focus on individual teachers within countries allows to discern differences and unique perspectives, but also, and more important, to find and acknowledge a common ground for a dialogue about joint citizenship policy at the European level.

Two premises are at the basis of this choice: first, teachers are unique professionals and their views and talking to them at their level is a logical starting point for a study; and second, the views on citizenship education form a dynamic field

8 I deliberately refrain from formulating a ‘research question’ at this stage. Rather, I prefer to set a task. A question limits and frames the possible answers in an almost inevitable logical sequence. A task invites us to explore, to wander and to possibly arrive at places unsuspected before. A task is also open for others to join and to pose their questions within its context. Consequently, the concluding chapter will offer insights, new ideas, discussion and suggestions for further research, instead of answers and recommendations.
with different dimensions. I call it a force-field, to indicate that it is dynamic, with mutual influences of different dimensions, which pull it in one direction or another, but it remains one field, nonetheless. The choice of term is inspired by science fiction, but so far I haven't found a better term. This force-field of ideas about citizenship education determines the topics that will be included in my conversations with teachers.

If the outcome of the conversations with teachers is a number of recognizable groups of teachers holding distinct views, then we would have achieved something. We would have made visible ‘communities of meaning’ among teachers (Yanow, 2000). We would not have to choose between the Scylla and Charybdis; between a one-size-fits-all advice or even worse, ascribing all kinds of (unwanted) views and attitudes to teachers; or an anecdotal gathering of ‘good practice’ to recommend without knowing if it will be appealing or applicable to other teachers.

The starting point is an inventory of views as held by individual teachers, through structured conversations and with an open mind. Subsequent analysis helps me to draw a map of their views and beliefs: a simple map with a few large ‘continents’, certainly on one planet, and not on different ones. Hopefully, at the end, the views expressed and discussed by teachers could serve as a basis to develop better curricula, better training materials and better teaching methods, which can help teachers in their work. The study will offer new empirically based insights to policymakers in the field of citizenship education. Most of all, I hope that researchers and teachers from other countries will become interested enough to join this dialogue.

**Structure of the Book**

The task defined in the previous section will be tackled in the following steps.

Chapter Two will address the challenge of developing a framework to provide a multi-level comparative context for mapping teachers’ views. I will present the typology of teachers’ views on citizenship education, adapted from the grid-group theory of Douglas and Wildavsky. I show that other existing typologies also can fit this meta-organizing frame. The framework of different aspects constituting four ideal types of views serves as the basis, the shared playing field, within which dialogues with individual teachers in the three different countries took place.

Chapter Three addresses the buildup and the choices informing the study’s research design. It contains an explanation of the way Q methodology was used to structure the conversations and to analyze them, thereby reducing the individual diversity of views to a manageable number of views shared by groups of teachers per country.
Chapters Four, Five and Six describe the diverse patterns of views within the three countries. I present the findings from Bulgaria, Croatia, and the Netherlands, respectively. Five types of views are described in Bulgaria, and four each in Croatia and the Netherlands.

Chapter Seven places the intra-country diversity in a broader inter-country comparative context. Five overarching patterns of view represented by teachers from the three countries together are described. Common themes are discerned, as well as the most striking differences. National contexts and historical circumstances are also highlighted to shed a light on the findings and to offer possible explanations.

Chapter Eight presents the conclusions and places them in a broader policy-interpretive context, by elaborating on topics that need to be addressed further. The chapter ends with an imaginary discussion between two fictional characters, in the tradition of inquiry, stemming from Socrates and John Dewey. The two fictional scholars discuss the findings, the implications for the areas of academic research and policy development. The chapter concludes with an outline of an agenda for future research to address the questions that this study has posed.
Chapter Two.
A typology of views on citizenship based on grid-group theory

In chapter one, I explained my main drives and motives to explore the views of teachers on citizenship education in the Netherlands, Bulgaria and Croatia. I argued that in the current academic and policy discourse on citizenship education in Europe teachers have been overlooked. Among researchers and policy makers alike, there is a strong, though tacit agreement that ‘active, democratic citizenship’ is the type of citizenship to be aspired to, and an expectation that the majority of teachers adhere to this understanding (Arthur et al., 2008; Crick, 1999; Kerr et al., 2010). I also argued that it is important to engage in conversation with teachers as the implementers of citizenship policy about their views; as professionals, as gatekeepers of citizenship education related curriculum and policy.

In this chapter, I will explain, first, what I understand under ‘teachers’ views’ for the purpose of structuring my conversations with teachers. Next, I will spell out my choice of grid-group theory as a suitable framework for exploring teachers’ views and for comparing teachers in different countries. Afterwards, I will present the application of grid-group theory to the teachers’ views of citizenship education. I will present what I call ‘the force-field of aspects’ and I will explain how these aspects delineate a level playing field, a common context in which a wide diversity of views can be placed and talked about. At the end of the chapter, I will argue, using examples from the literature, how this ‘force-field’ can serve as an overarching organizing scheme to interpret existing research on types of citizenship education and teachers’ views on citizenship and citizenship education. The organizing scheme will be used to construct the specific research instrument, which will be presented in chapter Three.

Teachers’ views

How can a researcher organize a conversation with teachers in order to reveal the way they construct and frame their preferences and choices? The challenge is to find ways to talk to teachers about their views and preferences without ignoring or condemning their diverse and multifaceted views. After all, in their daily practice, teachers do somehow manage to deal with the ambiguous and fluid concepts
and with controversial demands and to build their own set of beliefs and views, which guide them in their work. How do they do that?

As a helpful step in addressing these questions, I use the concept of ‘teacher views’. The term departs from the concept of ‘teacher beliefs’ (Anderson et al., 1997), which is too narrow in my view. The concept of teacher beliefs has been a subject of constant research attention since the 1980s, initially occurring in the field of natural science teaching. ‘Beliefs’ here broadly refers to the considerable body of research on ‘teacher beliefs’, which are notoriously difficult to assess. It its initial and still widely accepted use, the concept carries a negative connotation of ‘belief’ as opposed to ‘knowledge’, ‘theory,’ systematic conviction (Pajares, 1992). Teacher beliefs are then perceived of as lacking, implicit, in need of being explicated, corrected or substituted by the ‘right’ type of ideas. To the extent that they are explored, they are measured against one or several theories concerning particular types of beliefs, mostly about the nature of teaching and learning, about different types of instruction, and about the students they have to deal with. The concept of ‘teacher belief’, certainly in the context of teaching natural sciences, is thus too narrow, when applied to social sciences. This is particularly true for a politically imbedded and multi-interpretable concept such as citizenship education. Research on teacher beliefs unveils the complexity of teachers’ work and the constituents of this peculiar mix of core value orientations, of political and ideological convictions, of educational philosophies, various ideas about the nature of learning, about the role of teacher and so forth (see for an overview (Fives & Gill, 2014). Teachers develop an interpretative framework during their career and this framework is shaped and re-shaped through interaction between individual teachers and the social, cultural and structural working conditions of their working context (Kelchtermans, 2009). Most importantly, research on beliefs shows a rather direct, though complicated mutual dependency between beliefs and practice.

To avoid the negative connotation of ‘beliefs’ as something unwanted and unsubstantiated, I will use the term ‘views’. ‘Views’ is closer to ‘vision’ and ‘outlook’ and in my opinion, better depicts the diverse, eclectic, multilayered nature of teachers’ opinions, which form patterns rather than orderly systems:

‘Every teacher has a set of opinions that may clearly differ from those of his or her colleagues. This set of opinions is part of the teachers’ personal subjective educational theory, which is not a collection of scientifically found insights into the pedagogical-didactic process but a collection of general knowledge, insights, and experiences gained from actual practice. In other words: the professional knowledge of teachers is primarily practical knowledge; this practical knowledge is part of their more general - personal - knowledge base; and on the basis of this personal knowledge base, teachers construct their own subjective educational theories.’ (Van den Berg, 2002, p. 589)
Teachers views appear to be relatively stable, tacit and resistant to change (Kagan, 1992). There is also evidence that they do shape and define teaching practice (Evans, 2006; Van den Berg, 2002). Teachers’ professional knowledge and personal beliefs and views are inseparable (Day, 2002; Day et al., 2007). Similar indications come from research on teachers’ personal practical knowledge, where it becomes quite clear that teachers do not merely apply guidelines, but change them, sometimes dramatically, based on their understanding. As a result, ‘the lessons, and the learning from them, are not what policy makers might have had in mind in the construction of those guidelines’ (Connelly, Clandinin, & He, 1997, p. 674).

Of course, this influence of ideas and views on practice is intricate and mutual, as captured by the concept of ‘theory-in-action.’ (Schön, 1984). For the purpose of this research it is important to establish that studying views does indeed tell us something about teaching practice. Views lead teachers in their daily choices, mostly implicitly: they find practical solutions and reconcile seemingly contradictory positions around a relatively stable core. For example, teachers teach critical thinking and at the same time need to remain neutral in their own position, they teach democracy in institutions that are not necessarily democratic, they educate future citizens to participate in a society yet they are aware of the fact that the influence of the school on future participation is very limited.

These daily practical choices are not made ad hoc, but rather based on patterns of thinking and subsequent action, which are based on core beliefs (Converse, 2006; Michaud, Carlisle, & Smith, 2009) about politics, education, and the teaching profession. They gravitate towards different definitions of the concept of citizenship education as the nexus of a number of important, but equally difficult to define concepts – democracy, politics, neutrality, political education, the place of education in society, and the teacher as a professional. These concepts are not independent from each other and do not form random mix-and-match combinations.

In the previous chapter, I introduced the notion of a force-field of ideas about citizenship education, a dynamic field, with mutual influences of different aspects, which determines the topics included in my conversations with teachers. In the next section, I will explain how the boundaries of this force-field are outlined with the help of grid-group theory.
THE FORCE-FIELD BOUNDARIES OUTLINED BY GRID-GROUP THEORY

BASIC TENETS OF GRID-GROUP THEORY

The force-field of aspects, where the diverse views and beliefs of teachers fit, is constructed on the basis of grid-group cultural theory (Douglas, 1978; Thompson, Ellis, & Wildavsky, 1990). Grid-group cultural theory defines four core-value cultural types, ideal types – conservative hierarchy, active and competitive individualism, egalitarian enclavism, and fatalism – that serve as the researcher’s compass in structuring and ordering discourses (Hoppe, 2007). Using the grid-group framework, it is possible to identify views on citizenship education, which gravitate towards one of the ideal types in the framework. None of these views can be considered better, or more viable, or more up to date, without taking into consideration the particular political and national context in which it originated and was developed (Hood, 2000).

Since there is already a wealth of literature on cultural theory, I will limit myself here to only a number of important and relevant points, needed to understand the subsequent application of the theory to teachers’ views on citizenship education.

Grid-group theory, also known as culture theory, was invented by Douglas (1999) and thus has its origins in cultural anthropology. It was further developed by Thompson and Wildavsky (Thompson et al., 1990) and made its way into mainstream sociology and policy sciences (Coyle & Ellis, 1994; Hoppe, 2007; Thompson, Grendstad, & Selle, 1999; Verweij & Thompson, 2006). The main idea of culture theory is that it explains how people derive a limited range of answers to basic social questions such as: How does the world work? What are humans really like? To whom am I accountable? (Lockhart, 1999, p. 865). The answers provided by individuals to these basic questions produce orientations towards two dimensions: grid and group (see figure 1). ‘Grid’ refers to the legitimacy of external prescription and ‘group’ refers to the strength of affiliation with others. These two dimensions are the organizational pivots of every known human society. Thus, high group would mean intense social interaction, closely knit, and high grid would mean, simply said, more (formal) rules. The combination of these two dimensions results in four socially viable life-styles, or ‘biases’, as Thompson and Wildavsky called them, or ‘thought styles’ as Mary Douglas sometimes preferred to call them. (Perri 6, 2005)

“The range of actual social practice is constrained because only four general ways - admitting some variations - of responding to these questions are socially viable” (Lockhart, 1999, p. 865).

9 Throughout the book, I use the names ‘grid-group theory’ and ‘culture theory’ interchangeably.
These four thought styles hold distinct ideas about what a human being is, what the place of an individual in society is and in what ways one can influence the world around them. In every known society, all four thought styles are present, but in different proportions, and with different degrees of dominance of one thought style over another.

The individualistic thought style has its analog in the ‘Wealth of Nations’ by Adam Smith (Smith, 1776) and markets in general. It is most generally characterized by low tolerance for external prescription, weak group membership, a high-degree of self-regulation, and contract-based social interactions. The egalitarian thought style is based on weak regulation and strong social interaction. People who belong to the egalitarian type are characterized by strong group feelings, weak external prescription, which leads to a logical organization in small groups, where collective decisions are made through discussions directed towards consensus. The theoretical equivalent of an egalitarian mode is to be found in the social contract of Rousseau (Rousseau, 1997). Practically, the egalitarian organization resembles an enclave. The hierarchic type is defined by both strong group interaction and strong external regulation. Hierarchically oriented people exhibit high feelings of group affiliation and see themselves as a subject to strong external prescription. The theoretical model of a hierarchy is Plato’s Republic (Hamilton & Cairns, 1961). The empirical embodiments of the hierarchic thought style are most government structures. This is why, according to Thompson/Wildavsky, our contemporary Western society is organized mainly around the market-government axis,
or in other words, around two dominant orientations – individualistic and hierarchic. Finally, the fatalist, or the isolationist thought style, consists of those who have been unfortunate enough to feel both excluded from intense social interaction and at the same time to be subjected to regulation they have no control over. Their basic modus is survival, their strategy is avoidance. The other term used to describe this thought style– isolates – refers to the incapability of this group to participate actively in social life. At its best, residing in the isolationist (of fatalist) corners is temporary and would lead to one of the ‘active’ thought styles, as the other three are called. At the worst, a society with too many disillusioned and incapable outcasts would inevitably fall apart (Hood, 2000; Thompson et al., 1990).

**Advantages of Grid-Group Theory from a Conceptual Point of View**

The main advantage of grid-group theory is that it allows for dealing with tensions inherent to a contested political concept, without ignoring them or rendering them insurmountable. In chapter one, I discussed the difficulties stemming from the attempt to put citizenship education - a multifaceted, political and ideological at its core and thus inherently contested concept - at the center of a coordinated educational policy. This difficulty can be addressed in two ways. The first one is to attempt to reduce the concept of citizenship education to one uniform, one-dimensional definition and to prescribe it as the one and only “correct” one. All other possible ways of looking at citizenship education are seen either as ‘inferior,’ ‘underdeveloped’ or otherwise lacking. The second approach is to simply declare the existing diversity of views to be a ‘confusion’ of some sort. Attempts are then made to clarify it, to straighten the field, to achieve a kind of academic consensus. Since this effort is doomed to fail, it leads inevitably to a cynical attitude, ‘anything goes’ and to creatively pragmatic ways of inflating the concept with ever more fashionable meanings and aspects, often with the sole purpose of acquiring grants.

I argue that grid-group theory offers a way out of this dilemma by seeing diversity as a structural feature of a culturally embedded phenomenon and the concept that describes it. Grid-group theory allows the researcher to embrace the messy, controversial political dimensions of citizenship education and look at them as a pattern, as pieces of whole. Rather than focusing on one preferred aspect, or orientation, or ideology, culture theory encourages researchers to look at all possible views, preferences, and thought styles, in order to complete the puzzle of a particular set of perspectives in a given society. Culture theory examines various cultural thought styles not only as coexistent, but also sees them in a dynamic fashion – exactly the tensions between the different political preferences keep a culture together and allow for development. The different thought styles keep each other in check, so to say; an exaggerated presence of one style is a sign of disturbance; an attempt to ban or circumvent a particular thought style will also cause disequilibrium and cannot easily succeed.
METHODOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES OF GRID-GROUP THEORY

For the purposes of this inquiry, culture theory offers three advantages: First, in delineating discourses on a particular topic (Hoppe & Peterse, 1994), it can offer a check for completeness, but also clear boundaries. The boundaries help to select views directly related to the core of the research. When one seeks to establish a common context of conversations between persons otherwise unknown to each other, such a general framework proves very useful. Not only in the initial stages, but also in a subsequent analysis, the principle of requisite variety allows one to check for omissions and overlooked positions: culture theory’s postulate is that all four and only the four thought styles are present, though in different proportions, in every society. In this sense, culture theory is a powerful analytic tool (Geva-May, 2002; Hoppe, 2007).

Second, derived from this, culture theory allows us to reduce the variety of views to a workable typology: grid-group theory maintains that there is a finite number of viable orientations and positions, not any combination of theoretical or ideological dimensions is possible. What is even better, these dimensions and positions are dynamic and elastic – although the basic thought styles are always present, their mutual relationships can change, allowing for hybrid styles to occur (Hood, 2000). Thus, culture theory allows for explaining change and difference. (Coughlin & Lockhart, 1998, p. 863). This is particularly important in studying teachers’ views, which, as we already discussed, are complex and multi-faceted, as well as constantly influenced by various factors.

Third, culture theory allows for international comparison without relying on stereotypes or generalizations of any kind. Why? Because, unlike other theories which Douglas calls ‘lazy theories’ (Douglas, 1992), it does not reduce culture to a more or less arbitrary set of national, historical or geographical variables. Also, culture theory includes inherent safeguards against global favoritism of one culture, by finding manifestations of all four thought styles in any culture. This is a particularly important advantage in the light of the discussion in the previous chapter on ‘wishful thinking’ in citizenship education, leaning strongly towards an egalitarian idea of citizenship education. Culture theory does not make any implicit or explicit ranking of particular values and ideas and thus allows us to explore them with an open mind.

THE FORCE-FIELD OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION ASPECTS

Applying culture theory to the topic of citizenship education brings us one step further to understanding citizenship education and helps us to incorporate many of the insights of previous research in a larger, theoretically and empirically grounded typology of views about citizenship education.

The typology is graphically organized in a scheme, which I call ‘the force-field’ of citizenship education views. The word ‘force-field’ is borrowed from sci-
ence fiction as it nicely captures the mutual dependency and dynamics of the different aspects. A force-field is self-contained and held together by its own powers of attraction and rejection, a constant interplay between repellents and attractors (Thompson, 1996). It is in this sense fluid and dynamic, but kept in place by the outer boundaries of the extreme positions on various aspects explained below. Thompson describes it as a flock of starlings, always flying in formation, but moving nonetheless (Thompson et al., 1990).

In figure 2, the grid-group scheme is used to map the ideal types of citizenship education views. The four extremes of the field depict citizenship education, at a very basic level, as oriented towards Self-interest (low group, low grid), Participation (high group, high grid), Equity (low grid, high group), and Survival (high grid, low group).

THE GENERAL ASPECTS SPECIFIED FOR CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

For the construction of the aspects in the scheme, I have been looking at curriculum and pedagogy as message systems transmitting meanings (Bernstein, 1973, p. 85). Thus, the four ideal thought styles, specified for citizenship education, can be seen as different ways of transmitting meaning, as ideal-typical ways of handling the following key questions: What is the ideal of a citizen: a good citizen or a critical citizen? What is the perceived role of the teacher: supervisor, mentor, or a coach and facilitator? What is the approach to political education: indoctrination or neutral presentation of facts? What is the focus in curriculum: on knowledge or on attitudes? What is the main concern: individual rights or social responsibilities and obligations?

![Figure 2 The four ideal types of citizen education views](image-url)
These main questions are related to several other questions. What kind of school: a democratic one or traditionally hierarchic? What kind of student: an independent, self-centered one; a confident, traditional one; a critical, socially engaged one or one who cannot quite cope? What kind of subject: social studies with elements of citizenship education or the other way around? The possible answers fall into a continuum between two extreme positions, situated either along the grid or the group dimension of the grid-group scheme.

Below, I will explain the constituting aspects in more detail. The figures will highlight only one aspect at a time. Then, I will describe the general characteristic features of the four outlined types, built up by these aspects.

**Goal: critical vs. good citizen**

‘What kind of citizen?’ (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) is a pivotal question in many discussions in the field of citizenship education. I use the two terms here as two extremes of a continuum of possible depictions.

The concept of ‘good citizen’ has acquired negative connotations, paradoxically (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). It stems mostly from the classic book with the same title, ‘The Good Citizen’ (Schudson, 1998). The good citizen as understood here is on the high grid edge of the continuum, which means a certain idea of belonging, being part of a structure. In the hierarchic modus, the good citizen is the well adapted one; in the fatalist modus, the good citizen is struggling to survive and incapable of criticism, as she\(^{10}\) adheres to rules imposed by others.

\(^{10}\) I hope the readers have already understood that I use ‘he’ and ‘she’ interchangeably throughout the text, to avoid clumsy syntax.
Being good means to be adapted, to function properly, to accept the way the world is run and not necessarily to desire or envision a change. In the hierarchic version, being good means to know what one’s place is in society and to make the best of it. In the fatalist version, ‘good’ has the connotation of having no control and settling for whatever the world has to offer. Almond and Verba’s ‘participant citizen’ (Almond & Verba, 1972) could be seen as belonging to the hierarchic thought style, and the ‘parochial citizen’, with a stretch, would fit the fatalist corner. Bennett uses the terms ‘dutiful citizen’ and ‘self-actualizing citizen’, which fit well the hierarchic respectively the individualistic (‘critical citizen’) brand of citizenship (Bennett, 2007).

From the hierarchic understanding of being ‘good’, one can be well adjusted and thus participate in society in an orderly, constructive and predictable way. Social arrangements and institutions will not be questioned. Official and established channels of participation such as voting, membership of political parties, community boards etc., will be strongly encouraged.

Is ‘being good’ less valuable than ‘being critical’? Often, citizen participation is associated with a critical attitude and automatically linked to participation. This does not necessarily have to be so for everyone. To be critical is considered a virtue in education, as it is associated with critical thinking, not accepting anything at face value. However, educational systems also have a very strong adaptive tendency, thus, being good is not less akin to school practice than being critical. In fact, the school is a good example of the possibility to participate, as a pupil, within a hierarchic system without being (too) critical. This is a point of criticism by the proponents of critical pedagogy, most recently (Carr, Zyngier, & Pruyn, 2012).

In the force-field, the two extremes of the ‘good citizen’ aspect are called survival and participation. ‘Participation’ is one of the overly used concepts in the citizenship discourse. In the official EU documents (European Commission, 1998, 2012), what is meant by ‘active participation’ is most often the hierarchic version of it, as participation is encouraged to take place through established political channels and traditional institutions. In the Council of Europe’s notion of ‘democratic citizenship’ participation fits better the egalitarian version, which includes a critical stance towards institutions. For example, the promotion of participative, deliberative and ‘deep’ democracy in a ‘thick’ definition of citizenship education (Enslin, Pendlebury, & Tjiattas, 2001).

Now we turn to the two depictions of the ‘critical citizen’, the two versions of critical attitude at the low-grid edge of the continuum. This critical attitude has two different manifestations, also referred to by Johnson and Morris (Johnson & Morris, 2010) as critical thinking and critical pedagogy, which could be ascribed to the individualistic and egalitarian perspective, respectively. The indi-
individualistic critical citizens are led by self-interest, which is not necessarily bad, as they are also concerned with individual rights and freedoms. In the egalitarian version, the critical attitude is driven by a concern for equity, social solidarity and emancipation.

**Approach: indoctrination vs. neutrality**

This aspect, concerning ‘approach’ reflects another vivid discussion on the way a social science teacher is supposed to deal with his or her own political beliefs (Sears & Hughes, 2006). The discussion is embedded in a cluster of notions and dilemmas around value transmission, manipulation, the distinction between personal and professional views and so on.

A variation of this aspect is the juxtaposition of value-explicit and value-neutral education. The distinction is made at a national level, claiming that highly centralized countries would promote explicit values (Levstik & Tyson, 2008; Kerr, 2008). I maintain the position that at the level of individual teachers, different choices will be made, but all positions are viable in all national contexts and official intentions of the curriculum.

Here, in the low group-low grid (self-interest) part of the scheme, the teacher does not impose rules (values, ideologies) to students. In the survival oriented quadrant (low group-high grid), the reason for maintaining neutrality is different: students are seen as subjected to rules they do not understand and as having little chance to change them, therefore, teachers can see then as
potential victims of indoctrination and therefore withhold from any ideologically loaded discussions. Since the rules are quite clear and dense on the high group-high grid hierarchic extreme, there will be little hesitation to expose students to them. In the egalitarian version, ideological preference for equity and justice are seen as the glue of a community and as the natural tool to initiate students into the social mores.

‘Indoctrination’ in its extreme meaning - to close down the path to other views, to deliberately block the entertainment of other thoughts - will probably not be found in educational settings in any contemporary European country. Indeed, indoctrination is sometimes defined as the opposite of education itself:

“We define education as the opening up of possibilities through the exploration of alternative understandings, the critical application of evidence and argument and the development of the skills and dispositions necessary to act on the possibilities.” (Porfilio & McClary, 2004, p. 4)

However, in its ‘milder’ manifestations, the term ‘indoctrination’ is opposed to ‘neutrality’, meaning the inclination to promote a particular (ideological) viewpoint, or a more progressive idea, in the eyes of the teacher. In the hierarchic thought style, indoctrination is justified with the need to maintain and reproduce social systems and relations. The egalitarian thought style justifies indoctrination by the necessity to instill in the younger generation the ideas and values which the community considers valuable.

To remain neutral in the sense of not taking position, refraining from a choice and from making preferences known to one’s students, appears to be a popular position among some teachers (Olgers et al., 2014, p. 23). They are inclined to see any form of deliberate influence as somehow manipulative. The individualistic version of ‘neutrality’ defines the perceived own agenda and personal freedom of the student as a central concern. In the fatalist version, the neutral attitude is purely pragmatic and dictated by lack of interest in political or ideological positions.

The aspect has connotations to different notions of political socialization, value and character education, and the inherent tension between promoting democratic education and the insistence on accepting the value of democracy uncritically.
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Concern: Individual rights vs. social obligations

![Diagram](image.png)

Figure 5  Concern

Obviously, this aspect stems directly from the basic grid-group postulate. A high group society would focus more on obligations and responsibilities, as opposed to the low group society, concerned much more with individual, respectively collective rights. The discourse on citizenship tends to overemphasize rights (Kymlicka, 1996, p. 335), but it really depends on who you ask (Abowitz & Harnish, 2006).

The implication for education is a difference in accents - discipline and order are considered more important in the hierarchic/fatalist thought styles, as opposed to creativity and self-initiative in the low group thought styles (individualist/egalitarian). Pedagogically, teachers adhering to all four thought styles will justify their choices as being the best for their students. If a teacher sees his students predominantly through a fatalist lens, she will attempt to move them out from their isolated position by empowering them with knowledge and understanding of their individual rights. A teacher with a hierarchic thought style will see discipline and character education as a prerequisite for success in a society. From an individualistic point of view, the most important is to equip students with tools to promote their own self-interest.
Role: coach vs. supervisor

This aspect refers to a particular educational vision and a clear definition of the role of the teacher (Williams & Burden, 2004). Simply put, a teacher acting as a coach (or facilitator) treats her students as equals, as partners who should be helped and supported in finding their own way. In the individualist version, the teacher would clearly take the back seat and support his students with providing the necessary instruments for rational and effective decision-making. In the egalitarian version, the role of the teacher will be to help the students find their place in the community and to develop their sense of justice and solidarity. Both versions of the role of coach can be associated with the notion of ‘empowering education.’ (Shor, 2012)

A teacher acting as a supervisor (or mentor) would clearly assume a one-up position towards the students and will expect them to be followed without questioning his authority. This is a more traditional role: in a classic hierarchic situation, the master grooms the students for their position in the system; in a fatalist mind-set, students are perceived as lacking in important ways, or in need of protection and guidance.

Consequently, not all teachers will be inclined to employ innovative teaching methods. The ones assuming the role of coach will be generally more inclined to experiment, though in different styles. The high grid, top-down supervising teachers will have a preference for no-nonsense classical type of teaching.

This aspect should not be confused with another old juxtaposition, namely attitudes vs. knowledge.
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Focus: attitudes vs. knowledge

Every educational science student learns to mention knowledge, attitudes and skills in one breath. In the scheme, I leave out skills, because ‘skills’ acquire quite different meanings in the different thought styles. The attitudes - knowledge division runs through the diagonals. The individualist and hierarchic thought styles of the market-bureaucracy axis (Hood, 1995) both put an emphasis on knowledge, though on different grounds. In the individualist view, limiting oneself to knowledge and information is a way to prevent manipulation, indoctrination, or any other interference with the free will of the student. For the hierarchically oriented teacher, the world is a pretty organized, systematic structure to which young people should be introduced by providing them with the proper information about its functioning.

The egalitarian preoccupation with attitudes (and the underlying values), even at the expense of knowledge, can be explained with the critical position towards the status quo, of which, after all, school and curriculum are also part. In the fatalist position, knowledge is just a matter of lesser concern; survival skills based on attitude and change of disposition come first.

A classification of the types of curricula by Ross (Ross, 2002) fits these lines. Ross relates different models of citizenship education to different classical models of curriculum. He differentiates between content-driven, objective-driven and process-driven curricula. The first one is the traditional subject-oriented curriculum, with sharp disciplinary boundaries, and can be seen as fitting the hierarchic thought style. The objectives-driven curriculum is utilitarian in its nature and directed at acquiring certain specific and useful competences and skills. It fits
the individualistic thought style. Finally, the process-driven curriculum is what many indicate as the pedagogical aspect of teaching. It may fit the egalitarian thought style, as it is concerned with the development of the child. The fatalist orientation is not represented, as is very often the case.

Often in the literature, the juxtaposition is between ‘knowledge transmission’ and ‘active citizenship’ (Milana, 2008), the latter referring to a particular way of learning citizenship. However, these are concepts pertaining to very different domains, lumped together. Knowledge does not need to have the narrow depiction of a collection of facts, and can be acquired in different ways, including actively (for a discussion of definitions and measurements of political knowledge in education (see in more detail Emler & Frazer, 1999). Knowledge transmission is often associated with ‘formal citizenship education’, which is also seen as rational and technocratic (value-neutral) as opposed to promoting norms of political engagement on a moral basis (Condor & Gibson, 2007). Formal citizenship education did not appear to promote norms of political engagement but rather lent substance to the argument that political decision-making should be based on the rational application of technical knowledge instead of on public opinion or moral principle.

**Description of Ideal Types of Teachers’ Views**

The aspects discussed so far constitute the main axes of the force-field, as presented in the figure 8. Below, the four main types of views in the force-field are described briefly.

![Figure 8 The force-field of teachers’ views](image)
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**INDIVIDUALIST: THE STUDENT LEADS**

This individualist teacher adheres most closely to the ‘consumer citizen’ (Schudson, 1998) or the ‘calculating citizen’ (Norris, 2011) and ‘monitoring citizen’ (Putnam, 2000) and lets the student take the lead. The individualist thought style fits Amy Guttmann’s ‘state of individuals’ educational model, where future choices are maximized through open and neutral education without any preset ideals of the good life (Gutmann, 1987, p. 33).

The pupils’ personal development and emancipation of the pupil is a central goal of the individualist teacher. Education is mainly directed at self-realization of the individual. The didactic accent is on the development of the capability for critical thinking, mostly seen as rational, logical, and necessary to process the available information and to arrive at an optimal decision for a person’s future development. The focus is thus on cognitive skills aimed at problem-solving. For instance, how to get the best of any taxing system? How to change it in my interest in order to get maximum personal advantage (not concerned with equity etc.)? The role of the teacher is to offer the necessary information in a neutral and objective way, indoctrination is excluded; a certain critical attitude towards the social order is led by the need for optimization and maximization of each particular person’s chances.

This type of teachers is fact and knowledge oriented and less concerned with grand schemes and explanatory models, as it is up to the individual student to construct them if needed. As for the relationship between the school subject ‘social science’ and citizenship education, a teacher with this thought style will see them as two different things. The main accents in the subject itself are analytic skills, knowledge of rights and obligations, the way market based, pluralistic societies function, and anything else necessary for career advancement and self-realization.

The educational style of individualist oriented teachers would include aversion to rules, for instance adherence to a particular curriculum or teaching method. Equally, she would not impose any particular views on students and will encourage them to think for themselves instead. The contacts with students are on an equal footing and encourage the use and development of bargaining skills. The teacher encourages the students to be more interested in rights than in responsibilities and obligations. Individual competition is not only tolerated, but sought and appreciated. Debate and discussion techniques are mostly in a win-lose format.

**HIERARCHIC: KNOW YOUR LAWS**

For the hierarchic teacher, being ‘good’ equals to being well adjusted and thus participating in society in an orderly, constructive and predictable way. Social arrangements and institutions will not be questioned. Official and established
channels of participation such as voting, membership of political parties, community boards etc., will be strongly encouraged and ‘duty-based’, stemming from obligations and tradition, as opposed to the ‘engaged’ version, oriented more to social concerns and welfare issues (Dalton, 2008, p. 5).

A hierarchical thought style resembles the Platonic ideal and would adhere to traditional models of citizenship, limited to the legal and not the social aspects. Certain conservative views, e.g. character and patriotic education (Journell, 2010), fit this thought style. The hierarchic view allows most easily for an apolitical, generic participation idea of citizenship. Patriotism and loyalty are themes that appear most prominently in this thought style. The hierarchic teachers are inclined to promote a certain ideology, prefer a standard uniform curriculum, reflecting the grand scheme of society as they see it. The hierarchic thought style is more oriented towards reproductive, as opposed to ‘transformative’ teaching (Gitlin, 1983). When change is pursued, it is achieved through predictable patterns, and participation takes place through established channels and institutions. Political literacy is understood as knowing ‘how the system works.’ The current arrangement of representation is seen as a synonym for democracy (Barber, 2003). Character building and respect are quite central to teaching, which happens through a vaccination theory of education (Weingartner & Postman, 1969, p. 32), also discussed in relation to citizenship education (Leighton, 2006).

Consequently, the goal is to prepare the future citizens for participating in established political and social institutions; it is generally clear who will end where in the social machinery, which is seen as meritocratic; students are being prepared for this suitable role. A future citizen will be well adapted, rational, but not critical, would maintain the status quo, would pay attention more to responsibilities and obligations than to rights. Fulfilling one‘s obligations is not an act of passivity; rather, it is a matter of ‘responsible participation’, similar to the New Right in the USA (King, 1988). The role of the teacher is to supervise this process of adaptation and to act as a role model for the students when necessary. The teaching style is top-down, based on discipline and not inclined towards interactive teaching forms. The school in this hierarchic thought style will seek unity among its citizens through defining and transmitting what is considered worthy knowledge, e.g ‘the family state’ (Gutmann, 1987). Concerning the subject, citizenship education is seen as a small part of social studies, as it includes other topics, necessary to participate in society. The main themes are political parties and voting systems, rules and responsibilities, as well as proper preparation for the labor market. The preferred skills are persuasion and leadership, and reliance

Although Barber’s concept of ‘strong democracy’ could be seen more as a hybrid between the hierarchic and egalitarian position.
on expert information. Educational process gravitates strongly around school. The school as an institution, generally hierarchically organized, accommodates the hierarchic teacher quite nicely.12

**EGALITARIAN: DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION**

This thought style represents the proponents of critical democratic citizenship – equity oriented and concerned with improving the current state of society through promoting democracy at school. The inspirational sources of this thought style are Freire’s critical pedagogy (Freire, 1998), Guttmann’s democratic education (Gutmann, 1987), Parker’s pluralist citizenship (Parker, 1996). Martha Nussbaum is one of the strongest contemporary voices to link education in general to the very existence of democracy. The pivotal element of Nussbaum’s conception of good education for democracy is *critical thinking*, the ability to examine one’s own views and limitations, to see and tolerate difference between nations and within a community (Nussbaum, 1997).

The teachers with this signature are strongly community oriented and thus looking for ‘real life’ experiences beyond the classroom, for ‘active participation’ in life. The egalitarian teachers see education as an institution directed at social change and promoting social justice. In some cases, there could be too much stress on character-building and moral education, at the expense of knowledge transmission. Belonging to a community, acting in the interest of the common good is very important for the egalitarian teachers. This feature they share with the hierarchically oriented teachers. However, the hierarchists assume a fixed place for each individual in the social fabric, whereas egalitarians are directed at personal growth and development in harmony with the community. Cooperation and social involvement are voluntary, based on moral convictions rather than fixed social rules. Since care for each member of a community is important to an egalitarian teacher, she envisages her role more as a coach, similar to the individualist teachers. Whereas the individualist teachers allow their students to pursue self-interest and gladly equip them with the necessary tools to get ahead in life, the egalitarian teachers feel an obligation to instill certain values in their pupils, the most important one being the sense of justice and equity. Consequently, the preferred teaching methods are more interactive, frequently innovative and aimed at reforming the school system as well. The most consist-

---

12 In the influential international comparative study on citizenship education, Kerr (Kerr, 1999) chooses to place the possible views on citizenship education alongside a continuum ‘minimal’ and ‘maximal’. The ‘minimal’ type exhibits many features of the hierarchic thought style. It is exclusive, elitist, formal, content led, and based on the didactic transmission of knowledge. However, according to Kerr, this type of citizenship education is also ‘thin’ and therefore inferior to the ‘maximal’ type, much more akin to the egalitarian style.
ent position of this kind would argue for the necessity to establish a totally different school system altogether, in the tradition of critical pedagogy (see for an overview Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2003). A more moderate stance is to call for holistic assessment methods, to introduce more extracurricular activities and a more visible role of the school in a community. Egalitarian teachers see themselves as the necessary counterweight to markets and bureaucracies and ‘strive to reduce status differentials among persons and to build a sense of self-esteem, caring, and inclusive social equality’ (Lockhart, 1999, p. 869).

In the egalitarian thought style, the subject of social studies is seen as equal to citizenship education. All education is citizenship education in the ‘purest’ version of the egalitarian view. The focus on teaching is mostly on norms, values and relationships, but also on the role of the mass media as a source of deception, brainwashing and uncritical attitudes which should be changed. The egalitarian teachers share a passion for discussion and deliberation with the individualists. However, they focus less on winning a debate and are more consensus-oriented, with a great concern for a safe classroom climate, for example in the tradition of Dewey’s ‘community of inquiry’ (Dewey & Rogers, 2012). Also, Kerr’s description of ‘maximal’ citizenship education as inclusive, activist, participative, process led, and value based, fits the egalitarian thought style (Kerr, 1999).

A modern version of this thought style expands further than the social dimension and certainly further towards the global dimension and endorses terms such as a ‘lived experience’, multiple cultural and political identities (Milana & Tarozzi, 2013), as well as ‘Earth identity’ (Morin, 2002) and other environmental conceptions.

**FATALIST: KEEP THEM OUT OF TROUBLE**

The fatalist, or the ‘isolate’s’, position is often overlooked in research as it is seen as a ‘passive’ thought style. Mary Douglas warned about that, referring the blind following of the trichotomy of markets, hierarchies and networks. She called these trichotomies ill-informed, incomplete and too much addressed to formal institutions of exchange to capture the most basic level at which social life varies (Perri 6, 2002, p. 4). Most typologies of citizenship education, discussed throughout the chapter, distinguish between three types, as M. Douglas has warned, thus leaving out the inactive fatalist position.

And yet, empirically, the fatalist position is emerging regularly (Grendstad, 2003; (Anderson et al., 1997; Myers, 2007). It is based on a clearly discernable image of deficient students and consequently rather low expectations about their future role in a modern democratic society. These are students that do not understand ‘the rules of the game’ and often feel that they fall prey to other persons’
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games. They feel that they have no say in social developments and ultimately in steering their own life. They can become very cynical or desperate. According to the grid-group theory, the number of such individuals should never be too high in order to maintain a viable society. Therefore, there are teachers who feel that their role in general and particularly in citizenship education is to work for moving students away from this dead-end corner of the social map. This could be done in different directions, by egalitarian teachers as empowering (McLaren & Lankshear, 1994) and ‘affective thinking models’ (Klaassen, 2002), by hierarchically oriented teachers as character education, the deficit model of education (Osler & Starkey, 2003) and by individualist teachers as teaching ‘life skills.’

The teachers themselves can hold this kind of fatalist positions, in which they perceive ‘the system’ as omnipotent and themselves as actors with no control over events. They know the art of survival and this is what they teach their students as well. ‘Staying out of trouble’ is their only realistic strategy, which they bring over to their students as well.

The teacher inhabiting this quadrant of the grid-group landscape sees education as a form of protection and assumes the role of a parent and a protective supervisor. From this perspective, citizenship education is much broader than social studies, as knowledge would not fall on willing ears if students are skeptical, cynical and feeling left out. The focus is much more on the sheer avoidance of criminal behavior, and on promoting employability. This latter objective is not completely uncommon for hierarchic teachers as well, but in this case, it is seen as a safety measure and a way to move out of the fatalist square, rather than a form of self-realization. Obviously, ‘active participation’ is a step too far for this type of students, at least in the perception of their teachers. Rather, teachers focus on discipline, following orders, acquiring a minimal knowledge of the system and simple logical reasoning skills. Examples of this thought style are ‘deficiency models’ in citizenship education, often directed at minorities and other disadvantaged groups (Kiwan, 2008).

Popular typologies and aspects of citizenship education interpreted with grid-group theory

In chapter Three I will explain how the force-field framework of thought-styles and its constituting dimensions is used to create a common context, a canvass against which the various views of teachers can be positioned and to highlight intra-country as well as inter-country variation.

But first, a few more words on the potential merits of the force-field framework as a meta-theoretical tool. In this section, I discuss a number of existing typologies of citizenship education through the lens of cultural theory. The rationale
for doing this is: First, to demonstrate how the typology I have presented above is an addition to, and a continuation of the scholarly body of work so far, rather than a breach or a rejection. Second, to help readers who are familiar with one or more of the discussed typologies, to relate to the terminology presented in this chapter and to be able to place their own views and understanding in the suggested force-field framework. This will improve the chances for a meaningful dialogue in the future by creating a common inclusive language. Third, to show how the existing typologies can be grouped together on the basis of cultural theory, thereby improving comparability and allowing for combining different important aspects and nuances in general categories and types. At the same time, the distribution of the existing types throughout the force-field can be compared to the empirical findings presented in the next chapters.

The multidimensionality of the concept of citizenship education has invited many typologies and classifications. Some of them have been theoretically derived, others based on empirical data; yet other typologies are used as a direct input for developing policy interventions and monitoring indicators. All of these have been useful in a number of ways: they provide new insights into the underlying dimensions and suggest new directions for research; by mapping these dimensions, typologies also explicate the meaning of a concept; eventually, such typologies can serve as an input for different measurements and comparisons (Collier, LaPorte, & Seawright, 2012).

It is attractive and rewarding to create a typology of citizenship education, which reduces the diversity of definitions and perspective to a manageable number and at the same time does not dogmatically impose one perspective. These typologies offer a road map to different possible questions faced by citizenship education practitioners and theorists alike:

“Should it be an education in the realities of political power, of an education in the desirabilities of the future world? Should it be critical to the established practice or suspicious to novel ideas and inclinations?” as Frazer puts it, referring to the ‘classic liberal, republican and authoritarian construction’ (Frazer, 2007).

Typologies provide useful ways to explore different aspects of citizenship education and to compare practice across different contexts. However, typologies should be employed with caution, especially when there are too many of them.

**The numerous typologies can also create problems**

First, very often the typologies and classifications begin to live a life of their own, beyond the purpose of analytical classification: implicit and explicit preferences for one perspective or another are advocated. The grounds upon which the typologies were made are omitted and the categories are then imposed back
to practice. Sometimes the typologies are purely theoretical; sometimes they rest on historical or (context-specific) empirical analysis. When these premises are ignored and omitted, the result can be methodologically confusing.

Second, typologies are creative, which means that they are not always systematic, as they highlight some aspects and can change in the course of time (Collier et al., 2012). This means that a typology can focus on a single aspect, or a few aspects, thereby mixing up and conflating categories that can be analytically separated from each other as distinct manifestations of different grid-group thought styles. Grendstad discusses in a similar way left-right political orientations in five Nordic countries. For example, he shows how in Sweden and Denmark, ‘conservatism’ conflates the individual and hierarchic thought styles, and ‘radicalism’ conflates egalitarianism and fatalism (Grendstad, 2003).

Similarly, a critical attitude towards institutions is commonly lumped together with active participation. For example, Parker states that the juxtaposition of transmission and participation is central to a cluster of curricular approaches to citizenship education (Parker, 2001, p. 9). He clearly links ‘participation’ back to the critical pedagogy approach of Apple (Apple, 1971), thereby placing participation oriented approaches squarely in the egalitarian quadrant. In the force-field, it is quite visible that active participation is feasible not only from a critical, but also from an accepting, status-quo affirming, compliance-oriented hierarchical position. Similarly, belonging to a community does not automatically imply a justice orientation: both the hierarchic and the enclavist orientations value the community, but the place of an individual, in this case a citizen, in both thought styles is different. As a result, many authors and practitioners seem to be disappointed when it turns out that ‘active participation’ does not necessarily lead to the promotion of a deeper form of participatory democracy, for instance. Implicitly, many typologies envision a different type of citizen, reportedly aspired to by teachers, but fail to explicate the compatibility of this ideal with the personal, pedagogical and professional preferences of teachers about the ways to educate these citizens.

Another example of possible conflation is the international comparative CIVED study (Torney-Purta et al., 2001). In the study, the two types of citizenship – conventional and socially related – can be seen as juxtaposing the individual rights with social obligations, respectively. In grid-group terms, the distinction is made only alongside the group dimension. Apart from omitting the fatalist category altogether, this dichotomy creates problems with fitting the hierarchic variety within the continuum. When the hierarchical version gets conflated with the egalitarian thought style, then the distinction ‘good citizen – critical citizen’ will be contaminated. If the conflation is in the direction
of individualism (equal to common neo-liberal thinking alongside the ‘power axis’ of contemporary western societies), then the importance of individual rights can be put under pressure.

**Typologies can be read from a grid-group perspective**

By showing how they can be re-interpreted and maybe relabeled to fit the grid-group force-field, I hope I make a useful step towards a greater conceptual clarity, while avoiding the pitfall of killing the debate by adhering to one definition only.

In Appendix 1, end of this chapter, a number of well-known typologies of citizenship education (and of citizenship, if they were directly linked to education), is placed in the force-field as described above. This is my reading only and in no way a rigorous measurement of ‘compatibility’ or ‘similarity’ of the actual labels created by authors and the ideal types in the force field. What I hope to make clear is that grid-group theory can serve as a meta-theoretical framework to organize the discourse on citizenship education, without the need to superimpose preferences or to operate on implicit assumptions. Most of all, I hope to show that the diversity of views on citizenship education forms a common semantic field which does have its boundaries; and within it discussion of various goals, approaches, and ideals is possible. In the next chapter, I will show how, through using Q methodology, I embarked upon a similar systematization of teachers’ views as well.

In the following paragraphs, I will discuss only a few of the typologies quoted in the scheme, without any claim on exhaustiveness. The examples are meant as an illustration of the possible advantages of re-reading other analytic schemes in terms of grid-group theory.

The book of “The Good Citizen” (Schudson, 1998) deserves a place in this section with the title already. Schudson traces the development and the range of the concept of citizenship throughout modern American history with three distinct types that could roughly fit the grid-group scheme. Among the many contributions of his work, the most relevant for this discussion is the warning against unrealistic definitions of citizenship that actually hurt democracy. Schudson’s plea for a mixed model and different ways of distributing responsibilities and models of participation support the idea to employ culture theory to map the possible constellations of co-existing orientations, without placing a price-tag and a ranking order on any of them.

The typology by Van Gunsteren (Van Gunsteren, 1992) is included here for two reasons. First, because it has been influential in shaping at least the Dutch discourse on citizenship education and consequently, through policy advisers drawing on his work (Veldhuis, 1997), the European one; and sec-
ond, because his classification is explicitly based on grid-group theory. He
discusses the positive and the negative sides of each type of citizenship and
the ways they keep each other in balance. The calculating citizen pertains
to the liberalistic idea of citizenship, with two versions – profit maximizing
and self-interest promotion. The downside of this position is the difficulty
to engage in collective action when necessary. The republican form is very
much concerned with the idea of educating the citizen, with the initiation
of members of society to the relevant rules and procedures. The downside
of this orientation is that it can lead to an extremely hierarchic, military type
of order and more importantly, can be limiting to individual exchange and
diversity. Finally, ‘the individual as a member of a community’ falls into a hy-
brid enclavist thought style, where loyalty and good manners are cherished.
An important implication for education is that the individual is seen as capa-
ble of growth only if supported and directed by a community. The downside
of this type of citizenship is that it requires small-scale relationships, which
are not easily maintained in a modern society. Moreover, in such communi-
ties, the support can come at the price of limiting freedom.

An empirical study under Dutch teachers uses this typology as a starting
point. Leenders et al. (Leenders et al., 2008) depict three types of views among
Dutch teachers, related to three different types of educational activities. Note
that the preference of teachers is not considered in terms of their perceived role,
but linked to the type of citizens they envision as a product of their efforts. The
adapting citizen is oriented towards discipline and finds independence less im-
portant. The calculating citizen is the individualistic, self-interest- and market-
oriented citizen, and the critical democratic citizen is considered, again, somehow
superior and the only one linked directly to a (value-oriented) form of democ-
ropy. The adapting citizen exhibits many features of the hierarchic thought style,
the calculating one fits the individualistic type and the critical democratic citizen
is associated with the egalitarian one. However, in the force-field, the critical
orientation can also be manifest, though in another form, in the individualistic
thought style. And the unsuccessfully adapted citizen becomes suddenly visible
in the isolate’s quadrant, while it is missing in the study. The study misses that,
because it is focused on calculating prevalence of one view or another instead of
detecting possible hybrids or unique perspectives.

Kymlicka (Kymlicka, 1996) is one of the most quoted scholars in the
field of citizenship education and his ideals and models have found their
way in many policy and curriculum documents. The most important in his
writings for the purpose of this study is the idea of ‘minimal’ and ‘maxi-
mal’ citizenship, which are repeated in many different versions afterwards.
The important implication of this type of thinking is that it presumes some
kind of a linear progress, starting from a simple, liberal, legally oriented idea of citizenship, linked to teaching as informing students about their rights, which will inevitably evolve to higher, richer, more just and more inclusive types of citizenship. As a theoretical idea, also based on the historical development of the concept of citizenship and particularly its link to democracy in modern times, this is a fruitful line of thought. The trouble begins when it is used to prescribe teachers to aspire to the ‘higher’ forms of citizenship, as they are considered inherently more valuable. In terms of grid-group theory, all forms and positions are valuable as they keep each other in check. With a bit of a stretch maybe, the three virtues defined by Rawls, that from the underground of Kymlicka’s typology could fit the grid-group scheme. Justice would refer to hierarchic thinking (rules, law), tolerance (called civility by Kymlicka) refers to Individualism and public spiritedness to the enclavist position. Public spiritedness is defined as ‘the ability and the willingness of people to engage in public discourse about matters of public policy, and to question authority” (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994, p. 4)

The classification of Kymlicka becomes problematic, when skills required to exercise citizenship are firmly linked to a particular type. It could be argued that people in the hierarchical position would also engage in public discourse and the persons with individualist orientation will also be prepared to question authority. Kymlicka’s main concern are minorities and their representation in dominant types of citizenship, which makes matters more complicated. It could even be argued that the lack of attention for a fatalist (isolates) thought style effectively blocks the way to examining the ways to emancipate groups that are excluded by dominant modes of citizenship.

In a frequently quoted article, Westheimer and Kahne (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) depart from theoretical models and explore teachers’ views, which are eventually also grouped in two types along the low group – high group axis, highlighting two aspects: goal (good vs. critical citizen) and focus (knowledge vs. attitudes). Thus, one group of teachers they found adhered to ‘personally responsible citizenship’, law abiding, participating in the community, respectful and patriotic. The other group was less commonly pursued, ‘justice oriented,’ with an accent on critical social analysis, and more likely to address systemic change. These two views can be labeled hierarchic and egalitarian, respectively. I suspect, based on the descriptions, that the individualist thought style was lost due to the focus on one dimension only. A third type was labeled as ‘participatory.’

The authors discuss some ‘inherent conflicts’ in the typology. They see the diversity of views as ‘dual goals’, where understanding of social and political

---

13 The three types were confirmed in a later study by (Patterson et al., 2012).
issues is not always compatible with fostering participation. I think that these can be addressed if their findings are placed in the grid-group scheme. Rather than addressing only low and high group, it is possible to see the two versions of the ‘personally responsible citizen’ as hierarchic (patriotic character education) and a hybrid between hierarchical and egalitarian (‘participatory citizen’). Both value membership in a community, but the latter one is more equity and improvement oriented.

Similarly, the influential Eurydice evaluation reports (Eurydice, 2005, 2012) use a classification consisting of four areas: political literacy, followed by critical thinking and analytic skills, then values, attitudes and behaviors, and finally active citizenship, which is seen as the proof of the pudding: the result of the successful implementation of the elements in the other areas. These areas, however, acquire different meanings in the context of the grid-group thought styles. For each of these four areas, the accents will be differently chosen. Critical and analytic skills are taught by all, but with different purposes and in different contexts, as already discussed. Thus, comparing approaches to teaching critical skills among teachers adhering to different thought styles cannot be a one-step procedure. Since these four areas are used as a basis for monitoring and evaluating citizenship education activities, placing them in the grid-group force-field could prevent a great deal of confusion.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I presented the advantages of grid-group theory as a framework for mapping teachers’ views. In particular, I explained why the framework is so suitable for a cross-country comparison at the level of individual teachers. I also demonstrated how this framework builds upon other research and typologies by providing them with a solid theoretical background and a check for completeness. I also introduced the force-field of different aspects within which any possible type of teachers’ views could be positioned. The ascribed meanings of the aspects as well as their mutual connections and tensions was outlined. The four ideal types of teachers’ views emerging from the particular ways to resolve these tensions was described. The chapter ended with an illustration of the possible use of the force-field typology to map the existing discourse on citizenship education.

Now that the force-field is described in its main aspects, it can be used as a common context for a conversation with teachers to explore their position on these aspects, and to find common denominators and significant differences in their views. In the next chapter, I will describe the research design based on Q methodology as the most suitable tool to build upon the theoretical model.
Appendix 1 Typologies of citizenship education in the grid-group force field
The references correspond to the numbers of the scheme

1. (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001) 
2. (Hoskins, Villalba, & Saisana, 2012) 
3. (Heater, 2004) 
4. (Dejaeghere & Hooghe, 2009) 
5. (Kerr, 1999) 
6. (Banks & Nguyen, 2010) 
7. (Evans, 2006) 
8. (Bron, 2006) 
9. (Marshall, 1950) 
10. (Schudson, 1998) 
11. (Frazer, 2009) 
12. (Frazer, 2000) 
13. (Kymlicka, 1996) 
14. (Crick, 1998) 
15. (van Gunsteren & voor het Regeringsbeleid, 1992) 
16. (Putnam, 1995) 
17. (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004) 
18. (Leenders, Veugelers, & De Kat, 2008) 
20. (Myers, 2007) 
21. (Halstead & Pike, 2006)
Chapter Three.
Research Design: Q-Methodology Approach in Mapping Teachers’ Voices

In order to address the empirical questions of this study, I employed Q methodology as the most suitable method. Q methodology is applied by researchers in various fields, with a range of research goals, settings, and methodological preferences. In the last 20 years, Q methodology has been used in a constantly expanding area of research and is becoming increasingly mainstream (Brown, 1980; Dziopa & Ahern, 2011; B. F. McKeown & Thomas, 2013; Watts & Stenner, 2012). Q methodology has been used to explore teacher’s views (Barnes, Angle, & Montgomery, 2015; Elhoweris & Alsheikh, 2004; Øverland, Thorsen, & Størksen, 2012; Ramlo & McConnell, 2008; Reid, 1999), views on citizenship (Theiss-Morse, 1993) and teachers’ views on citizenship education\(^\text{14}\) (Anderson et al., 1997).

As it is the case with any expanding academic community, the modification and adaptations of the methodology also increase (Dziopa & Ahern, 2011; Wolf et al., 2011). A number of scholars insist on the promotion and preservation of the original methodology for the study of subjectivity as developed by Stephenson (Stephenson, 1953) and as further popularized by Brown (Brown, 1980). Others see it more as a research tool to explore diversities of views and opinions (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002; Durning, 1999; Hoppe & Jeliazkova, 2006), to unpack hidden meaning and gaps in discourses (B. Burke, 1998; Cuppen, 2010; Wolf, 2004b). It is possible to talk about a spectrum in using Q, with a strong quantitative orientation on the one side (Block, 2008; Van Exel & de Graaf, 2005) and an interpretivist/constructivist one (Stenner, 2009) on the other side. The former stream tends to use larger respondent samples, rigid rules of computation, and theory-driven Q-sampling. This approach appeals to researchers ‘that seek to persuade by use of large sample sizes, dense narratives, and/or mesmerizing triangulation assertions’ (Burke, 2015, p. 14). The latter see in Q an instrument to explore and structure diverse and/or overlooked discourses, to co-create meanings in an open dialogue with respondents, in a fashion which is more akin to ethnography, to

\(^{14}\) The study was carried out in the USA and was built upon an different framework. It produced interesting results relevant to the American context and time period.
take personal ‘bias’ seriously instead of attempting to eradicate it, and to ensure a relationship of trust between researcher and respondent.

My choice is for an interpretivist/constructivist use of Q methodology. It is my conviction that the combination of quantitative techniques (inverted factor analysis) and qualitative data interpretation (interviews) allows the researcher to transcend the qualitative/quantitative turf war of approaches. Below, when discussing the particular steps in the Q study, I will explain my choices at specific steps where necessary.

This chapter offers a step-by-step description of the Q methodology research, as it was carried out in this particular case. In the flowchart (figure 9), the steps of the research involving Q are indicated. The subtitles of the chapter follow the scheme. This allows readers to skip parts of the chapter, if they are sufficiently familiar with the method in order to understand how the results presented in the next chapter were obtained.

Q methodology is invented by Stephenson (Stephenson, 1953) as a way to delve into subjectivity in a structured way. It is a combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques, involving statement rankings, face-to-face interviews and other ways (written questionnaires, group interviews) of obtaining qualitative data, and factor analysis. As a result of the factor analysis\(^{15}\), groups of people are identified who share particular patterns of thinking. Q methodology has been employed in a wide range of disciplines and has proven to be an excellent tool for revealing complex belief systems and assumptions. A particular advantage of Q methodology for a comparative study is the creation of a common context within which participants with different backgrounds can engage in a dialogue with each other, but not with the interviewer: they all comment on the same set of statements. At the same time, respondents are encouraged to bring in their own ‘bias’ (subjectivity in terms of Stephenson) in their comments and interpretations, which yields a rich ground for comparative work. In addition, Q methodology allows for rigorous analysis and reliable results while working with a relatively small number of respondents, which makes the method also cost-effective and practical. Finally, the insights obtained through Q methodology research form a steady basis for constructing larger (quantitative) studies, which can address issues of representativity, and (cross-country) diversity in a more adequate and empirically grounded manner (see Brown, 1993).

Four major steps are involved in every Q study (figure 9): first, creation of a set of statements on the topic at hand; second, obtaining q-sorting data; third,

\(^{15}\) Contrary to ‘common’ factor analysis, which computes clusters variables, Q methodology factor analysis clusters people with similar patterns of response.
Figure 9 Flowchart research design
factor analysis and interview analysis; four, factor descriptions. This particular study also involves a fifth step, a cross-country comparison, which will be explained at the end of this chapter.

**STEP 1: CREATE A Q-SAMPLE**

A Q study works with a set of statements called a Q-sample. The statements reflect a variety of views and perspectives on the topic at hand. The first stage involves mapping the so-called ‘concourse’.

**MAPPING THE CONCOURSE**

The concourse is a term used by Stephenson (Brown, 1980; Stephenson, 1953) to signify 'the talk in the community' on a particular topic at hand. A concourse is only fluidly demarcated and does not have clear membership. The researcher’s responsibility at the stage of mapping the breadth of depth of the concourse is paramount. Different techniques for mapping the concourse exist. Most include a combination of literature review and conversations (formal and informal). Also, depending on the goals of the study, the concourse can be framed in a strictly theory-driven way, completely a-theoretical way (just gather all available views) or various mixes of both. The Q-sample in this study was constructed through a mix of literature study, explorative conversations, and grid-group theory as a scope-and-breadth check device.

**Literature review of academic, professional, and policy documents**

The literature review was the preliminary step in mapping the concourse. It included broad reading on literature covering roughly: different views on citizenship and citizenship education; citizenship education programs in different countries - description, reflection, criticism; empirical (comparative) studies on different aspects of citizenship education; available policy documents on citizenship education at European and national level; also countries such as England, USA, Australia, Germany were included, as well as East European countries other than Bulgaria and Croatia; empirical studies on teachers views and perceptions on different aspects of citizenship education, social sciences, and political education (see as well references in chapters One and Two).

The process of literature review is not a mechanical one, of mere extraction of statements. Interpretation, structuring and developing a 'feel' of the pertinence of the topics and views at hand are of crucial importance.
Explorative (pilot) interviews with experts and practitioners

In addition to the literature review, pilot unstructured interviews were held in 2010 with 11 Dutch experts and practitioners, including two teachers, four teacher trainers, two textbook authors, two experts involved in citizenship and political education at an European level, and one social science curriculum expert. Since this was the beginning of the research project, the interviews were intended mostly to get a feel of 'what was going on' in the field of citizenship education, what the important issues were and whether there was indeed a diversity of positions and views on the topic. For practical reasons, the pilots included Dutch respondents only. These were complemented by the literature study covering international sources, including Eastern Europe, and combined with my own personal background and experience in the region as well as a number of informal talks to people in the field from Bulgaria and Croatia.

Statement construction

The construction of statements is a crucial stage in Q methodology and requires a particular responsibility and accountability from the researcher (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002; Durning, 1999). This being said, there is no magic formula for creating a concourse and the subsequent set of statements (Paige & Morin, 2014). Notes from the literature review and from the pilot interviews (audio-recordings) formed the basis of a long list of 131 statements, obtained by a combination of open coding technique (identifying topics of importance) until a point of saturation was achieved, and no new topics and views appeared to emerge. Simultaneously, the 'force-field' framework was developed, as it gradually became clear that many existing classifications of views, as well as implicit and explicit preferences for one aspect or another, could be classified in the grid-group field. The framework has the function of a sampling frame only, a point of departure, an initial aid to research, similar to 'the triangle removed once the balls are set for a game of 8-ball' (Wolf et al., 2011). The typology and its consisting aspects presented in detail in chapter two, was used to ensure a sufficient spreading of the statements across different views and themes. Eventually, the statements were reduced to 41 and organized in a table as follows:
Table 1 Q-statement selection matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIAS /ASPECT</th>
<th>INDIVIDUALIST</th>
<th>HIERARCHIC</th>
<th>FATALIST</th>
<th>EGALIATARIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: CRITICAL/GOOD CITIZEN</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>3, 13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6, 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROACH: Indoctrination/Neutrality</td>
<td>24, 30, 34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20, 31</td>
<td>26, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN: RIGHTS/OBLIGATIONS</td>
<td>16, 35</td>
<td>7, 33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE: COACH/SUPERVISOR</td>
<td>12, 14</td>
<td>5, 18, 21</td>
<td>19, 28</td>
<td>10, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS: ATTITUDES/KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>9, 11, 22</td>
<td>4, 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion/exclusion</td>
<td>39, 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers correspond to the list in Table 2.

Table 2 Q-sort statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students need an environment in which they could discuss the problems of society without anyone pointing a finger at them and correcting them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We need to teach young people to be independent and to make their own decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I encourage my students to get involved in social life through the established institutions and to listen to expert opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. These are the rules, these are the laws. I think this is the bulk of citizenship education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The teacher should be a model of honest and decent behavior, this is the core of citizenship education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We have to teach young people to be critical and not to believe everything they see and hear in the media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The teacher should make it clear to the students that they need to participate in public life if they want to advance in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Citizenship education should contribute to the development of competences required by the labor market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. We should pay more attention to knowledge: to look at how things really are, instead of just discussing how they should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is not enough only to engage in discussions about how to improve the world, it is important to give young people the chance to participate in real life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. The teacher should stress first of all the anatomy of government: the separation of powers, the functions and prerogatives of the institutions, the different types and purposes of democratic systems.

12. I am pleased when my students begin to discover structures and regularities and when they begin to understand the world of politics.

13. The goal is to educate thinking citizens who can employ various methods, theories and models to explore the world around them, and who are able to assess facts and to arrive at conclusions.

14. It is important that students learn to defend their views in political discussions and social debate; this is why I help them to develop research and discussion skills.

15. Citizenship education should focus on the development of skills and attitudes, much needed for students to survive in today’s complex world.

16. Young people may learn the law by heart, but this does not mean they will necessarily obey it.

17. Students should learn to take into account the common good, rather than follow only their private interests.

18. I feel that I am first and foremost a teacher and only then a subject specialist. The subject matter is only secondary.

19. Controversial political problems should not be discussed in class.

20. Citizenship education should not be associated with politics, because individual acts of compassion and generosity are more important.

21. The subject “as it is called in the country” is in fact citizenship education. Both are aimed at educating future citizens.

22. Young people should acquire knowledge about democracy: how it works and why is it worth defending it.

23. It is very important that students learn how to analyse social problems, but also select the most important ones.

24. The teacher should present to the class only established facts about society. Social norms are not a suitable topic for teaching.

25. Official citizenship programs are essentially uncritical: democracy is good, we are a democratic state, therefore we are good.

26. The democratic approach to inquiry and debate should be demonstrated in class, in order to encourage students’ interest in politics.

27. Students cannot learn democracy at school, because school itself is not a democratic institution.

28. Citizenship education means to hold students accountable for their behaviour and to get them involved charity and community activities.

29. It is better that the teacher discusses norms and values instead of stiffly adhering to neutrality.
30. The teacher should not disclose his or her political views to the students. Quite the opposite, only broadly accepted social and political values should be discussed.

31. My task as a teacher is to defend state policies and interests, because I am an employee of a state financed educational institution.

32. I am obliged as a citizen and a teacher to stir things up if necessary, and not only through the so called legitimate political channels.

33. In my opinion, citizenship education is an emergency measure by the state against the obviously growing lack of social tolerance.

34. We should not declare any ideology to be correct; instead, we should give students an opportunity to get acquainted with various ideas about political and social order.

35. The most important task of citizenship education is to inform students about their civil and political rights and freedoms.

36. Citizenship education should be of some use to society, for instance by contributing to greater safety.

37. Citizenship education is an outdated concept, because it conveys to students the values of the middle class.

38. Civic obedience means more than just obeying the law, it means obedience to higher personal standards and higher social interests.

39. Students should be made to realize that they live in a world of growing interdependence. Even though we do not respect each other, we still depend on each other.

40. Citizenship education should cultivate a spirit of unity, loyalty to the state and national pride.

41. For most students, politics is way too abstract and incomprehensible, it belongs more to elite schools.

Five issues are important to mention:

First, Q methodology is concerned with discovering and identifying views and not with quantifying known views. Thus, Table 1 does not indicate any ‘assigning’ of a statement to a particular bias or a ‘measurement’ attached to individual statements. It only has the function of ordering and double-checking of the breadth and scope of the set of statements. This is why an even number of statements was not necessarily sought. Also, some statements could be classified in two positions, for example ‘being critical towards the media’, which fits the shared ‘critical citizen’ position of the individualist and the egalitarian ideal type.

Second, the interpretation of the statements as belonging to a particular cell in Table 1 was the choice of the researcher at the time of constructing the statements. This initial interpretation is only a point of departure for the analysis later.
In the process of Q sorting, respondents are assigning meanings and interpretations to the statements, depending on their general pattern of thinking and the overall structure of their views as expressed during the interviews. To be sure, the choices and the interpretations were doubled-checked extensively during a day-long session with a graduate student familiar with the theoretical framework and with grid-group theory in general, and only statements that were sufficiently uncontested were included in the final list of 41 statements. Still, Q methodology requires a great degree of humbleness by the researcher who should not resort to her own understanding of being ‘right’ and impose an a priori understanding of any statement on the respondents (Brown, 1993).

Third, the last aspect in the table – inclusion/exclusion – is not part of the theoretical framework, as I felt that the topic of identity and national loyalty belongs to a layer of discourse on citizenship education that was certainly underplayed in the European documents on the topic. However, the mere frequency of mentioning the theme of national identity, patriotism, and globalization in the literature, called for including the statements in the sample.

Fourth, another consideration in choosing the statements was the potential to generate response and subsequent conversation on the topic at hand. This is the reason some statements deliberately contain two parts, one offered as a specification of the other. This makes the sorting by respondents more complicated and therefore contextually rich: the respondent needs to search for his or her own arguments and preferences while responding to the statement.

Fifth, an obvious last step was to eliminate redundant statements: statements that looked similar were discarded. Wherever possible, direct quotes from interviews were used as an input or the statements were adjusted from written sources to speak as directly as possible to the teachers. In this way, I adhered to the recommendation of Watts & Stenner (2012. p. 59) to ensure that the statement set ‘cover all ground smoothly and effectively without overlap, unnecessary repetition or redundancy.’

A final check was provided by the respondents themselves: when especially asked at the end of the interviews, they did not indicate overlaps or serious gaps in the statement set.

### Statement Translation and Editing

The use of the statements for international comparative purposes created additional challenges with translation. After the list of statements was finalized in English (which meant translating some quotes from Dutch), the sentences were

---

16 Credit it due to Roald Vogels, whose sharp mind and critical attitude made a difference at this stage of research.
translated back to Dutch. The English version was translated into Bulgarian, calibrated with Bulgarian colleagues and translated back to English. The same procedure was applied to Croatia. Thus, the list of statements in English was used as a reference only, while the statements used for the actual interviews were in the three corresponding languages.

**Step 2: Q-Sorting Interviews**

As a first step in the interview process, we turn to the selection of respondents in the three countries.

**Selection of respondents**

The respondents were chosen through a similar procedure in all three countries—through a mix of initial professional contacts and a snow-balling technique. The respondents were all teachers at high schools in the respective countries, held the required academic qualification for the school subject associated directly with citizenship education and taught it at the moment of taking the interviews. No additional qualifications were required. A balance was sought between a reasonable demographic spreading and travel distances, particularly in Bulgaria and Croatia. The teachers were contacted in advance and personally agreed to take part in the study.

A note on representative samples of respondents: for the reasons explained above, a Q study does not require representative samples. This means that no respondent ‘represents’ a group of other respondents on the basis of demographics or other characteristics. Of course, a reasonable diversity is always useful, and it was taken into account in forming the groups of teachers in the three countries. I will come back to the implications of the respondents’ group composition later, when I discuss the analysis of the outcomes.

In Bulgaria, 17 teachers were interviewed from 6 different places, which included the capital Sofia, three big cities and two small towns. 16 of them held university degrees equivalent to a Master, 12 in philosophy and 4 in history; one had a PhD in philosophy. The teachers taught at 16 secondary schools varying from elite (high-profile gymnasias) to vocational. The youngest respondent was 29 years of age with 5 years teaching experience and the oldest one was 60 years old with over 35 years of teaching experience. There were 11 women and 6 men in the sample.

In Croatia, in 2012, 17 respondents were interviewed from 10 cities and towns of various sizes, including the capital Zagreb, from 15 schools. All the teachers had academic level of training in on the areas: sociology, philosophy, political science, law and economy. There were 2 men and 15 women, ranging in age from 32 to 60. Their teaching experience ranged from five to over 35 years.
In the Netherlands, 28 teachers from 23 schools at the upper secondary level were interviewed in 2013. Their academic background was in the social sciences (political science, sociology, and the like), with a small number (3) educated in history. 24 respondents held Master degrees, three respondents had bachelor degrees and one a PhD. The experience of the respondents varied from two to over twenty years. Geographically, the respondents represent all provinces in the Netherlands, with the exception of Limburg and Zeeland. The number of men and women was 16 and 12, respectively.

**Face-to-face interviews with respondents**

For a Q methodology research, it is crucial that the respondents are taking part in the study voluntarily and willing to share their views as openly as possible. The research strategy is based on establishing and maintaining a relationship of trust between the researcher and the respondent. In this sense, the researcher does not just collect data; rather, the researcher and the respondent are involved in a process of co-creation. The most important function of the Q-sample is to create a common space for an indirect dialogue between the respondents. By reacting to the statements, the respondents engage in a conversation with peers expressing these views.

I will come back to this topic during the description of a typical Q-sorting interview.

**Sorting forms (ranked statements)**

The interviews involved a Q-sorting procedure. The respondent was presented with a set of 41 cards, one card per statement, in random order. The respondent was then invited to read out loud the statement on the card and to sort it initially in three rough piles – agree, disagree, undecided. Later on, the respondent ranks the statements in a more fine-grained fashion, according to a fixed distribution scheme:

![Sorted cards at the end of a Q-sorting interview.](Photo 1)
Every empty cell represents a statement, which is ranked from (-4) or ‘most disagree’ to (+4) ‘most agree.’ The more extreme the choice, the less available slots there are. The implication is that, contrary to a Likert scale, where one assigns scores to individual statements, here the choice is made by comparing each and every statement to all others. The function of the statements is thus distinctly different in a Likert scale and in a Q-sorting (McKeown, 2001). The ranking is as important as the comments on the statement. Consequently, the statements can also be perceived as a set of interview questions (Burke, 2015, p. 71), as a trigger for a dialogue with distant peers, other teachers in other countries in our case.

I chose to work with forced distribution (every statement has to fit in a slot as shown in the scheme), although it is possible to allow more freedom in ranking and it is regularly done (Brown, 1971). I have learned from experience with Q studies (Hoppe & Jeliazkova, 2006; Jeliazkova & Westerheijden, 1999) that forced distributions have an advantage: to force the respondents to walk that extra mile and look for really good arguments to select one statement over another. In this particular study, given that citizenship education is complex and multifaceted, teachers would initially agree with many statements. After all, knowledge is important, but so are attitudes, and skills, and critical thinking is important, but so is caring for the others etc. etc. Eventually, the respondents discovered that one of these aspects matters more to them and they also revealed the reasons for their choice in the interviews. For this reason alone, the Q-sorting interview is indispensable.

17 The upper row of cells indicate the degree of agreement, from -4 to +4; the raw underneath it indicates the number of cards that are allowed per column, to help the respondent in the process of sorting.
18 Only one respondent did not manage to comply with the forced distribution rule. She had very strong reasons for not doing so. Her answers were recorded and used for further computations unchanged.
Interview recordings (thinking out loud)

The researcher encouraged the respondent to think out loud as much as possible and to explain his or her choices. Follow up questions involved clarification, examples, inquiries about other experiences of the researcher, inquiries about underlying reasons and assumptions. The following becomes quickly apparent:

First, no matter how carefully designed, edited and proofread the sample of statements may be, respondents never fail to come up with yet another reading, yet another interpretation, yet another accent on one particular word of the statement, which changes its meaning altogether. The statements are interpreted in the overall ‘state of mind’ of the respondent and make sense within the whole pattern of sorting. Good listening skills are essential for the researcher, as part of an effort to stay as close as possible to the respondents’ train of thought.

Second, I am always amazed by the way people are conditioned to take a passive role in a research situation, to expect to be ‘caught’ through all kinds of ‘bias detection’ devices. It is almost disturbing to see articulate men and women look at me as a researcher for approval and often with the explicit question – is that the ‘right’ answer? – as they are conditioned to be seen as an object of research only. It takes time to re-establish trust and to reassure the respondents that I am only interested in their own take on the topic, that I am genuinely interested in their own views, not in any official or ‘politically correct’ positions; that I honestly do not know what a ‘right’ interpretation of any card is, and that I certainly do not secretly know how they ‘score’ on the exercise! The experience is revealing and worth going through, if one is serious about matching a research question with a suitable instrument. One cannot ask people to reflect on their own work, to reveal political, ideological and pedagogical preferences, while at the same time assuming a superior position of someone who is there to ‘measure’ their performance and assign them to one ready-made classification or another. In this sense, the experience of Q-interviews is in itself a proof for the suitability of the method.

Third, in the process of talking, respondents delve deeply into the topic and indeed engage in a conversation with their peers as represented in the cards with statements. Because they do not respond to the researcher directly, it is easier for them to be less than polite about some statements, on the one hand, and to take them seriously, on the other. They search for their own reasons and underlying assumptions and are sometimes surprised to discover these during the sorting.

Fourth, related to the previous point, the process of sorting is a process of articulation of meaning, and not just ‘data harvesting’. The data is not ‘out there’ to be gathered and harvested by the researcher; it gets unpacked, developed and literally constructed during the conversation. Respondents frequently mention that they are surprised by their strong reactions to certain topics, or by discovering what they really care about (e.g. ‘I discovered I was less conservative than I
thought…”). They also spontaneously distinguish between their own views and the views of others (“I know that most of my colleagues think otherwise, but…”). More than once I have been asked to send a transcript to the respondent, as they felt they created something of value for them during the conversation. They also reflect on the process of sorting as rewarding by itself. As one respondent put it, she did not feel she was ‘squeezed like a lemon’ but taken seriously and invited to participate, to actively contribute to the outcomes of research.19

At the end of the interviews, respondents were asked to summarize and label the overall pattern they created in sorting the statements. They were also asked if there were statements missing. The teachers did occasionally volunteer other topics, which fell largely in two categories – a totally new concourse, e.g. students, or variations of the existing statements, in line of the respondents’ general tenet of interpretation and sorting. The question about missing statements is an additional check on the adequacy of the Q-sample. In a few cases, suggestions were made, none of which can be seen as substantially changing the scope or the depth of the Q-sample. Also, in some cases I asked respondents to speculate how their colleagues would sort the sample. The question helped to demarcate the respondents’ position more clearly.

All interviews were audio-recorded and used in the subsequent data-analysis. Obviously, the quotes used in the following chapters were translated into English from the three respective languages.

**STEP 3. DATA ANALYSIS**

Q methodology is concerned with identifying possible views on a subject, and not with the prevalence of particular views. This is important for understanding the nature of the analysis and the implications of the obtained results.

Although the two components – quantitative and qualitative – are described here separately, in practice they only acquire meaning in combination. Factor analysis informs and frames the reading and interpretation of the qualitative data, and the interviews in turn shed light on the numerical outcomes, by offering explanations of patterns, similarities and differences. Usually, a number of iteration cycles occur during the analysis, going back and forth between the two sets of data: the numbers pose questions which needs to be answered through the interviews, and the interviews in turn suggest insights which are tested against the numbers. As a result, a general portrait, a narrative is created which represents the views of the particular factor.

---

19 These features of Q methodology make it a suitable method for engaging in deliberative exercises in diverse policy-making settings, a topic that beyond the scope of the chapter.
Below, I will first explain the types of calculations and quantitative outcomes, and then the process of interpretation.

**Quantitative analysis**

**Factor extraction and rotation**

A standard statistical package used for Q methodology studies, PQMethod (Schmolck, 2002), was used to process the data. The sorted statements were entered into the program in three separate sets – one for each country. In addition, a combined set of all respondents was created and also processed. PQMethod employs computational methods and default procedures which are widely tested and accepted by the academic community familiar with Q methodology. In this particular case, a PCA factor extraction routine was used in a combination with a Varimax rotation to maximize the differences between the factors.

The most important data outcomes can be found in the subsequent chapters (see list of tables and figures). Further, I will explain the kind of outcomes and how they were employed in the overall interpretation of the results.

**Factors are groups of respondents with similar views**

The meaning of a factor is, simply put, a group of respondents (in this study a group of teachers) who adhere to approximately the same pattern of sorting. This means that the respondents, and not the statements, are the variables, contrary to conventional studies, where factor analysis groups statements in clusters. A factor is thus represented by an ideal type of sorting pattern. The respondents are grouped according to the extent to which they have sorted their statements in a pattern similar to the ideal one for this particular factor. Typically, a respondent is ‘loading’ on a factor if their pattern of sorting is at least 50% similar to the ‘ideal’ one, represented in this factor. All sets of ‘ideal’ rankings are presented in the respective chapters (see list of tables and figures).

There are also confounding respondents, people who belong to more than one group. Their views are also interesting to take into account, as they often offer unique meta-reflective perspectives and/or explicate the common grounds between the different factors.

Thus, the number of factors indicates the number of distinct views revealed within the sample. Q methodology has no claims on extending the findings outside the sample, so we cannot make any inferences regarding the total number of possible views existing in a general population. In our case, say, if all teachers in
Bulgaria were included, there might be other types of views revealed. Even more, sometimes the absence of a particular expected type of view may pose questions worth exploring in further research.

It is important to keep in mind that no claims on representation can be made, particularly no claims based on respondents’ attributes such as gender, age, experience. Sometimes these attributes (e.g. young) are used to explain a particular respondent’s position, but in no case this would imply that, say, all young teachers in the country express similar views.

As it is indicated in Figure 9, four sets of factors are presented and analyzed in the following chapters: five factors for Bulgaria, four each for Croatia and the Netherlands, and five for all the respondents from the three countries combined. These results will be discussed in the next four chapters and are mentioned here to make the further steps in the analysis easier to follow.

**Correlation between factors**

The correlation between factors indicates the degree of similarity between the factors. A high correlation would mean greater similarity. A low correlation means that the views presented are considerably distinct from each other. Further analysis of the data is employed to indicate the areas in which the factors are similar or different from each other. The statistical difference is indicative only and has to be substantiated by the qualitative material.

**Consensus statements and distinguishing statements**

The PQMethod package generates an output with includes, besides the factor extractions, a list of consensus and distinguishing statements per factor. Consensus statements are the ones that are ranked in a similar fashion by all factors. This could be a positive consensus, i.e. all factors approving (strongly) of a certain statement; a negative consensus, i.e. a (strong) rejection of certain statements, and consensus on items ranked as neutral. When the qualitative data is analyzed, it becomes clear, again, that the numbers do not tell us everything. It so happens that some statements are accepted or rejected on very different grounds, so what looks like consensus reveals difference in opinion, after all. Also, in the ‘neutral’ category, it turns out that some statements are really considered uninteresting and other are seen as ‘taken for granted’, ‘uncontested’ and therefore not worth discussing. All these nuances are taken into account in the description of the factor profiles in the next chapter, as explained in more detail below.

The distinguishing statements are statements that are unique for a particular factor. They are not to be mistaken with ‘typical statements:’ they are not neces-
sarily the ones that constitute the core narrative of a factor. In Q methodology, the overall pattern of ranking is important, and thus the statements in relation to each other: no particular statements are singled out as ‘typical’ for a factor.

**Statement rankings per factor**

In Figure 9 (flowchart) at the beginning of the chapter, the next piece of quantitative data analysis output are the standardized ranking scores per factor, which are used to construct the ‘ideal’ factor sortings, as explained above. The ideal sortings are used as a guideline in the further steps in data analysis. They should be considered only indicative, due to the obvious limitations of assigning average ‘scores’ of eigenvalues (unique to each ranked statement) back to ranking positions (further in the data output these are indicated as ‘normalized factor scores’).

**Qualitative analysis**

**Making sense of respondents sortings and profiles**

The quantitative information makes sense only in conjunction with the information received from the respondents – their stories and explanations are leading in answering questions raised by the numeric outcomes. All elements described above are included in a process of analysis moving back and forth between individual interview data, numeric outcomes, comparison of patterns, back to the interpretation of particular statements, looking for differences and similarities between patterns. It is a creative, iterative process, which resembles more ethnographic work employing grounded theory coding procedures than theory driven checking of pre-set assumptions. In the process of analysis, the initial aspect is used to construct the Q-sample (41 statements) move to the background, while other underlying organizing themes emerge and prove to be more pertinent for distinguishing between the factors.

Unlike what is referred to as ‘common’ R research (variable-oriented), where the analysis is at the level of individual statements, Q researches viewpoints of the respondents. Instead of comparing the different responses to one and the same statement, Q compares the overall sorting of a group of statements, comprising patterns of thinking, the respondents’ views. The meaning and the salience of the themes are determined by listening to the internal logic of the respondent and by paying attention to the (implicit) context.

**Interpreting in terms of grid-group framework**

The grid-group theory framework plays a role at the stage of data interpretation as well. The framework could be seen as the canvass, the playing field
where the respondents, organized in a number of groups, engage in a dialogue with each other and finally determine their position with respect to the others. It is also a highly creative interpretative processes, where the researcher takes the utmost care to stay as close as possible to the authentic voices of the respondents, while at the same time highlighting the underlying core themes, a process of bringing out ‘the bones of the concourse’ as A. Wolf eloquently puts it (Wolf, 2004a; Wolf et al., 2011).

**STEP 4: CONSTRUCT PROFILES (TYPES OF VIEWS)**

The profiles of the ‘ideal’ types of views, called here factors, are thus comprised of five elements:

The first element is an analysis of the views and opinions of the factor ‘loaders’, including a comparison between their individual sortings. Whenever appropriate, I have used direct quotes. The quotes are deliberately not traced to individual respondents, as they represent the voice of the factor, the type of view presented in the profile. The number of the statements discussed is mentioned, to make it easier for the reader by providing more context. The second element is a comparison between the views and opinions of respondents loading on different factors, in order to explicate the differences between these factors. Third, a comparison between the ‘ideal’ factor sortings, as described above and presented in chapter seven. In order to describe something, it is always necessary to describe, as well, what it is not; to demarcate the boundaries between the types of views we have found. Fourth, a discussion of the common themes in conjunction with a discussion of the factor correlations. The higher the correlation between the factors, the more common themes there will be expected.

The process of analysis is made as transparent as possible, but not unconditionally replicable. The researcher is accountable for the outcome of a process with a largely hermeneutic nature (Shinebourne, 2009). The researchers’ judgment, based not only on the collected data and procedures, but also on general knowledge, analytic and association skills, language skills, life experience, taste, and intuition, leads to a product open for scrutiny but not completely replicable.

I have made great effort to satisfy what Maxwell (Maxwell, 1992) has defined as interpretive validity: the ability of the research to illustrate the subjective meanings disclosed by the participants. The voice of the respondents, as co-creators of the types of view presented further, remains central, with my role as a researcher at the background as a facilitator and a mediator of a dialogue within a virtual community of teachers responding to the ideas presented in the Q-sample. From this perspective, a Q-analysis is only a snap-shot, as detailed and as focused as
possible, which answers some questions and poses many new ones. The product of a Q-analysis is an invitation to peers not only to control and revise the outcomes, but more important, to engage in a conversation in search of answers to the newly occurred questions in the future.

Finally, for each group (factor) profile, I created a name and a motto. The name refers to the main underlying themes of the profile as explicated in the data, and the motto is a direct quote from the interviews. The outcomes of this analysis are presented in chapters Four, Five, and Six, for Bulgaria, Croatia, and the Netherlands, respectively.

**Step 5 (Not in Chart): Compare Countries, Compare Factors**

The last step in the analysis is to compare the outcomes between the different countries. True to the Q-methodology approach, the comparison is based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative data and consists of the following components:

**Compare country factors to factors obtained by combined factor analysis**

As a first step, the data of all the respondents were combined and a factor analysis was performed. The main rationale for this operation was to keep the level of comparison at the individual teacher level rather than at the level of generic national context. The second important advantage of performing a joint factor analysis of the data was that not only differences, but common themes, structural similarities between the factors were exposed and provided a basis for a future dialogue between teachers from different countries. A third important advantage is the possibility to highlight confounded sorts (double loaders), as a number of them defined the new, combined factors. In this way, their perspectives did not get disregarded and ‘lost’ in the process of interpretation.

A possible objection to such a procedure could be the unequal distribution of the number of respondents in the three samples (a larger Dutch sample). However, two circumstances mitigate the objection. First, the samples are not representative and in this sense the number of respondents loading to a particular factor is not of any substantial importance for the interpretation of this factor. And second, the Dutch group exhibited highly correlated views. This means that the total variation in the general sample would not become ‘overshadowed’ by the variation revealed in the Dutch group.
INTERPRET SIMILARITIES, DIFFERENCES, COMMON THEMES

The second step, similarly to the steps described in the scheme, was to interpret the data obtained from the factor analysis. The narratives of the ‘combined’ factors were constructed, based on the interview data. Shifts in common themes and emerging differences compared to the three national samples were registered.

COMPARE THE COMBINED FACTORS WITH EACH SET OF COUNTRY FACTORS

As a final step in the analysis, the combined factors were compared with the country factors. On basis of the general factor descriptions and properties such as loading respondents, distinguishing statements and strong preferences, the country factors could be grouped together and related to the combined factors, which then took the role of meta-reference to help outline similarities and differences between the particular countries.

Additionally, relevant issues from the educational and political contexts of the three countries are brought in to offer possible clarifications and explanations of the findings.

The results of this inter-country comparison are presented in chapter Seven.

Now that the research design is explained in detail, the results can be presented. The following chapter, Four, presents the finding from Bulgaria. Chapter Five describes the results in Croatia. Chapter Six is the case of the Netherlands. Finally, chapter Seven focuses on a comparison of the teachers’ views from the three countries. These four chapters complete the part of the book which presents the empirical findings.
Chapter Four.
Bulgaria: five types of views, a shared sense of responsibility

This chapter presents the empirical results from the Q-sort study in Bulgaria. It begins with a short introduction about the context of citizenship education in Bulgaria. Then, the five types of distinct teachers’ views found as a result of the Q-sorting interviews and subsequent analysis, as explained in the previous chapter, are presented, as well as a discussion on the common themes and issues in the Bulgarian context.20

BACKGROUND

A few words on the educational system in Bulgaria: the country has a comprehensive system of public schools, where children are mandatory enrolled at age 7 at the elementary school, 1st grade. Secondary school begins after 6th, 7th, or 8th grade, depending on the profile of the secondary school. Formally, Bulgaria has no differentiated levels of secondary education final qualifications. In practice, there are many types of schools ranging from low-skill vocational education to high-profile gymnasias, such as bilingual education schools, often combined with other specializations in the humanities or the exact sciences, as well as the modern business and ICT profiles, which leads to a high degree of hidden segregation in the school system (Kosseva & Hajdinjak, 2011). All of these schools have their own application procedures. Universities do not differentiate formally between different kinds of secondary school diplomas, but also have their own entrance exams.

The private school sector is small and concentrated in a few big cities. The public school system is centralized, with relatively strict state standards and state approved textbooks (though more than one textbook is approved for each subject).

Citizenship had a place in the curriculum as early as 1892, as a subject “Civic studies”, with its own textbook written in 1894. The subject was mainly associated with the current state and political system, depicted as based on universal democratic values in the form of national state and political institutions (Zahariev, 2001). The subject remained a steady part of the curriculum till 1944,

20 Substantial parts of this chapter have appeared in a publication in the Journal of Social Science Education. (Jeliazkova, 2015)
when it was substituted by communist propaganda under the general name ‘ideological disciplines.’ By 1989, at the secondary level these disciplines consisted of Ethics and Law in the 8th grade, Psychology and Logic in the 9th grade, and Social studies (a mix of political science and philosophy) in the 10th grade (Ministry of Education, 2000a). Practically all teachers who worked at the schools before the fall of the communist regime in 1989, continued to do so afterwards. Officially, the political part of the texts was removed and teachers focused on teaching ethics, psychology and philosophy instead.

A new Law of Education was accepted in 2000, as a part of the EU accession efforts of Bulgaria. Citizenship education became important again and promoted to one of the central themes of the curriculum. In a special ordinance (Ministry of Education, 2000b), the educational area “Social sciences and citizenship education” was defined. Citizenship education was described as an interdisciplinary element of the school curriculum, at the basis of youth’s personal development toward social realization through the knowledge, understanding and use of human rights and freedoms, in accordance with the laws of a democratic society.

As in many other European countries (see for comparison Eurydice, 2012), a mixed model of teaching citizenship was established. This means that citizenship education was established as an interdisciplinary study theme, with many subjects contributing and a special designated subject to address the goals more directly. Throughout the school years, history, Bulgarian language and literature, and geography were designated as the contributing subjects, with state standards for citizenship education at all school levels. The legislative requirement is that these standards should be harmonized with the state standards for the separate subjects, but this does not happen in practice (Dishkova, 2003).

At the secondary school level, the disciplines directly concerned with citizenship education are the ones in the so called Philosophy cycle, very similar to the ‘old’ one: Ethics and Law in the 8th grade, Psychology and Logic in the 9th grade, Philosophy in the 10th grade, followed by a newly established subject, “Svjati lichnost” - “World and person”, at the 12th grade (Ministry of Education, 2000a). The latter subject is established as integrating and at the same time practice-oriented, with room for projects and other activities. All the subjects from the cycle are taught by teachers with academic master degrees (including teacher certification) in philosophy mainly, in some cases history teachers and rarely psychology. Geography teachers are also allowed to teach ‘World and person’ but this seldom happens in practice.

The model described above was fully in place at the time of the interviews. There is a new law of education being broadly discussed at the moment of writ-
ing this study, and the new minister of education has announced in February this year his intention to introduce a mandatory subject “Citizenship education” as a part of the school curriculum.\(^{21}\)

Now I move to presenting the empirical results from the interviews with the teachers.

**THE Q-SORT STUDY**

For the purpose of this study, 17 Q-sort interviews with Bulgarian secondary school teachers were conducted in May 2011. The group was selected on voluntary basis, through personal and professional contacts and referrals. A reasonable spreading was sought in terms of age, gender, school type and location. The teachers were from 6 different places, which included the capital Sofia, three big cities and two small towns. All teachers taught the subject “World and person” as well as one or more subjects of the Philosophical Cycle (explained above) to students 15 to 18 years of age. Four of the teachers also taught history. All of them held university degrees equivalent to a Master, 13 in philosophy and 4 in history. The teachers taught at 16 secondary schools varying from elite (high-profile gymnasia) to vocational. The youngest respondent was 29 years of age with 5 years teaching experience and the oldest one was 60 years old with over 35 years of teaching experience. There were 11 women and 6 men in the sample.

I took all the interviews in person in Bulgarian and audio recorded them. The procedure was the same as described in chapter Three.

The Q-sorts were factor analyzed with a routine PQMethod/PCA/Varimax procedure, also described in detail in the previous chapter. A 5-factor solution was chosen, because it allowed for the most meaningful variation between the factors and for the most respondents clearly loading on different factors. Table 2 presents the factor matrix with the number of the factors corresponding to the factor number in the description below. The high loading respondents are indicated in **bold**, the confounding respondents (double loading) are indicated in *italics*. In the analysis, the data from the confounding respondents was taken into account where relevant. This is particularly true for factor 5, which has one high loader and a number of confounding respondents exhibiting similar views in the interviews.

---

\(^{21}\) Minister T. Tanev informally announced his intentions in January 2015, with no official follow-up by August 2015.
Table 3 Factor matrix with individual respondents’ factor loadings in Bulgaria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 x</td>
<td>0.1026</td>
<td>0.0719</td>
<td>0.1806</td>
<td>0.2016</td>
<td>0.8465X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x</td>
<td>0.8028X</td>
<td>-0.1094</td>
<td>-0.1250</td>
<td>0.2766</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x</td>
<td>-0.0596</td>
<td>-0.0238</td>
<td>0.8095X</td>
<td>0.1083</td>
<td>0.0634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 x</td>
<td>0.3237</td>
<td>0.2562</td>
<td>0.1771</td>
<td>0.5069</td>
<td>0.4384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 x</td>
<td>-0.0020</td>
<td>0.7448X</td>
<td>-0.1157</td>
<td>0.0316</td>
<td>0.4464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 x</td>
<td>0.7437X</td>
<td>0.2234</td>
<td>0.2992</td>
<td>0.1010</td>
<td>-0.0714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 x</td>
<td>0.5156</td>
<td>0.0914</td>
<td>0.0237</td>
<td>0.3404</td>
<td>0.5138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 x</td>
<td>0.1914</td>
<td>0.7384X</td>
<td>0.2639</td>
<td>0.2613</td>
<td>-0.1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 x</td>
<td>0.1695</td>
<td>0.0983</td>
<td>0.0786</td>
<td>0.8892X</td>
<td>0.2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 x</td>
<td>0.1108</td>
<td>0.5728X</td>
<td>-0.0274</td>
<td>0.4954</td>
<td>0.1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 x</td>
<td>0.2066</td>
<td>0.1709</td>
<td>0.3517</td>
<td>0.6814X</td>
<td>-0.0207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 x</td>
<td>0.3798</td>
<td>0.1974</td>
<td>0.0188</td>
<td>0.7651X</td>
<td>0.2442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 x</td>
<td>0.4608</td>
<td>0.2927</td>
<td>0.3603</td>
<td>0.2058</td>
<td>0.3776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 x</td>
<td>0.2747</td>
<td>0.3605</td>
<td>0.5166</td>
<td>0.0435</td>
<td>0.3731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 x</td>
<td>0.6217X</td>
<td>0.3318</td>
<td>0.0416</td>
<td>0.4071</td>
<td>0.2615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 x</td>
<td>0.6465X</td>
<td>0.4833</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>0.1718</td>
<td>0.3027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 x</td>
<td>0.5245</td>
<td>-0.1796</td>
<td>0.4909</td>
<td>0.3791</td>
<td>0.2449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% expl.Var</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factors are weakly correlated, as shown in Table 4. Factors 1, 2 and 4 show the most statistical similarities, factor 4 and 5 are associated with each other to a considerable extent, and factor 3 stands out with very low correlations to the factors. This relatively big distance between the different factors is reinforced by the qualitative data.

The normalized factors scores per factor are presented in Table 5. As already explained in the previous chapter, the normalized scores do not reflect in all cases the actual similarities and differences between the factors, but will serve the reader as a compass, when there is reference to particular statements in the factor descriptions further in the chapter. The numbers in the columns indicate the ranking of the statement per factor, ranging from -4 to +4. Similar rankings indicate similar views, however, keep in mind that the comparison between the factors explores the overall patterns of sorting and not only the ranking of individual statements.
Table 4 Correlations between factor scores in Bulgaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4159</td>
<td>0.0941</td>
<td>0.5516</td>
<td>0.3442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4159</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0978</td>
<td>0.4578</td>
<td>0.2992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0941</td>
<td>0.0978</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1834</td>
<td>0.1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.4578</td>
<td>0.1834</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.4054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3442</td>
<td>0.2992</td>
<td>0.1755</td>
<td>0.4054</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Standardized ranking (‘ideal’ rankings) per factor in Bulgaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>STANDARDIZED RANKING PER FACTOR BG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students need an environment in which they could discuss the problems of society without anyone pointing a finger at them and correcting them.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We need to teach young people to be independent and to make their own decisions.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I encourage my students to get involved in social life through the established institutions and to listen to expert opinion.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. These are the rules, these are the laws. I think this is the bulk of citizenship education.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The teacher should be a model of honest and decent behaviour; this is the core of citizenship education.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We have to teach young people to be critical and not to believe everything they see and hear in the media.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The teacher should make it clear to the students that they need to participate in public life if they want to advance in society.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Citizenship education should contribute to the development of competences required by the labour market.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. We should pay more attention to knowledge: to look at how things really are, instead of just discussing how they should be.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. It is not enough only to engage in discussions about how to improve the world, it is important to give young people the chance to participate in real life.  & 1 & 0 & -3 & 4 & -1  \\
11. The teacher should stress first of all the anatomy of government: the separation of powers, the functions and prerogatives of the institutions, the different types and purposes of democratic systems.  & -2 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1  \\
12. I am pleased when my students begin to discover structures and regularities and when they begin to understand the world of politics.  & 2 & 3 & -4 & 0 & -1  \\
13. The goal is to educate thinking citizens who can employ various methods, theories and models to explore the world around them, and who are able to assess facts and to arrive at conclusions.  & 3 & 2 & -1 & 2 & 4  \\
14. It is important that students learn to defend their views in political discussions and social debate; this is why I help them to develop research and discussion skills.  & 3 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 2  \\
15. Citizenship education should focus on the development of skills and attitudes, much needed for students to survive in today’s complex world.  & -1 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 4  \\
16. Young people may learn the law by heart, but this does not mean they will necessarily obey it.  & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & -2  \\
17. Students should learn to take into account the common good, rather than follow only their private interests.  & -1 & 3 & -3 & 1 & 3  \\
18. I feel that I am first and foremost a teacher and only then a subject specialist. The subject matter is only secondary.  & -2 & -2 & 4 & 0 & -3  \\
19. Controversial political problems should not be discussed in class.  & -3 & -1 & 1 & -4 & 1  \\
20. Citizenship education should not be associated with politics, because individual acts of compassion and generosity are more important  & -2 & -3 & -1 & -1 & 1  \\
21. The subject “as it is called in the country” is in fact citizenship education. Both are aimed at educating future citizens.  & -1 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 1  \\
22. Young people should acquire knowledge about democracy: how it works and why is it worth defending it.  & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2  \\
23. It is very important that students learn how to analyse social problems, but also select the most important ones.  & 4 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 3  \\
24. The teacher should present to the class only established facts about society. Social norms are not a suitable topic for teaching.  & -4 & -3 & -1 & -2 & 0  \\
25. Official citizenship programs are essentially uncritical: democracy is good, we are a democratic state, therefore we are good.  & -1 & -4 & -2 & 0 & 0
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>The democratic approach to inquiry and debate should be demonstrated in class, in order to encourage students’ interest in politics.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Students cannot learn democracy at school, because school itself is not a democratic institution.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Citizenship education means to hold students accountable for their behaviour and to get them involved charity and community activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>It is better that the teacher discusses norms and values instead of stiffly adhering to neutrality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The teacher should not disclose his or her political views to the students. Quite the opposite, only broadly accepted social and political values should be discussed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>My task as a teacher is to defend state policies and interests, because I am an employee of a state financed educational institution.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I am obliged as a citizen and a teacher to stir things up if necessary, and not only through the so called legitimate political channels.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>In my opinion, citizenship education is an emergency measure by the state against the obviously growing lack of social tolerance.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>We should not declare any ideology to be correct; instead, we should give students an opportunity to get acquainted with various ideas about political and social order.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>The most important task of citizenship education is to inform students about their civil and political rights and freedoms.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should be of some use to society, for instance by contributing to greater safety.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Citizenship education is an outdated concept, because it conveys to students the values of the middle class.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Civic obedience means more than just obeying the law, it means obedience to higher personal standards and higher social interests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Students should be made to realize that they live in a world of growing interdependence. Even though we do not respect each other, we still depend on each other.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should cultivate a spirit of unity, loyalty to the state and national pride.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>For most students, politics is way too abstract and incomprehensible, it belongs more to elite schools.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE FIVE FACTORS

The five factors found in the Bulgarian data set are presented in figure 10. For clarity’s sake, I have left out the labels from the original scheme in chapter Two, only referring to one of the aspects, to serve as a ‘compass’ for the reader. Each factor represents a group of teachers holding similar view. The figure is not a mathematically precise representation; it is a visualization of the mix of quantitative data and the subsequent qualitative analysis of the interviews. The distance between the factors is a rough indication of the degree to which they are alike.

![Figure 10 Five factors in Bulgaria](image)

COMMON THEMES: “A NEUTRAL TEACHER IS A SCARED TEACHER”

The teachers I spoke to were making a serious attempt to uphold their own professional and academic standards, to be truthful and to demonstrate a clear position on matters they deem important. The overall impression is that they remain critical, guard their degree of professional discretion and assume a great responsibility for the education of Bulgarian youth, even when they feel that the school as an institution, and particularly the state, are failing them. Especially when the institutions are failing them, as the respondents clarify.

All teachers agree that citizenship education is about participation in a democratic debate and this is why they help students to develop their research and
discussion skills (14\textsuperscript{22}). The strong link between citizenship and democracy was found in every interview, in spite of critical notes about Bulgarian political reality. In the eyes of the teachers, the process of democratization, though far from completed, is irreversible (22).

“It is extremely important for them [the students] to understand that is not silence, aggression, negativity or passivity that would help them, but debate, regardless of how different your opponent's opinion is. This is the only civilized way to solve problems. To be able to defend your point of view, firmly, respectfully, without being afraid of the other.”\textsuperscript{23}

Probably because many of the Bulgarian respondents had a background in philosophy, the fact value-dichotomy proved to be unpopular among them. They did not subscribe to the suggestion that only established facts should be taught (24). The statement was puzzling to most respondents and the reaction can be summed up by this quote:

“Oh, it will be extremely boring to present only established facts. Our teaching will be meaningless.”

Absolutely categorically, with high statistical significance, teachers reject the statement ‘My task as a teacher is to defend state policies and interests, because I am an employee of a state financed educational institution’ (31). In one case a respondent suggested that other subject teachers do behave as ‘civil servants’ and ascribed a special place to philosophy teachers at school. The teachers assume a strong professional attitude and do not feel particularly restricted by state requirements of any kind. This almost allergic reaction to any state interference can be partially traced to old communist times:

“We should not lose the art of telling the truth in a situation when it was forbidden to do so.”

For the younger teachers, the explanation of this position is sometimes more trivial - they do not feel supported enough by the state to feel part of any official state policy. Generally, the teachers’ attitude towards the state is ambivalent, to say the least. As one respondent puts it

“I am out of sync with the state.”

Bulgarian schools have been traditionally considered pioneers of progress, enlightenment and democracy. This is why all respondents define Bulgarian schools as largely democratic (27). The juxtaposition between school and state institutions emerges as a theme:

\textsuperscript{22} The number indicates the number of the statement related to the discussion. Sometimes the connection seems 'remote' as respondents give their own interpretations of the statements. These are captured in the analysis.

\textsuperscript{23} The quotes are taken from the respondents. Deliberately, no respondent identification is used, because the quotes represent the voice of the group (factor). The English language translation is by the author and as close as possible to the original.
“[Today’s young people] are critical towards society as a whole, towards the institutions which have no clear youth policy and strategy for their future, but they do not necessarily hold schools accountable for these problems.”

Teachers insist on a solid, though not overburdened knowledge base, but this is not the same as just feeding children with facts. In a nutshell, this is everything they had to say about the official state standards and prescribed curriculum.

I have observed a peculiar combination of a large number of consensus items with low correlations between factors. The qualitative data reveal that, although some items do appear undisputed on the surface, reading them in context reveals substantial differences. For example, virtually every respondent agrees with the necessity to teach young people to be critical and not to believe everything in the media (6). However, they offer different assessments of young peoples’ susceptibility to manipulation. The comments vary from

“I am afraid it is too late, they already believe everything”

to

“They have this [critical attitude] naturally, they are Bulgarian and thus distrustful.”

The teachers also vary in their ideas about independent decision-making (2). The group of teachers defining factor 1 considers independent thinking a necessary skill to enable the acquisition of knowledge, while factors 3 and 4 value the spirit of independence:

“If they are dependent, they would never be able to be true to themselves …”

The expected success of teaching this kind of independence varies from “wishful thinking” to “self-evident.”

Bulgarian teachers exhibit a strikingly ambivalent attitude towards politics and politicians. Most respondents make a clear distinction between the practice of politics – what politicians do – which is considered predominantly as something not suitable for students, if not outright harmful; and the political nature of any social phenomenon discussed. The latter is often not seen as ‘politics.’ Πολιτικά [Politika] in Bulgaria is a negative term for teachers and students alike. Teachers sometimes go at great lengths to explain how they differentiate between active political propaganda (which is considered inappropriate) and allowing for an academic, but not necessarily academically detached analysis of the most urgent problems of society. A positive role model of a Bulgarian politician suitable for school lessons is yet to be found.

Let’s turn now to the five types of teachers, technically called factors. The factors consist of groups of teachers holding similar views. The descriptions below are composites and the quotes are from teachers ‘belonging’ to this factor.
**Factor 1. Pragmatic Conservatives: ‘We give them the rules of social behaviour’**

The Pragmatic Conservatives put a strong emphasis on knowledge, take a mentoring and protective position towards their students, and exhibit a great amount of trust towards the school as an institution. They see the school as a model of a social institution and thus encourage participating in school activities as a preparation for life.

The Pragmatic Conservative teachers do not agree with the suggestion that citizenship education is an outdated concept and define it as follows:

“It gives students rules of social behavior, after they have studied values in ethics classes.”

Consequently, the Pragmatic Conservatives are the only group that sees citizenship education as an instrument to help students find a place in the labor market. (8)

“The other subjects do not prepare them for the labor market… […] I tell them that school is also work and if you add up all the financing for their education, they sometimes end up making more money than their parents.”

The teachers in this group are slightly more interested in factual knowledge than the other groups – just to look at things as they are, instead of how they should be (9). While the others sort the statement negatively and put an accent of the need to have a horizon, an ideal in the future, these respondents situate citizenship education in the current moment:

“Yes, I agree with this quite a lot, because we tend to do a lot of things for the future only, instead of here and now.”

The latter quote corroborates the pragmatic, status quo orientation of this factor. Partly, the pragmatism can be explained as a reaction to Bulgaria’s socialist past, where the unattainable ‘bright future’ had become a running gag.

The Pragmatic Conservatives do not wish to encourage students to participate in Bulgaria’s current political life (26):

“They are children, after all, and should remain children… “

The teachers do what they can to protect their students from the hardships of everyday politics, which they see in a negative light. This is a theme underlying various other topics and echoing in other factors as well:

“Why would anyone want to encourage students to engage in politics? In Bulgaria, politics is over-exposed; politicians get into the center of events and get a lot of attention […] In Bulgaria, politics is seen as follows: elections are organized so that some people could enter some institutions and get privileges, and then nothing happens – I do not think that this is the right message to convey to kids!”
This particular respondent then goes on to explain that politics should be something left to professionals, after all. Not everyone needs to know everything about politics, the way we do not know anatomy and go to the doctor. Ideally, politicians are experts in governance, it seems. Logically, the teachers with this attitude are careful not to ‘ politicize’ the class discussion too much (19).

The Pragmatic Conservatives very strongly reject the suggestion that sometimes it is necessary to engage in activities outside the legitimate institutions (32). Generally, teachers’ personal political engagement is not linked for them to teaching citizenship. To demonstrate this kind of active political engagement is considered an act of irresponsibility:

“We should not forget that we are educating our students […] It is extremely important for them to know the mechanisms of resistance, but this resistance should not result in anarchy […] they should act solely within the limits of the law […]”

For the Pragmatic Conservatives, the greatest concern is discipline. In their eyes, students do not take their obligations seriously. Very often, the respondents mention rights in conjunction with democracy, stating that ‘democracy and freedom is not the same as doing whatever you want.’ They counter the youthful students’ claim on more freedom with the classic:

“They know their rights perfectly well, but it is about time they should think about their responsibilities as well.”

Statements concerning the method, process, and critical analytic skills necessary to acquire knowledge about institutions, social structures, and politics, are rated positively (23, 13, 14, 12). Respondents are concerned with neutrality and are careful not to promote any particular ideology (34). The teachers share a cautious, sometimes confused, judgment of the past. They often feel they are forced to renounce the ‘old’ ideology and they are not convinced that the new one, called ‘democracy’ in short, is necessarily better.

“Students need to decide for themselves what is good and what is bad […] Not all things from the past were bad; we should not throw out the baby with the bathwater.”

Statement 2, ‘We need to teach young people to be independent and to make their own decisions’, while on the surface concerned with granting students independence, is interpreted in a protective, mentoring fashion. One respondent regrets that students have ‘too little opportunity to express their own thoughts, we tend to draw them into the field of our own thinking.’ Another respondent claims, similarly to the argument against engagement in politics, that students’ independence in not a sign of maturity:

“Kids, due to circumstances, are forced to take responsibility for their lives much too early, this puts them under enormous stress.”
This protective attitude towards the students is mixed with a matter-of-fact acceptance of the hardships and the challenges of the modern globalized world (39). The Pragmatic Conservatives are certainly not concerned with promoting values such as tolerance and multiculturalism. They focus on the message: learn to live with it!

Also, consistent with their role of mentor, they feel the need to step in where family, in their eyes, comes short:

“Parents do not have the time, plus the teacher gives a balanced picture of all views”[…]

“It will be completely anti-pedagogical and senseless to close my eyes to the problems and to let the kids enter society without a clear position on these topics!”

Just like all Bulgarian respondents, the Pragmatic Conservatives reject the idea that they are just civil servants and should defend the interest of the state (31):

“The state has abdicated from its duties, so why should we feel obliged to defend it?”

The Pragmatic Conservatives consider the state interest in general worth defending, but not in the current Bulgarian state, which they perceive as lacking in many ways. They are even ready to take some of the blame for this, which may explain their hesitation in imposing their views on students:

“Tomorrow they will rule us, the sooner they take power away from us, the better.”

In sum, these teachers see themselves as contributing to the education of a citizen who would find a place in the fabric of society, who would obey the law out of conviction and as a result of thoughtful deliberation, and would be mature enough to ensure social stability, on the one hand, and safeguarding personal rights and freedoms, on the other. This situates the factor mainly in the hierarchical quadrant, with a slight overlap with individualism. In Bulgaria, the distrust towards power is too great to allow for a viable genuinely hierarchic position.

**FACTOR 2. DELIBERATIVE LIBERALS: ‘WE ARE HERE TO PROVOKE THEM INTO FREEDOM’**

The name of this group of teachers refers to their two most important vantage points – an individualistic/liberal orientation and a focus on democratic deliberation. Deliberative Liberals’ main concern is the method of thinking and inquiry, the need to take one’s own decisions. They steer away from everything that looks like indoctrination and imposing specific content and worldviews. Providing information to students is important, particularly about civic rights and freedoms (35). The defense and strengthening of civic rights and freedoms is high on their agenda:
“Particularly in Bulgaria, the most important thing is to inform students about their rights, they just do not know them.”

The school subject “World and person”, which deals directly with citizenship education, should be called “Person and world” according to one of the respondents. He clearly puts the individuality of his students in the limelight. The respondents in this group do not consider the curriculum in its current form to be a big obstacle to educating young people the way they find fit. They find enough room in the books for critique and discussion (25). It is not that the books encourage critical reflection; the teachers have their own agenda and very strong didactic preferences and do not feel confined by textbooks and curriculum requirements. Although they do insist on providing correct information and acquiring solid grounds for discussion, the Deliberative Liberals do not see themselves as teaching only a subject.

“I do not feel a teacher or a subject specialist, I am a provocateur, and that’s probably the opposite of what they expect from me as a teacher. They expect me to adhere to norms and standards […] Generally, teachers are just like civil servants, with the exception of the philosophy teachers, because they are very critical. Within the framework of limitations, we are able, thank God, to establish some kind of freedom.”

The respondents approve, though moderately, of the idea that citizenship education should be of some use to society (36). This approval stems by no means from a particularly great concern about the common good. It is their pragmatism speaking – why do something that has no use? In contrast to all the other factors, they reject statement 39 – “Students should be helped to realize that they live in a world of growing interdependence. Even though we do not respect each other, we still depend on each other”. Although it would be tempting to explain this as approval of egoistic self-interest, the interviews reveal a more sophisticated position. Respondents claim that just tolerating the other is not enough, a true liberal society should foster respect for every individual. Thus, the statement is rejected on the grounds of not going far enough. The fact that they value democratic inquiry the highest of all (26), is an indication that we are not dealing with individualists in the household sense of the word, concerned with self-interest only. The keyword for this group of respondents is ‘inquiry’:

“Students should be made aware of the possibility and the need to enter discussions with lots of other people…”

Because the Deliberative Liberals value discussion and deliberation highly, the teachers reject the idea that citizenship education should not be associated with politics (20) and look for a balance between individual and collective action. They are careful about discussing politics at a more general, theoretical level, “leaving it to the students to judge”.
The Deliberative Liberals rank positively the demand to students to learn to take into account the common good, rather than follow only their private interests (17). The key to understanding this position is the rejection of narrowly self-serving behavior. This makes sense, if we bear in mind that the self-perceived goal of this group of teachers is to provide students with the necessary skills and attitudes to function in the world (15). Note that they do not stress 'survival,' in the statement, which would be a fatalist position; they trust their students to be emancipated actors and to give direction to their own lives. This is why the Deliberative Liberals do not feel the need to impose any views on students:

“Political propaganda is forbidden. But even if it were not, my authoritative position would lead to some form of manipulation of the students. I do not want to make them my copies.”

In short, the Deliberative Liberals see civic education mainly as a tool for promoting emancipation. Knowledge of individual rights and freedoms is put at the core of their efforts. They strive to equip their students with the necessary tools to operate in a world seen as increasingly complex, to understand political structures and games and to find their path in society. Although they certainly do not promote reckless egoism, the teachers see their students as individuals with inherent rights and feel compelled to support them in becoming independent, critical citizens who know how to defend and extend their freedom through democratic debate. The Deliberative Liberals occupy the individualist quadrant of the force-field.

**FACTOR 3. LOCAL SOCIAL GUARDIANS: ‘THEY NEED US AS A PERSONAL EXAMPLE’**

The Local Social Guardians see their students as vulnerable and at risk. Their rights could be easily violated because of ignorance, no access to power structures, and lack of resources. The teachers see it as their task to educate students about their rights (sometimes interpreted also as entitlements). Teachers do this both by providing their students with the necessary knowledge, but first and foremost by establishing themselves as role models.

“Knowledge is the basis, but it is isn’t the whole story. Otherwise they just stay home and watch television. You need to prepare, every day, every lesson, for every group. You don’t know how they would surprise you, you need to be prepared to react, to calm them down and still take the challenge and make them think deeper in a certain direction. To do your job, actually.”

The Local Social Guardians stand out a bit from the others. Statistically, the group is the least correlated to the other factors, which gives it a distinct place in the force-field. Looking at the features of the respondents, we see that the respondents who define the factor the most clearly, both have a background in history, as opposed to the majority of the other respondents, who are philoso-
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The respondents strongly emphasize the role of the teacher in the process of upbringing their students. In this they differ from all the other respondents who tend to seek a balance between the role of a professional and the role of a teacher. From this point of view, the comparatively strong rejection of statement 1 “Students need an environment in which they could discuss the problems of society without anyone pointing a finger at them and correcting them” is understood not so much as an inclination to indoctrinate. It is an expression of the teachers’ conviction that their students “need a sense of direction”. Similarly, the teachers assume great responsibility in countering the influence of the students’ home environment. Although they sometimes feel that at 15 and up, it may be too late to change basic attitudes, the teachers know they should encourage their students, because

“[…] even when they do express their will, the family would tell them it’s not for them [to have these ambitions]”

The Local Social Guardians reject very strongly the suggestion that their students should ignore their private interest in the name of the common good (17). One respondent feels that his students do not share in the common good anyway and therefore should be encouraged to claim their rights. By the same token, the idea that citizenship education would contribute directly to public safety (36) is strongly rejected, because it is seen as an attempt by those in charge to take advantage of the students.

“It is hard for [the students] to take the common good into account, while they see that everything around them is ruled by self-interest and money. This is not cynical, just their reality. […] For some of them, it is pure survival, how to make ends meet […] they need us teachers to support them.”

Perhaps surprisingly, the Local Social Guardians do agree with the statement that politics is too abstract for their students (41). One explanation could be, at least partly, that these teachers work with socially disadvantaged students, a large portion of which have a minority background. Still, the respondents are ambivalent in their views, because they see different layers in political education. To begin with, they do think that the textbooks are written in a way that makes them inaccessible to the students, both in style and in price (in one of the schools, kids could not even afford to buy the books and were using syllabi put together by the teacher, instead). From a different angle, the teachers felt that kids were not interested, because they came from families where no one was engaged in politics in any way. The teachers thought it was their duty to show to the students that it matters to get involved. At yet another level, the respondents strongly felt that their students were left out, marginalized and disadvantaged by
today’s political ruling class in Bulgaria and this is why they were very cynical towards anything political. Again, the teachers saw themselves as an example of a positive way to participate in social life. They were very strongly involved in local politics and felt that their activities could not and should not remain hidden from the students. For the same reason, this group of teachers very strongly rejected the idea that the school is not a democratic institution (27). The Local Social Guardians share this conviction with factors 4 and 5. However, while the latter make a claim on the school as a playground for community involvement, the Local Social Guardian sees the school as a corrective and emancipatory institute in a society seen as grim:

“If the school is not democratic in Bulgaria, I would not know what is!”

The respondents strongly approve of the idea to get students involved in charity and community activities (28). The reason they give is that charity is a low-threshold activity, which students understand, even when they are not interested in politics. The involvement in charitable and community service becomes a way of teaching responsibility, on the one hand, and a means of empowerment, on the other.

At first glance, it might appear that the Local Social Guardians do not believe in the feasibility of the project to educate critically thinking people through citizenship education. Their (slight) doubts stem from the demand to employ a variety of theories or methods, which they consider indeed a bridge too far (13). This reaction is less unique than it may seem based on the numbers alone, as respondents from other factors have also expressed concerns about the effectiveness of explicitly teaching people to think. Moreover, the joy of discovering structures and regularities to understand the surrounding world (12) is overshadowed by distrust they share with their students - nothing is the way it looks, the laws in the books are not the same as the laws in real life.

In sum, this group of teachers can be placed in the fatalist corner of the grid-group scheme. Their position is unique among all the other respondents.

**FACTOR 4. PERSONAL GROWTH FACILITATORS:**

‘WE TEACH THEM TO BE HAPPY’

Participation, action, involvement is what this group of teachers is about – practice what you preach, also outside the classroom! Seeking growth and change, through dialogue and self-perfection, these teachers respect their students and attempt to provide for them the right environment to help them in their development. All the respondents defining this factor, and only they, used words like emotions, feelings, growth, and ‘the joy of life’. They also expressed concern about such ‘overlooked’ topics as ecological education and art education.
Participation in real life, as opposed to just teaching during lessons, is the most important for the Personal Growth Facilitators, in contrast to all other respondents (10). Not only should students participate and be engaged in ‘attitude building’, they should do this in groups, because

“Personality develops much better in a group than through individual projects”.

Because they value personality so much, the Personal Growth Facilitators, together with the Global Future Debaters (factor 5), are categorically against any hint of instrumental use of citizenship education, by the state or by the students themselves (8, 7):

“Oh no, we are not going to educate self-seeking komsomol snitches any longer!”

The Personal Growth Facilitators feel very strongly about letting the students free in expressing their opinion, without anyone pushing them in a certain direction (1). In contrast to other factors, the respondents from this group believe that the teacher should be a model of honest behavior (5). Together with the Local Social Guardians, these respondents agree that teachers should not attempt to stay neutral at any price, as this is a sign of fear by the teacher. Similarly to the Local Social Guardians, the teachers in this group are way too personally engaged to consider withholding their preferences and views from students. (30) For them, citizenship education does not end with just informing students about their rights and freedoms (35):

“You can’t just come and tell them, we are not the news broadcasting service.”

Since the climate of collaboration, which promotes free development and self-growth is a priority to this group, they tend to avoid controversial topics in the classroom (19). Not every controversy is avoided; teachers seem to make a distinction between political issues and social issues, the latter being less transient. The teachers still seek a solid knowledge base for their work, it goes beyond just practice (18).

“Citizenship education requires high personal erudition, combined with honesty and lack of hypocrisy.”

The respondents in this group tend to sort negatively all statements suggesting that one needs to teach facts and ‘a body of knowledge’ (4, 24, 35, 9, 11) as opposed to the approval of statements stressing particular skills and attitudes (34, 14, 2, 6, 26, 23).

This Personal Growth Facilitators exhibit many features of the egalitarian ideal type, with a twist: personal growth is seen as being facilitated by participation in a group, rather than directed at group preservation. Again, like in factor 1, this group demonstrates that truly collectivist attitudes are not popular in a country with a communist past and are always countered by a healthy dose of self-interest.
The Global Future Debaters are the most explicitly concerned with European citizenship. They are divided, however, in their judgment of the value and the success of citizenship education as a European project. One of the high loading respondents is positive and with a cosmopolitan orientation, while the other one, to the contrary, is convinced that citizenship education was implemented under pressure and as an act of compliance – to demonstrate that Bulgaria belongs to the European Union:

“It is just to show off - look, we have that thing - but there is no tradition, nobody takes care that teachers get schooled […]. The European Union is not a panacea for all problems in Bulgaria.”

The most important task of citizenship education, according to the Global Future Debaters, is to help students develop as thinking citizens (13). The respondents recognize the serious dilemmas young people face and work to equip them with the instruments of analysis, self-reflection, debate and argumentation (1, 23, 14, 6). Similarly to the Personal Growth Facilitators, the teachers in this group adhere to a broad conception of citizenship education: action oriented, including matters as ecological citizenship and global awareness, but with critical thinking skills remaining at the core of teaching citizenship.

This group approves of the necessity to provide students with skills and instruments to advance in society (7, 15), because the future citizens they have in mind will live in a complex global world, which requires different qualities to understand it and to manage it. In doing so, these teachers always depart from a strong professional identity, based on subject knowledge (18).

The respondents slightly disagree with statement 10 (1, 0, -3, 4, -1 It is not enough only to engage in discussions about how to improve the world, it is important to give young people the chance to participate in real life). The main reason for rejecting the statement is that students should learn both – debate and discussion are also very important.

The Global Future Debaters are not inclined to impose any specific type of action on students; they need to take the lead. This does not mean ‘stirring things up’ however (32), because the teachers find that more suitable for the street; the school has other functions and other rules. This is also why they moderately agree with keeping controversy outside the classroom – an atmosphere of trust and safety is crucial to foster the development of independent thinking. These teachers’ civic engagement is strong, but oriented towards individuals instead of institutions:

“We make the state, the initiative has to come from society, it is not necessary that all measures come from the state.”
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The Global Future Debaters share a focus on universal human values. They current political practice is corrupt and thus not worthy of discussing in the classroom (20):

“For heaven’s sake, do not encourage them to get into politics! [They need to learn what is] good and bad, the human nature, how to become good, but no politics, please! They do not have the social experience yet to engage in politics.”

Instead, students should engage in activities in the school, a suitable environment to learn essential democratic skills (27).

The Global Future Debaters take a pragmatic attitude towards the fashionable patriotic discourse in Bulgaria. They agree that students should know “what this country has achieved in order to go further” (40). However, the growing interdependence of people in the world takes precedence and is a far more dominant theme (39). The statement is interpreted at an interpersonal level – students need to learn how to respect each other, to be able to get in the shoes of others and to understand their social experience.

In sum, the Global Future Debaters are more concerned with the future of citizenship education and the future of their students in a global dynamic world than with the current practice, which can be disappointing at times. They reside in between the individualist and the egalitarian part of the force-field.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, among Bulgarian teachers I found one clearly pronounced fatalist type of view, one each in the individualistic (Deliberative Liberals) and egalitarian (Personal Growth Facilitators) quadrants, and two hybrids – one hierarchic with strong individualist features (Pragmatic Conservatives), and one individualist/egalitarian (Global Future Debaters). All of the Bulgarian discourses share a great concern about the current political situation. Also, in all of the discourses, there seem to be two different streams of thought – how things should be and how they are in reality.

In terms of the aspects described in chapter two, the good citizen – critical citizen one takes a prominent role, as it is related to the image not only of Bulgaria’s future citizens, but to a generally shared distrust towards political life in its current manifestations. All five views exhibit a strong tendency towards a critical position, including the fatalist one, where regret is expressed that the students are prevented from taking a critical attitude and an active civic position by circumstances. Directly related to this aspect were the different versions of a balance between individual rights and social obligations.

The aspect ‘coach vs. supervisor’ was moderately important and colored the idea Bulgarian teachers had about their students. The aspect was mostly inter-
interpreted in terms of preferred teaching styles and approach towards students, as it is reflected in the labels of the factors.

The aspect ‘indoctrination vs. neutrality’ did not play a significant role, in any case it was far less prominent than in the Dutch sample (chapter Six). This may be attributable to the philosophy background of Bulgarian teachers: they were much less inclined to subscribe to a fact/value dichotomy, popular in many social science disciplines, for example. All respondents had experience with state-imposed indoctrination (some as students, some as teachers as well), and they claimed to know the difference between inevitable bias and blatant imposition of ideological standpoints.

The pattern of views exhibited by the Bulgarian teachers is spread towards the edges of the field. The distance between the Bulgarian viewpoints is large, which confirms the impression from the interviews that the discourse there is fragmented, at times even disorganized. The whole political culture of Bulgaria exhibits fatalist tendencies. In Bulgaria, politics was perceived mainly in the narrow and negatively charged meaning of party politics, and thus as something to be avoided. Obviously, participation in ‘real-life’ institutions could not be effectively encouraged. Such high levels of mistrust in the government, statehood, and politics in general, were not found in Croatia and in the Netherlands.

The disillusionment with a failed transition only reinforces this long-standing political culture and spills over to the teachers, in spite of their enviable optimism. This optimism and faith in the emancipatory role of education explain why the Personal Growth Facilitators and the Global Future Debaters are also Bulgarian brands – they represent a shared belief in the influence a teacher can have on a students’ life and thereby on the future of society as a whole. Against the backdrop of the desolate state of Bulgarian education at the moment, this attitude can be seen as either heroic or naïve. In chapters Seven and Eight, these observations will be further discussed.
Chapter Five.
Croatia: four types of views, on the verge of change

This chapter presents the empirical results from the Q sort study in Croatia. It begins with a short introduction about the context of citizenship education in Croatia. Then, the four types of distinct teachers’ views found by the analysis are presented, as well as a discussion on the common themes and issues in the Croatian context.24

BACKGROUND

Croatia became an independent state as a result of the disintegration of Yugoslavia and a decade of war, followed by a period of stabilization and rapprochement, leading to the country’s membership of the European Union since July 1, 2013. The school system in Croatia can be grasped in terms of the recent history of the region. It exhibits a combination of a centralized decision-making style, legacy of former Yugoslavia, and an over-politicized approach, the result of the wars in the 1990s (Spajic-Vrkas, 2003). It fits a tradition of a centralized, subject-based and knowledge-oriented curriculum (Baranovic & Doolan, 2005)

In Croatia, the central Ministry of Science, Education, and Sport retains overall responsibility for all levels of education. It serves as the main policy-making body with financial responsibilities for all education, but local governments have taken responsibility for part of the material costs for schools (Batarelo et al. 2009)

The present system of secondary education includes gymnasia, some of which specialized in languages, science or mathematics, vocational schools of two types - higher (4 years) and lower (2 years), as well as specialized fine arts schools.

Both gymnasia and 4 year vocational schools lead directly to higher education. There is a small share of private and confessional schools, mostly Catholic (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, 2014).

Citizenship is officially on the agenda since September 2001, when the White Paper on Croatian education was published (Government of the Republic

24 Parts of this chapter have appeared in a previous publication in the Journal of Social Science Education (Jeliazkova, 2015).
of Croatia, 2001), as part as an overall strategy for educational development. The document explicitly mentions ‘the competences for active citizenship’ as a part of the educational system. The competences are only loosely related to the central objectives of Croatian education (Spajic-Vršak, 2003, p. 7). In 2003, some elements of citizenship education were included in the newly adopted textbook standard. The adopted approach for the standard was cross-curricular, with a special emphasis on a subject Politics and Economy, which is taught since 1994 at the secondary school level (G. o. t. R. o. Croatia, 1994). The content of the subject was adjusted after the separation from Yugoslavia almost overnight, in a top-down fashion, and reformulated in a minor fashion in 1997 (Doolan & Domazet, 2007, p. 210). The subject is taught in grammar schools for the period of one year (Baranovic & Doolan, 2005, p. 40).

In 2011, the Framework Curriculum (Fuchs, Vican, & Litre, 2011) defined the necessary knowledge, skills and capacities and attitudes for the cross-curricular program ‘Education for human rights and democratic citizenship’. These objectives can be implemented through an interdisciplinary approach, as a separate optional subject, as extra-curricular activities such as projects, community-based activities, or they may be systematically applied through the entire school curriculum. The inclusion of this field in the school curriculum is left to the school and the teachers.

At the time of conducting the interviews (2012), a pilot program in citizenship education as a new subject, as a part of the newly developed Croatian Citizenship Education Curriculum, was running at several schools with the intention to introduce it in the school year 2013/2014. For various reasons, mainly due to apparent lack of support and strong resistance by the proponents of religious education, the implementation of the program was postponed for two years in a row and it looks like it will not be introduced in this form at all.

**THE Q-SORT STUDY**

In 2012, 17 respondents were interviewed from 10 cities and towns, including the capital Zagreb, from 15 schools. The teachers all had academic level of training in one of the areas: sociology, philosophy, political science, law and economy. There were 2 men and 15 women, ranging in age from 32 to 60. Their teaching experiences range from five to over 35 years. The interviews were conducted by Anka Kekes Kostro, who also contributed substantially to the initial data analysis.

A four-factor solution was chosen, a result of PCA factor extraction and Varimax rotation. The factors are moderately correlated yet distinct, with one factor standing out more than the rest. The table of correlations is presented here:
Table 6 Correlations between factor scores in Croatia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2202</td>
<td>0.6525</td>
<td>0.5942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2202</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2863</td>
<td>0.1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6525</td>
<td>0.2863</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.5479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5942</td>
<td>0.1003</td>
<td>0.5479</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factor loadings per respondent are presented in Table 7. As in chapter four, respondents defining the respective factors are indicated with **bold**, and the respondents contributing to more than one factor are indicated with *italics*.

Table 7 Factor loadings per respondent per factor in Croatia

|       | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    | 17    |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1     | xxxxxx| 0.2302| 0.2492| 0.4040| 0.6223| X     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 2     | xxxxxx| **0.7516**| X | -0.2419| 0.1361| 0.3443|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 3     | xxxxxx| 0.2057| 0.1270| 0.0387| **0.8228**| X     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 4     | xxxxxx| 0.2820| X | -0.1371| 0.3295| **0.7154**| X     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 5     | xxxxxx| 0.1500| 0.2898| **0.7563**| X     | 0.3419|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 6     | xxxxxx| **0.7149**| X     | 0.2033| 0.3836| 0.1748|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 7     | xxxxxx| **0.6758**| X     | 0.1160| 0.4481| 0.2197|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 8     | xxxxxx| -0.0192| **0.8605**| X | 0.1373| -0.0261|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 9     | xxxxxx| **0.6236**| X     | 0.1802| 0.5027| 0.3382|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 10    | xxxxxx| 0.2198| 0.0626| **0.7420**| X     | 0.0722|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 11    | xxxx  | **0.6618**| X     | 0.3568| 0.2868| 0.3228|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 12    | xxxxxx| 0.2876| 0.5106| 0.1918| 0.4957|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 13    | xxxx  | 0.4037| 0.0800| **0.7855**| X     | 0.1136|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 14    | xxxxxx| 0.1265| 0.3692| **0.6176**| X     | 0.4381|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 15    | xxxxxx| 0.3310| **0.5706**| X | 0.3552| 0.3137|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 16    | xxxxxx| 0.3631| 0.4047| 0.5028| **0.4288**| X     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| 17    | xxxxxx| **0.6921**| X     | 0.5576| 0.0614| 0.0973|       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

% expl.Var. 21 14 21 17
The normalized factor scores for the four factors are presented here:

**Table 8 Standardized ranking ('ideal' ranking) per factor in Croatia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Standardized ranking per factor CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students need an environment in which they could discuss the problems of society without anyone pointing a finger at them and correcting them.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We need to teach young people to be independent and to make their own decisions.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I encourage my students to get involved in social life through the established institutions and to listen to expert opinion.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. These are the rules, these are the laws. I think this is the bulk of citizenship education.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The teacher should be a model of honest and decent behavior, this is the core of citizenship education.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We have to teach young people to be critical and not to believe everything they see and hear in the media.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The teacher should make it clear to the students that they need to participate in public life if they want to advance in society.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Citizenship education should contribute to the development of competences required by the labour market.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. We should pay more attention to knowledge: to look at how things really are, instead of just discussing how they should be.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is not enough only to engage in discussions about how to improve the world, it is important to give young people the chance to participate in real life.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The teacher should stress first of all the anatomy of government: the separation of powers, the functions and prerogatives of the institutions, the different types and purposes of democratic systems.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am pleased when my students begin to discover structures and regularities and when they begin to understand the world of politics.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The goal is to educate thinking citizens who can employ various methods, theories and models to explore the world around them, and who are able to assess facts and to arrive at conclusions.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is important that students learn to defend their views in political discussions and social debate; this is why I help them to develop research and discussion skills.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should focus on the development of skills and attitudes, much needed for students to survive in today's complex world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Young people may learn the law by heart, but this does not mean they will necessarily obey it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Students should learn to take into account the common good, rather than follow only their private interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I feel that I am first and foremost a teacher and only then a subject specialist. The subject matter is only secondary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Controversial political problems should not be discussed in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should not be associated with politics, because individual acts of compassion and generosity are more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The subject &quot;as it is called in the country&quot; is in fact citizenship education. Both are aimed at educating future citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Young people should acquire knowledge about democracy: how it works and why is it worth defending it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>It is very important that students learn how to analyze social problems, but also select the most important ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The teacher should present to the class only established facts about society. Social norms are not a suitable topic for teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Official citizenship programs are essentially uncritical: democracy is good, we are a democratic state, therefore we are good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>The democratic approach to inquiry and debate should be demonstrated in class, in order to encourage students' interest in politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Students cannot learn democracy at school, because school itself is not a democratic institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Citizenship education means to hold students accountable for their behaviour and to get them involved charity and community activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>It is better that the teacher discusses norms and values instead of stiffly adhering to neutrality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The teacher should not disclose his or her political views to the students. Quite the opposite, only broadly accepted social and political values should be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>My task as a teacher is to defend state policies and interests, because I am an employee of a state financed educational institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I am obliged as a citizen and a teacher to stir things up if necessary, and not only through the so called legitimate political channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>In my opinion, citizenship education is an emergency measure by the state against the obviously growing lack of social tolerance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>We should not declare any ideology to be correct; instead, we should give students an opportunity to get acquainted with various ideas about political and social order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The most important task of citizenship education is to inform students about their civil and political rights and freedoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Citizenship education should be of some use to society, for instance by contributing to greater safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Citizenship education is an outdated concept, because it conveys to students the values of the middle class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Civic obedience means more than just obeying the law, it means obedience to higher personal standards and higher social interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Students should be made to realize that they live in a world of growing interdependence. Even though we do not respect each other, we still depend on each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Citizenship education should cultivate a spirit of unity, loyalty to the state and national pride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>For most students politics is way too abstract and incomprehensible, it belongs more to elite schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four distinct factors found in Croatia are presented in Figure 11.
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THE FOUR FACTORS

COMMON THEMES

At the moment of taking the interviews, Croatia was developing a new model for citizenship education. As a result, the need for change and the ways to achieve it emerge as a common theme in the whole Croatian sample. All teachers stress the importance of citizenship education in the overall curriculum and do not agree with the suggestion that it might be outdated (37).

The need to shift the focus from passive knowledge transfer to critical thinking competences is addressed by practically all respondents.

“Critical thinking and discussion with arguments should be highly positioned as a content of citizenship education. Therefore I think that only one hour per week in one year for such an important subject is just a terrible choice. The model we have now is just not functioning well as it is all about learning the textbook content...”

All teachers think that too much stress on knowledge transfer leads to uncritical acceptance of the surrounding world (9):

“Discussion on how things should be is an important part of a critical attitude toward reality”.... “We need to discuss and question things and on these grounds to see how they might become better”

Like their Bulgarian colleagues, Croatian teachers perceive the current political reality in Croatia as lacking in many ways and in need for improvement:

“Tell me, where do I find properly working institutions to show them?;”“There is no such thing as separation of powers in Croatia!”

On the surface, Croatian teachers subscribe to the need to focus on democratic inquiry (26). However, the qualitative data reveals a great amount of disconcert about the difference between discussion, deliberation, and debate, as well as on the way these should be implemented in everyday teaching. The devil is in the details, so to say. The most important differences in interpretation and accents are highlighted in the factor descriptions below.

There is a strongly felt consensus around the idea that all students should be empowered and taught to understand politics. Teachers believe that citizenship education is for all students, not just the elites, including those who ‘just like adults, are disappointed in politics’ (41).

Croatian teachers, unlike their Bulgarian colleagues, embrace a broad definition of politics and feel obliged to make it clear to their students that “everything is political.” Acts of compassion and generosity are also seen as political in nature (20), for instance:

“I keep telling to my students that politics is all around us, it is not just the government and [official] political fights. Acts of compassion and generosity are also political acts, they are not separated.”
Within the context of this broad definition of the political, Croatian teachers seek ways to remain neutral and still take a stance towards the communist past of the country. Often, they refer implicitly to a dichotomy Marxism – democracy. Some find a compromise by claiming that they do not defend or reject ideologies, but political regimes:

“I have to be neutral while discussing political parties and I cannot be neutral while talking about political regimes. Therefore, when I talk about totalitarianism, I cannot remain neutral.”

Teachers share the view that the school as an institution, even with a non-democratic structure, is a suitable platform to raise democratic citizens (27). They tend to agree that the content of the school subject is more important than the school-structure.

“There is no democracy in mathematics, there is certainly no democracy in religious education.”

This latter reference to religious education deserves attention. Many respondents mention religion and religious education while discussing norms and values, and particularly ethnic and religious tolerance. The role of the Catholic Church in Croatia is substantial and religious education has a prominent place in the school system (Bobinac & Jerolimov, 2006). This is in contrast to Bulgaria, where religious education has a marginal role at best, and has been largely linked to the emancipation of Muslim minorities.

The role of the church is often seen by Croatian teachers as anti-democratic and as a threat to free thinking. Teachers feel they should counter this influence:

“The Church cannot impose its views, nor can parents or politicians impose their views on children, not even teachers. They should listen to us, but they should not be afraid.”

Croatian teachers share the aversion of their Bulgarian colleagues towards political careerism (7), clearly a legacy of the past, where belonging to the nomenclatura was required:

“[To tell them:] look, guys, you should join the SDP and you will prosper in life. No way I am teaching this.”

I now turn to the descriptions of the four groups of teachers, the four factors yielded by the data.

**Factor 1. Reflective Humanists: ‘I am just inviting students to be reflective, nothing more’**

The Reflective Humanists emphasize strongly the development of the intellectual and critical thinking skills of their students. They envision citizenship education mainly as an instrument to help students cope with today’s complex world. Bor-
dering on a fatalist worldview, the Reflective Humanists support their students’ intellectual growth, but they also focus strongly on ‘coping’ (15).

“I see teaching as a help for students to become aware how schizophrenic is his/her situation and position and to accept it as it is in order to cope with it the best way possible!”

Yet, the teachers remain pragmatic and emphasize the importance of developing their students’ ability to use concepts and methods to analyze and understand the world around them (13). They do this systematically, professionally, based on solid mainstream theory. The teachers recognize the importance of politics as the context of one’s life and emphasize the importance of power relations in society. As one respondent puts it:

“We live in a world defined and divided by power”.

But it is more about understanding the world than about participation, after all. The teachers’ slightly cynical attitude towards a disappointing political and economic reality leads them to stress thinking and analytic skills more than actual participation. The Reflective Humanists are not particularly concerned with directly fostering students’ participation in social and political life (10). As one respondent puts it:

“We simply do not see an alternative to the passivity which results in high distrust in political engagement. I am not a person who can promote any kind of social [community level] action among students. That is absolutely impossible. The only thing I can do is to try to evoke an act of humanity.”

On the same grounds, the Reflective Humanists reject the idea that citizenship education revolves around laws and rules only. The respondents’ attitude towards any ideology is neutral, but reflective and open (34):

“We are all limited with our ideological positions and other factors, but the intention is to remain open as much is possible... and ability to reflect on our own limitations is therefore extremely important”

With a strong focus on open minded, independent, critical thinking, this group of teachers does not agree that laws and rules should be accepted and followed at face value (4). They consider this approach to teaching to be at odds with the promotion of a basic level of political and social literacy. Also, the idea of promoting values of national loyalty and pride does not fit the individualistic orientation of the Reflective Humanists and is thus rejected (40):

“The fact that I do not preach loyalty to the state does not imply that I preach deviant behavior. Not at all, I am just inviting students to be reflective, nothing more.”

Summing up, the Reflective Humanists exhibit mostly individualist features, with some clear inclinations toward fatalism/cynicism. These are countered, however, with a faith in the inner moral strength of the young people educated by them.
FACTOR 2. PATRIOTIC CONSERVATIVES: ‘THE TEACHER HAS TO BE A MODEL OF DECENT BEHAVIOUR’

The main trait of the Patriotic Conservatives is their loyalty to the state. Statistically, the group stands out from the others and holds distinct positions, particularly concerning the defense of state interest and the endorsement of a patriotic perspective.

With a strong devotion to rules and formal state institutions, the Patriotic Conservatives see themselves as an ‘old school’ role model for a decent citizen. The knowledge of laws, procedures and institutions is an important aspect of their idea of citizenship education. The main goal is to prepare students to act as good, adapted citizens who are able to function not only within the political community, but also on the labor market (8). The respondents perceive the relationship between the Croatian educational system and the labor market as problematic. Thus, to the extent they value the acquisition of skills, they are interested in more market-oriented skills, as a key to the successful adaptation of young people in the fabric of society:

“The ability to function on the labor market is very important. We do not prepare our students for that enough, and I believe that this subject has the potential to foster employability and even a spirit of entrepreneurship among our students.”

Within a clearly hierarchic mind-set, the teachers see market oriented competences and tolerance as two sides of one coin, both promoting order; they believe that tolerance is also a skill that should be taught and that it is a state’s responsibility to do so (33). Additionally, a high agreement is expressed with the idea of fostering charity through citizenship education (28), as an additional element of social order:

“Where the market does not succeed, tolerance and humanitarian activities should take place.”

Citizenship education is clearly concerned with national identity and the loyalty to the state is highly valued by the Patriotic Conservatives (40).

“This is absolutely OK. It is a matter of identity”

What strikes me is the defining role of national pride and loyalty in Croatia for the respondents in factor 2. The theme can be obviously traced to the country’s post-war focus on independence and state-building.

The Patriotic Conservatives are the only group that endorses the unquestionable acceptance of procedures and rules (4). Knowledge of procedures and institutions is a key objective of citizenship education, according to them. This is why the Pragmatic Conservative teacher would shy away from discussions on dominant norms and values and from controversial topics (29). Instead, students
should be prepared to contribute actively to society and the democratic political community. Note that the word ‘democratic’ here refers to a particular state arrangement, as normally and naturally succeeding ‘socialist’, but where, similarly, a set of rules must be obeyed, not questioned.

“[It] is a way to provide students with general information on the structures, procedures, and basic concepts. And then, if the time allows, I can focus on the preparation of children for active participation that is aligned with what I was teaching them.”

Thus, there is not much time left to devote to questioning and criticism (6). This group of teachers prefers to work within the rules and within the system (32):

“I do not need to stir up things, if they are OK, acceptable for a majority in a sense of common good. Why should I try to deconstruct things? There are people who do that all the time, always digging; they just cannot stand a peaceful state of affairs. This kind of peaceful approach is in its core a constructive one. You just cannot be constructive in a stirred up, un-peaceful, environment.”

The Pragmatic Conservatives do their best to act as a role model that “walks the talk” of a decent citizen (5).

“I believe that a teacher has to be a model of decent behavior. I belong to the old school, and therefore think that if I teach a certain model of citizen, then professionally, I should not allow myself to be a bad example.”

In sum, the ‘old school’ Patriotic Conservatives fit the hierarchic corner of the force-field. Their attitude could be called patronizing. The teachers are loyal to the state, to their country and to their students and expect loyalty and respect in return.

**FACTOR 3. LIBERAL DEMOCRACY MENTORS: ‘WE PREPARE STUDENTS FOR THE ROLE OF DEMOCRATIC CITIZENS’**

The respondents in this group hold the values of liberal democracy very high (22). In the name of propagating democracy, they are not afraid of being biased; as a matter of fact, the Liberal Democracy Mentors believe that liberal-democratic values should be actively promoted (34):

“I agree that students need to be acquainted with all important ideologies, but I am not all for relativism. I believe that we can say that at this moment of human development, some ideologies are the closest to the ideal of a common good. By that I refer to liberalism, only not in a sense of free market principles, but in a sense of its potential to enable the maximum number of people to achieve their rights and freedoms.”

As a part of establishing a relationship of trust with their pupils, the teachers openly discuss their political preferences. This does not mean that they impose their views on their students. Teaching established facts only also does not make too much sense to them (24). The Liberal Democracy Mentors value their
students’ independent thinking and make an effort to teach them to be systematically critical (13). The teachers strongly agree with the statement that young people should be taught to be critical and not to believe everything they see in the media (6). The students need that:

“[In order] to be able to go a step further and to filter the information they receive to develop their own opinion, agreement or disagreement with something”.

Instead of offering ready-made rules, the respondents in this group are inclined to look at the processes and the underlying debates behind the established rules and laws. They strongly reject the idea of taking rules for granted (4). Instead, the teachers emphasize their changing nature and the role of citizens in this change.

“Laws and rules are human artefacts. […] The point is not to respect the [existing] rules but to create rules that would be better for most people and for the community. Education thus needs to deconstruct the rules and the laws and improve them. […] We do not raise children to conserve the world but to change the world so it becomes a better place.”

Because of their conviction that the world is to be made a better place through education, the teachers gladly take the role of empowering mentors. They actively encourage students to participate in social life in order to improve the world (10). This engagement is a social endeavor and takes the common good into account (17). As one respondent puts it,

“the ultimate purpose of education is human happiness.”

The Liberal Democracy Mentors occupy a hybrid position between egalitarian and individualistic, leaning towards hierarchic, particularly because they are loyal to a Croatian ideal, which they feel should be pursued by all.

**Factor 4. Personal Growth Coaches: ‘We teach independent and responsible young people’**

The Personal Growth Coaches are teachers by calling. The pedagogical core of their work takes priority over subject knowledge (18):

“I believe that the pedagogical core is inherent to the teaching profession and for me that represents a feeling we [ought to] have for young people… besides giving them knowledge, we are also upbringing them…”

They focus on students’ personal growth, on the development of participatory and intellectual competences, seen in a broader perspective. This group of teachers highly appreciates social and political responsibility and approves strongly of all statements, which emphasize the common good and accountability (28, 38, 17). The importance of high personal standards motivated this group, in contrast to the other three groups, to doubt whether politics should be
the primary content of citizenship education (20). While teachers in this group do not downplay the importance and the leading role of politics, they emphasize value aspects such as solidarity among individual citizens:

“I agree that not everything should be tied directly to politics, because politics even in its broad sense is not the only thing that guides us through life. Compassion and generosity is something that needs to be more emphasized in societies… although that should not exclude politics”

The social side of citizenship takes precedence over politics. Compassion and generosity are cherished and encouraged, preferably through taking ‘real life’ action (10), whereas the Liberal Democracy Mentors see action as derived from political and social theory, the Personal Growth Coaches think that it is increasingly necessary “to teach students how to participate”.

The Personal Growth Coaches tend to pay a lot of attention to the development of participatory skills, and consequently do not stress knowledge-oriented elements in the citizenship education curriculum (11), in contrast to the Liberal Democracy Mentors. Citizenship education, in the eyes of the Personal Growth Coaches, does not end with just informing students about their rights and freedoms (35).

The teachers make a strong connection between independent thinking and accountability. They provide their students with some guidelines, but let them make independent decisions and encourage them to take responsibility for the consequences, particularly the consequences for others:

“We need to teach young people to think independently[…], always to be autonomous and responsible for their decisions. That implies, when making a decision, to take in account all consequences [it] can have for other people.”

For them, critical reflection also refers to norms “which should be always discussed” (24) It also means to raise up controversial issues (19) and to even personally take a critical stand toward the state or status quo (32). Stirring things up for this group doesn’t imply

“revolutionary acts, but this implies active citizenship which tries to improve the situation and to pursue citizens’ rights.”

The Personal Growth coaches occupy the egalitarian quadrant of our force-field, with some hierarchic elements. The most distinguishing feature of this factor is the moral, slightly depoliticized depiction of citizenship and participation and the strongly felt sense of accountability and responsibility to each other. There is less discussion on teaching methods and more of a general direction and spirit of citizenship education.
CONCLUSION

Summarizing, the four Croatian factors are distributed around the middle line, with individualist (Reflective Humanists), hierarchic (Liberal Democracy Mentors) or egalitarian (Personal Growth Coaches) accents, with one factor (Patriotic Conservatives) clearly in the hierarchic quadrant. The aspect ‘good vs. critical citizen’ is less relevant than the ideas teachers have about their role as teachers. The roles of supervisor, coach, and mentor fit respectively the hierarchic, egalitarian and individual types of views. The time of taking the interviews, when the pilot citizenship program was broadly discussed, may be the reason for a heightened interest in teaching styles and methods. The aspect ‘knowledge vs. attitudes’, tends to get more comments compared to both Bulgaria and the Netherlands. The theme of national identity proved to be important and dominated part of the discourse in Croatia. Also, the link between citizenship education and religious education turned out to influence the overall positions of teachers. Particularly the aspect ‘indoctrination vs. neutrality’ was interpreted in relation to the Catholic Church, on the one side, and the legacy of Marxist ideology, on the other. Both were seen as an attempt to impose certain ideological views and the way to counter those was not always sought in neutrality, but in clearly denouncing a position as ‘wrong’ and creating space for exploring other perspectives.

The fatalist view is absent among Croatian teachers, although in their protective attitude towards students, the Reflective Humanists exhibit some fatalist tendencies. A possible explanation is the less cynical attitude of Croatian teachers towards politics. Unlike their Bulgarian colleagues, the Croatian respondents tend to highlight the political dimensions of everyday life and thus subscribe to a broader definition of the political. This fundamentally different attitude towards politics in Croatia means that political participation is thus seen as something positive. Croatian teachers also seem to put high hopes on education as a motor of social change, though to a lesser degree than their Bulgarian colleagues. At the moment of taking the interviews, Croatia was about to join the European Union and to introduce the subject ‘Citizenship Education’. The first happened, the latter was frustrated, in spite of a well-received pilot25, together with the initial enthusiasm of the EU accession. This shared frustration with the teachers from Bulgaria will be discussed again in chapter Seven, in the comparison between the three countries.

25 For more information about this recent development see www.gong.hr/en/active-citizenship/citizen-education/
Chapter Six.
The Netherlands: an established professional community

BACKGROUND

Citizenship education is on the national educational policy agenda since 1992 (Dufour, 2007), when the Dutch Scientific Council for Government Policy made an explicit link between education and citizenship and called the investment in citizenship “a wise preparation for an uncertain, changing and surprising future” (Van Gunsteren, 1992, p. 126). The reticent tone of state citizenship education policy has been gradually changing towards more explicit steering. State policy on citizenship education in its current form was structured in 2003 with a specific attention to strengthening the pedagogical task of education (Onderwijsraad, 2003). Since 2006, citizenship education is explicitly a part of the Dutch curriculum and subject of monitoring by the Inspectorate of education (Inspectie van het Onderwijs, 2006). The monitoring framework is broad and respects school autonomy and the diversity of publicly funded schools in the Netherlands: about two thirds are denominational, predominantly Protestant and Catholic, and in the last years, Islamic (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2012).

In the current educational system in the Netherlands, citizenship education is incorporated in the following ways:

First, at school level, every school is obliged to develop and implement its own citizenship education policy. This applies to all levels of primary and secondary education. Schools traditionally enjoy a considerable degree of freedom in shaping their curriculum, thus in shaping their own citizenship education policy as well, within a very broad and multi-interpretable framework. The official definition of citizenship is also broad: “the preparedness and the capacity to be a part of society (community) and to contribute to it” (Onderwijsraad, 2012, p. 8).

Second, in subjects such as history, geography, and Dutch language and literature, elements of citizenship education are also included, as a part of the national curriculum guidelines. It is the responsibility of the school to find the

26 Small parts of this chapter were published earlier in the journal InterDisciplines (Jeliazkova, 2014).
practical balance between curriculum, school policy and pedagogical preferences. (Inspectie van het Onderwijs, 2006)

Third, at the secondary school level, a mandatory subject “Social studies” (maatschappijleer) has citizenship education as one of its core objectives. At the general pre-academic upper secondary school level\(^ {27}\), students can also choose to follow a subject “Social sciences” (maatschappijwetenschappen) (Meijs & Need, 2009) which offers more depth and breadth of topics associated with citizenship education. In the vocational stream of education (MBO) a subject ‘Citizenship competencies’ (Bouwmeester, 2008) is taught instead, which covers broad topics from politics through interpersonal skills to health education.

The mandatory subject “Social studies” or “Social education” is taught in Dutch schools since 1962 (Meijs & Need, 2009). In the last 20 years, the subject has been explicitly associated with citizenship education (Olgers, 2012; Vis & Veldhuis, 2008). Since there are no state-approved textbooks in the Netherlands, the books that are used at school are chosen by teachers. The available books offer a diverse and inconsistent treatment of the topic of citizenship education (Kaljee, 2015).

**RESPONDENTS**

28 teachers from 23 schools were interviewed in the period 2012 – 2013. They all teach social studies at upper secondary schools (HAVO/VWO). Their academic background is mostly in the social sciences, with a small number educated in history. Their educational level is predominantly at the master level, with three respondents holding bachelor degrees and one a PhD. The experience of the respondents varies from two to over twenty years. The age of the respondents varies from 23 to over 65. Geographically, the respondents represent all provinces in the Netherlands, with the exception of Limburg and Zeeland. The number of men and women is 16 and 12, respectively.

**FACTOR ANALYSIS**

The factor analysis was performed through a PCA factor extraction and Varimax rotation (standard PQMethod algorithm) with four factors with 71% cumulative explained variance. The factor matrix is presented in the table below:

\(^ {27}\) HAVO – higher general preparatory secondary school; and VWO – academic preparatory secondary school
The correlation between the factors is high, as shown in Table 10. This means that the types of views associated with each factor resemble each other in many ways. Also, there is a substantial common ground of views shared by all teachers.
Table 10 Factor correlations the Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations Between Factor Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high correlation between the factors is due to a high number of consensus items – 11. However, in spite of the shared common ground, the number of distinguishing statements per factor is higher than usual. This means that within a relatively small shared framework, the factors can be still interpreted in a distinct way.

A breakdown of the type of consensus statements reinforces the picture of four distinct views within a relatively narrow framework: only three of the consensus items indicate a strong approval, and only two are strong rejections. The remaining six neutral items also offer a substantial degree of variation in the explanation and interpretations of the statements by the four groups of teachers.

THE FOUR FACTORS

The idealized factor scores are presented in table 11.

Table 11 Standardized factor rankings per factor in the Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students need an environment in which they could discuss the problems of society without anyone pointing a finger at them and correcting them.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We need to teach young people to be independent and to make their own decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I encourage my students to get involved in social life through the established institutions and to listen to expert opinion.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. These are the rules, these are the laws. I think this is the bulk of citizenship education.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The teacher should be a model of honest and decent behaviour, this is the core of citizenship education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>We have to teach young people to be critical and not to believe everything they see and hear in the media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The teacher should make it clear to the students that they need to participate in public life if they want to advance in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should contribute to the development of competences required by the labour market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>We should pay more attention to knowledge: to look at how things really are, instead of just discussing how they should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>It is not enough only to engage in discussions about how to improve the world, it is important to give young people the chance to participate in real life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The teacher should stress first of all the anatomy of government: the separation of powers, the functions and prerogatives of the institutions, the different types and purposes of democratic systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I am pleased when my students begin to discover structures and regularities and when they begin to understand the world of politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The goal is to educate thinking citizens who can employ various methods, theories and models to explore the world around them, and who are able to assess facts and to arrive at conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>It is important that students learn to defend their views in political discussions and social debate; this is why I help them to develop research and discussion skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should focus on the development of skills and attitudes, much needed for students to survive in today's complex world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Young people may learn the law by heart, but this does not mean they will necessarily obey it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Students should learn to take into account the common good, rather than follow only their private interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I feel that I am first and foremost a teacher and only then a subject specialist. The subject matter is only secondary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Controversial political problems should not be discussed in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should not be associated with politics, because individual acts of compassion and generosity are more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The subject “as it is called in the country” is in fact citizenship education. Both are aimed at educating future citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Young people should acquire knowledge about democracy: how it works and why is it worth defending it.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. It is very important that students learn how to analyse social problems, but also select the most important ones.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The teacher should present to the class only established facts about society. Social norms are not a suitable topic for teaching.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Official citizenship programs are essentially uncritical: democracy is good, we are a democratic state, therefore we are good.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The democratic approach to inquiry and debate should be demonstrated in class, in order to encourage students’ interest in politics.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Students cannot learn democracy at school, because school itself is not a democratic institution.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Citizenship education means to hold students accountable for their behaviour and to get them involved in charity and community activities.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. It is better that the teacher discusses norms and values instead of stiffly adhering to neutrality.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The teacher should not disclose his or her political views to the students. Quite the opposite, only broadly accepted social and political values should be discussed.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My task as a teacher is to defend state policies and interests, because I am an employee of a state financed educational institution.</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am obliged as a citizen and a teacher to stir things up if necessary, and not only through the so called legitimate political channels.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. In my opinion, citizenship education is an emergency measure by the state against the obviously growing lack of social tolerance.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. We should not declare any ideology to be correct; instead, we should give students an opportunity to get acquainted with various ideas about political and social order.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The most important task of citizenship education is to inform students about their civil and political rights and freedoms.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Citizenship education should be of some use to society, for instance by contributing to greater safety.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Citizenship education is an outdated concept, because it conveys to students the values of the middle class.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Civic obedience means more than just obeying the law, it means obedience to higher personal standards and higher social interests.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. Students should be made to realize that they live in a world of growing interdependence. Even though we do not respect each other, we still depend on each other.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Citizenship education should cultivate a spirit of unity, loyalty to the state and national pride.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. For most students politics is way too abstract and incomprehensible, it belongs more to elite schools.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four factors are graphically represented in Figure 12. Just a reminder that the figure is for visualization purposes only, and is not a mathematically accurate representation of the extracted factors. The high correlation of the factors is indicated by a partial overlap, and the orientation in the grid-group scheme also includes the insights from the qualitative analysis.

![Figure 12 Four factors in the Netherlands](image)

**COMMON THEMES**

The four factors - Action Learning Idealists, Critical Academics, Loyal Citizens’ Teachers, and Pluralist Democratic Educators – are descriptions of four types of views of Dutch teachers within a relatively narrow consensus framework. The consensus framework is built around a number of issues about which all teachers agree.

Most importantly, the data reveals a shared professional language, a common discourse, developed over time. Often, the teachers referred to discussions with other colleagues; they also seemed to know where others in the field stand.
on most of the issues discussed. Occasionally, they referred to their teacher training at the University, and to the way their own experiences with social studies have shaped their personal and professional choices. Often, the teachers used similar language to express their opinions. There was a sense of continuity, of a tradition of teaching the subject over several decades. The difference with the East European teachers, who saw themselves much more as pioneers in an unknown, yet to be established school subject, was striking.

The statement with the highest degree of shared approval was “We have to teach young people to be critical and not to believe everything they see and hear in the media.” (6)

Two themes emerge from the comments on this statement.

The first theme is an obvious concern about the growing power and increasing influence of the media. Teachers feel that they should make their students ‘aware of the power of the media.’ Teachers see it as their task ‘to educate critical media consumers.’ In many cases, teachers see the media as a competing force to the messages, which students receive at school. Their reactions to this perceived threat vary from ‘fighting back’ to feeling defeated. While some have faith in their ability to teach youth to counter ‘the ideal pictures they see’ and develop autonomous views, others are afraid they are fighting an uphill battle:

‘[…] it is very difficult, it requires knowledge […] this requires a lot [of experience]; the whole society is uncritical, I get really scared about it, I find this difficult and I have to take care not to put it away, because it is hard.’

Another prominent theme associated with statement 6 is the way examples from the media are used in class for teaching critical thinking and reasoning skills. One way to do this is to analyze ‘the laws of media logic […] to see the backyard of the media.’ Through a media example, important themes can get introduced and discussed:

“We had a discussion on the Netherlands as an immigration country. They had the idea that it is a new phenomenon. It helps to put the immigration processes in a historical perspective: you get a lot of questions, they start asking a lot about the process - who is allowed in, how do we believe them etc.; also the illegal immigrants, who have no option, I illustrated this with a film, and then you see them thinking […] the clichés get changed.”

Given the importance teachers ascribe to the topic, it is curious to note that »Media and communication«, will no longer be a separate topic of the examination program in the new social studies curriculum. The program is in its pilot phase now and excluded the theme, in spite of indications that students find it appealing (Schnabel 2009). One of the teachers declared that he will still keep teaching about the media, because it is too important and helps them ‘judge the quality of the [political] process.’

Also undisputed is the idea of the need to teach »how democracy works and why it is worth defending it« (22). Teachers do not see this as an
attempt to indoctrinate students. Rather, they see teaching about democracy as a specific contribution of their subject—social studies—to the overall task of schools to educate future citizens.

A closer look at the discussions around this statement reveals a wide range of views. Some of the teachers find it sufficient to inform students about basic democratic rights and freedoms. Others underline ‘the importance of letting your voice be heard,’ and encourage participation to make democracy work. Several teachers explain how they teach about ‘different shades’ in democratic arrangements, rather than reproduce the simplistic juxtaposition of democracy and dictatorship. Yet another group focuses on letting students realize ‘how lucky they are to be born in this part of the world,’ to show them that ‘people [in Syria and Egypt] give their lives for what we find normal.’

All Dutch teachers approve of the statement “It is better that the teacher discusses norms and values instead of stiffly adhering to neutrality”(29). On the one hand, this reflects a general consensus on the importance of going beyond ‘the established facts’, which we see reflected in the combined-country analysis in the next chapter. On the other hand, the statement can be seen in the context of an ongoing debate in the Netherlands about the neutrality of the teacher. The topic has a prominent place in teacher training programs and is discussed at length in the standard teacher training textbook (Olgers et al. 2010). Although teachers offer different arguments, they do not reject neutrality altogether:

“I am open; I find neutrality very important, I see around me that neutrality is not a value any longer. I think it is part of professionalism and it decreases lately […] you have to approach these things in an academic manner; not to preach.”

The boundary between an open discussion and imposing one’s views is strictly maintained:

“You should not impose your own opinion, but absolutely discuss it.”; “[students] are allowed to know who I am, and also that other people have different views.”

Others are more concerned with the importance of discussing ‘the underlying values’ of social issues, and with the very process of discussion as a means to reveal more substantial causes and mechanisms:

“For instance, communism starts with idealism and within a very short time becomes ugly, the problem is power.”

One respondent stresses the cultural aspect of values, claiming that she discusses ‘Dutch values’. Most teachers associate ‘Dutch values’ with democracy and decent social arrangements, and clear away from identity, so ‘Dutch’ is used here by default:

“Sometimes as a teacher I need to show them the values of society and to tell them what is normal.”
“Neutrality” is often seen by teachers as an ideal, which does not work in practice. Instead, they adhere to personally tailored rules for disclosure – at what moment, how much, what kind of ideological preferences to reveal, as a part of a broader pedagogical process. Thus, although statistically consensual, the statement (29) acquires different colors in the four thought styles. The general agreement, nevertheless, sounds like this:

“I do not disclose my political preference before explaining about different ideologies. I do not keep it a secret though. But I am not sure if it is wise to tell them if a teacher is voting PVV [the extreme-right Dutch party].”

‘Neutrality’ is also interpreted as independence, as the lack of obligation or pressure ‘to defend anything at all’, which is highly valued by Dutch teachers. They are particularly weary of directly promoting government positions:

“I can explain what the role of government is, but I have no interest defending it at all.”

This is why Dutch teachers unanimously reject the statement “My task as a teacher is to defend state policies and interests, because I am an employee of a state-financed educational institution” (31). An extreme yet common reaction left no room for doubt:

“Halleluiah, no, absolutely not! I do not even have to discuss this!”

The teachers defended their position with pluralistic arguments – there is no such thing as ‘a state interest,’ so even if they wanted to, they would not know what exactly to defend:

“If the state interest means to defend the democratic state, then I agree, but if this is only the interest of the government, no.”;

Then they go on to explain that it is exactly their right to be scandalously provocative, if they please:

‘Last week I told them that it was a good idea to abolish Dutch monarchy. A student asked me what would happen if the Queen would refuse to sign a law. I told them that we should hang her on the highest tree around; that this was maybe a good idea in general.’

Nevertheless, a number of the teachers were willing to give the statement a fair consideration before rejecting it, which is in line with a much more positive attitude to the state, compared to the Bulgarian respondents:

“I find this one difficult. On the one side, if you work for the government, you should accept what kind of government this is. If the government finds that this is the ideal citizen, you will have to contribute to this, but you need to be critical about this ideal and about state interests. You cannot defend them all the time. It depends on the definition of state interest. If you work in Iran, it is exactly the state interest that you need to defend.”

Another statement which invoked similarly strong negative reactions, was ‘Citizenship education should cultivate a spirit of unity, loyalty to the state, and national
The teachers felt the need to use strong language: ‘nationalistic nonsense’, ‘I am allergic to this kind of language’, ‘scary, yucky’! ‘I feel like singing the national anthem on the spot!’ Patriotism was not seen as a thing to be taught at school. Patriotism is seen as something that ‘we do during sport events, and that’s about enough.’

When the initial emotional reaction subsided, most respondents went further to link the statement to two main themes.

A large group made a link to the theme of neutrality in teaching:

“My students have the right to a ‘neutral’ lesson. They should be able to formulate a position based on the information they get. If they want unity, loyalty and pride, that’s fine, but I am not going to impose it on them.”

A smaller group of teachers relate the theme of patriotism to the current identity debate in the Netherlands. One teacher made a comment that pluralism is a more important topic than national unity. Another one notes that we should not confuse loyalty to the country with one’s personal feeling of cultural identity:

‘I can be prepared [to function in] society, but I do not have to be proud of my country; you can have the knowledge, but not the feeling’; “This is the point, you teach them, it is a process, but the outcome is not in your hands. The result of a process is not determined in advance.”

Given the current political debate about national identity of immigrants and religious minorities in the Netherlands (Doppen, 2010), it is remarkable that teachers tend to stay clear of this discourse. How exactly they will deal with this issue in the classroom, when it is inevitably brought up by students, remains to be seen. I will come back to this topic in the following chapter, when the teachers from the three countries are compared.

A statistically consensual statement, “The democratic approach to inquiry and debate should be demonstrated in class, in order to encourage students’ interest in politics” (26) turns out to be dissensus is disguise. It did invite comments and different positions.

Some teachers considered the statement self-evident:

“if you teach them how discussion works, you show them how politics works, it is the same, only for grownups with power and authority.”

Another part of the teachers felt that they were ill-equipped to prepare their students for democratic inquiry and debate; others noted that they saw the importance of it, but eventually chose for the safer route of exam preparation, where these skills are not tested. A small group had doubts about the effectiveness of teaching inquiry and debate for promoting political interest in students. Partly, the differences in interpretation stem from the varying views on democracy, seen by some as equal to ‘voting’ and by others in a broader sense of democratic relations in all facets and layers of social life.

A few consensus statements ended up in the middle ‘neutral’ category. Dutch teachers are not very much inclined to mix the role of a teacher with the
role of an activist (32, 36), which is concurrent with their positioning around the individualistic/hierarchic axis. Also, they do not subscribe to the idea that citizenship education should have serious pragmatic value. But unlike their colleagues from Bulgaria and Croatia, the teachers do not react strongly to the idea that their work would be directed to the labor market or would somehow contribute to safety in society (8, 36). They do not feel pressed to follow government agenda’s as much. For Dutch teachers, national guidelines do not seem to carry as much weight; school identity and school philosophy are of greater influence:

“I think it depends on the school. Our school is more inclined to be against the status quo and critical, but some schools are very authoritarian.”

Against the backdrop of this strong sense of belonging to a professional community with an established discourse, the voices of the four factors revealed are also strong and distinct, exactly because the high loading respondents sometimes use identical or similar words and expressions to present their views.

Below, the views of the four groups of teachers are presented. Every group has a label, which expresses their position in the force-field scheme, and a motto – a direct quote by a teacher. The most typical comments and discussions are presented, where possible with direct quotes from teachers belonging to the group. At the end, I also compare briefly the factor (group) to the others, to establish their place in the force-field.

**FACTOR 1 – ACTION LEARNING IDEALISTS: “THE SKILL TO DO SOMETHING ELSE”**

This group of teachers is united around the notions of action, movement, process, change. They are change-oriented, skills-oriented, and follow their students in shaping the learning process.

The teachers in this group are clearly oriented towards the needs and the development of their students:

“[it is important] to see the students as persons, not numbers.’ ; ‘that they work on something that is not necessarily directed at money, they get to know something they did not know before, some also stay longer and keep doing it”

The group of Action learning idealists shares the hope that the students will ‘contribute actively [to society]’ The teachers do this most efficiently through experiential learning: “let them experience, taste, and experiment.” However, this faith that learning will lead to action is also ‘idealistic’ in their eyes, as it is mixed with frustration with their actual practice:

“it is very important that they also do things, [when they are exposed to other sides of life] a kid who saw that actually cried, only then I see things happen, it changes me also as a teacher […] but are not there yet.”
Because they place so much value on practical experience, the Action learning idealists strongly agree with the statement: »It is not enough to engage in discussions about how to improve the world, it is important to give young people the chance to participate in real life.« (10) This focus on action and practice is combined with the ambition to cultivate skills in discussion and research in their students (14), with the goal to form “attitudes and instruments to explore the world, to find their place in it and to be able to express it.”

The skills are necessary for a contribution to society in the future; knowledge is only instrumental to acquiring these skills (3). The teachers in this group are opposed to teaching ‘static’ knowledge (9). Instead, the Action Learning Idealists consider looking at systemic mechanisms, explaining the social dynamics, more important than ‘structures and regularities’ (12)

“Yes, [but] not in the sense of understanding what the names of the parties are and so on, but understanding what the system does to them, that they can make a better choice for themselves, what their place is; after they have discovered the structures, so I go further than the structure alone.”

The Action Learning Idealists guard and cherish student individuality (1, 17). They do not wish to impose common interests on their students, without giving them the opportunity to make their own individual choice:

“In any case, they should know what it means if they follow only their self-interest; if they choose for their own interest, who am I to tell them that they should not do it? [...] they should realize that this has consequences. It will be nice if they also took the common good into account.”

“I think that [the lessons] confront them with the consequences of their own behaviour and make them think about their individual choices. For example, do you choose for high interest rate, even if you know that your bank is doing some morally wrong things with the money?”

Because they value free choice and openness so strongly, the Action Learning Idealists insist on a place for controversial issues (19). They insist on discussing different ideas and perspectives in the classroom:

“To the contrary, you have to discuss, [offer] a framework, which is difficult here: I have a homogenous class, they agree with each other on a lot of hot issues.”

In other circumstances, a certain amount of caution is important, to ensure safety. One respondent mentions the longest discussion she had with a class about same-sex marriage, which took place under after assuring strict confidentiality. But most of all, the teachers in this group are not satisfied with just talking about the issues, but go beyond discussion:
“If it [becomes] too hot, then you should take action. I worked with a […] white school, the students were all against Muslims, so we got them in contact with black kids\(^{28}\) and they softened their opinions eventually.”

The Action Learning Idealists are teachers with a mission; this is why they reject the idea that they could teach any subject (19). The subject is important to them, in a sense that they do not consider themselves just educators, but political educators:

“The subject is important, I would not just teach any subject: compared to physics, which is much more static subject, or biology […] the link to real life is interesting; also, you are surprised by what students bring in, it is a journey, and you do it together with students you do not know where you will end. They challenge you to go deeper and this is a rewarding thing.”

The rewarding journey of discovery together with the students does not combine well with sticking to the ‘dry facts.’ This is why this group of teachers does not wish to accentuate too much ‘the anatomy of government’ (11). While they all agree that knowledge is important, it is only so as a basis for a deeper understanding and attitude change:

“Yes, but also discussion about, for instance, the disadvantages of democracy, that it is not that black and white. You have to show them that there are also bad systems; the most important is the why, why did things become as they are.”

Compared to the other teachers, this group does see some merit in the idea that “citizenship education is an emergency measure by the state against the obviously growing lack of social tolerance.” (33). A number of explanations are offered.

One teacher agrees that ‘it is not a bad thing [to use it to counter intolerance].’ However, he doubts that teachers have that much influence on young people and even if it is their responsibility to challenge the growing intolerance:

“Teachers cannot solve this. If a football referee gets beaten up, it is not my responsibility. I find it logical to try to do it, but I should not be responsible for failing.”

Another teacher, on a similar note, stressing the limitations of a teacher’s job and the importance of subject knowledge, states that it takes very good social science teachers to succeed, not just ‘some history teacher who does this on the side,’ and even then, skepticism prevails.

Yet another teacher wonders if the idea of citizenship is linked directly to tolerance. Instead, she insists, it should be directed at

“[t]he lowest layer, the people who sink through the bottom […] for these people who cannot participate for all kinds of reasons, citizenship is [made] by us all, [we need] to make sure that you participate and everyone participates.”

This focus on collective action, the main focus of the Action learning idealists, is also echoed by one of the younger teachers in the group. She insists that it all de-

\(^{28}\) The Dutch refer to anyone non-Nordic as ‘black’
pends on the willingness of society as a whole ‘to do something,’ when discussing the relevance of citizenship education (15). Otherwise, the efforts of the teachers would not lead to any effects and will just remain in the realm of the ‘beautiful goals’:

“Everything is about money these days and the human being is forgotten, I find this difficult, because I am also in the system and thus cooperate.”

A striking feature of the Action Learning Idealists is their frustration about examination programs and the conflict between what they see as important and what they ‘should’ teach for their students to pass the exam. This frustration stems from their strong preference for controversy in the classroom. While the other three groups also agree that controversial issues should be discussed in class, Action learning idealists put controversy and discussion at the center of their teaching. Knowledge and »facts« take second place, however at the end, »facts are on the exam. « They also go on to explain that there is not always enough time to follow their students in more substantial discussion, because of the necessity to prepare them for the exam. This group, particularly the younger respondents, is concerned most of all with what they perceive as a mismatch between what they would like to teach and the program requirements they have to take into account. At the end of the day, the Action Learning Idealists turn out to be first and foremost content knowledge teachers, some by choice, most by frustration.

In sum, the Action Learning Idealists can be characterized as balanced individualists. The teachers insist that their students become independent (1); they also acquire the tools necessary to arrive at this personal choice. The student-focused attitude and the concern for growth (‘they have to walk through it by themselves’) and the use of school as a playground for democracy (27) makes the Action Learning idealists akin to an egalitarian position: similar, but less distinct than the one in factor 4. The concern about ‘society as a whole’ and about upholding democratic principles is shared with factor 3 and adds a hierarchic taste to this group of teachers. This mixture explains the placement of the factor in the force-field scheme, slightly off the center, towards individualistic.

Factor 2. Critical Academics: thinking independently about society

A major source of motivation for the Critical Academics is to see how their students understand the world of politics in a rational, academic way (12). They also place a high value on discussion skills, depicting is as ‘a weapon’, which students need to master. The Critical Academics feel more strongly than anyone else

29 The teachers refer here mainly to the subject ‘Social science’ in its current form; the newly proposed examination program was generally not discussed in the interviews. My overall impression is also that the teachers differentiate between the mandatory and the elective subject to a far lesser degree than the national syllabi suggest.
that their goal is »to educate thinking citizens who can employ various methods, theories and models to explore the world around them, and who are able to assess facts and arrive at conclusions«(13). However, we should not mistake this love for theory with a scholastic stiffness, as it has two distinct aims. The first one is to introduce students to the academic world, by letting them ‘see that all theories are temporary, that theories are different’. The second goal is broadly pedagogical:

“If you can use different methods and theories, you increase your own freedom, you give them the means to see through other persons’ thinking, from sloppy decisions you make structured decisions.”

The Critical Academics are the only group of teachers who subscribe to the suggestion that official study programs are uncritical of democracy (25):

“Yes, it is very much like, we have to impose this European idea of democracy and everyone will be happy. This is too easy. It has to fit your culture. We could say that we have a democratic tradition of a couple of hundred years. Citizenship education tends to get cut off from culture. There should be more culture, but it is not easy to do it.”

and also

“It is really a very rudimentary understanding of democracy - you become 18, you may vote, here are the parties, we will show you how to choose between them. You do not get to discuss what is good and bad, maybe trias politica and power abuse in dictatorship, but not more.”

Worth mentioning is that the group of Critical Academics consists of teachers involved in national policymaking and social studies curriculum development, with many years of experience. Maybe it is not coincidental that they are the only ones who have substantial comments on the quality of textbooks and on official curricula: the respondents in this group were involved in writing and evaluating textbooks, in one way or another. The teachers who ended up using the books do not seem to share their concern.

The Critical Academics’ focus on theory and academic skills keeps them in a strictly academic role as teachers of a subject with a clearly political core (20), in fact identical to citizenship education (21):

“No, no, no! Everything is politics: that kids have to sit in this old [school] furniture here is also politics.”

“Politics is extremely important […]. Politics is where the decisions are made that influence our fate: if democracy is not in order, many people can become the victim of this.”

The clearly defined academic core of their subject helps the Critical Academics to find a balance between the substantial and pedagogical side of teaching (18). Teaching without content knowledge is ‘empty and meaningless’ for them, and defines the limit of the influence of the teacher, who should keep in mind:
“The school has limits; I am not a social worker.”

The pedagogical side is important for the Critical Academics, but the academic skills, the necessary sharpening of the instruments for reason are leading again, sometimes at the expense of safety in the classroom (1):

“[…] the normative side, the soft skills, yes, but if your reasoning is not correct and your knowledge is lacking, then I will correct you; but if the finger [pointing at students] is the one of a preacher, no, I do not do it.”

Content knowledge (9) is therefore important, as teaching is ‘description instead of prescription.’ Also, the statement “These are the rules, these are the laws. I think this is the bulk of citizenship education” (4) is rated only mildly negative, compared to the rest of the respondents. The Critical Academics underscore the importance of learning about rights, but also see the idea of teaching the law by the letter as rather limited; as lacking an explanation about the origin of law, conflicting law, ‘realistic and less realistic rights’ and the fact that ‘laws are just a reflection of our time.’

In conjunction with the above, these teachers stand out as a group that shows some understanding for the suggestion that politics “belongs more too elite schools” (41). The Critical Academics share this position with the Bulgarian Local Social Guardians. However, the Dutch teachers approve on different grounds and to a lesser extent than the numerical rankings suggest. The Dutch teachers in this group feel that the highly rational and abstract teaching, which they personally prefer, may not be suitable for younger students. Still, the ability ‘to translate’ content in a way accessible to students is a sign of professionalism, according to the respondents:

“If you claim this [statement 41], you are very arrogant and a bad teacher. Obviously you are not capable to relate to the world of your students.”

Critical Academics demarcate crisp boundaries between their tasks as schoolteachers and the responsibilities of other societal actors in educating the youth. They reject the suggestion that their teaching will contribute to developing the skills necessary for the labor market (8), as “students can see for themselves what they need.” Also, the teachers do not see it as their task to encourage students to participate in society (3, 7) or to keep them responsible for engaging in charity work (28). The reasons vary from the suggestion that it is mainly the parents’ responsibility, and not a school task, to the more individualistic and non indoctrinating ‘it is their own business’:

---

30 This discussion has a lot to do with the way Dutch secondary education is organized, one of its effects is the de facto separation of two distinct forms of citizenship education for children in general schools and in vocational schools.
“As far as I am concerned, you are allowed not to be involved in society all day long, if you please.”

Within this context, the teachers do not see how playing democracy at school would help them achieve any teaching goals (27). They do not place special demands on the school as institution:

“This is nonsense [that the school is not democratic]. 2% of the Dutch are members of a political party, so the rest function in a democracy only during elections, there are no democratic institutions, corporations are not democratic, you can learn it at school, of course.”

“No, this is mean; students grow up in a democratic tradition. Firms are not democratic, university is not democratic, but this doesn’t mean we are not a democracy, our life is woven with democracy nonetheless.”

In such a world, to which the teachers are not overly critical, students need knowledge and reasoning skills to survive, and not ‘competencies’ (15). The respondents insist that young people know very well how to make it in society and do not need political education to do so successfully:

“I am thinking about the plumber who makes 150000 euro in a year and is not interested in anything political at all, so to survive you need other skills.”

“Come on, nobody will die if they do not get citizenship education! People are just happy and live on.”

Summarizing, this ultimate faith in individual freedom and self-sufficiency, the refusal to prescribe any type of behavior, combined with a firm belief in knowledge and rational reasoning places the Critical Academics clearly in the individualist side of the grid-group field.

**FACTOR 3. LOYAL CITIZENS’ TEACHERS: “STABILITY IN CHANGING TIMES”**

The respondents defining this group used almost identical words to describe their main concern: “times are different”, “the winds are changing”, “this is trendy now.” They feel they need to respond to the new demands of their time, and do not feel ill prepared: the teachers are convinced that they could offer some structure, stability and where possible, an alternative voice.

Their main didactic tool is knowledge transfer, but values such as mutual respect are also high on the list. The teachers state that knowledge has been ignored lately and needs to be reinstated (22), particularly the appreciation of democratic rights and freedoms.

For these teachers, loyalty means active defense of the democratic system—participation in discussion and debate (14), a critical, but tolerant attitude toward the media (6).
The Loyal Citizens' Teachers are not as concerned as the respondents in the other groups about the need to offer a variety of theories and methods to explain the world (13). Instead, this group of teachers would stress the competences and skills directly needed to take part in society (15).

The Loyal Citizens’ Teachers are clear about their acceptance of the Dutch political system. They encourage students to contribute positively to Dutch society (3) through membership of political parties or interest groups, also ‘to get an idea about how society works.’ Listening to experts, ‘people who know what they are talking about’ is also approved and stimulated.

The Loyal Citizens’ Teachers subscribe very strongly to the statement “Students should learn to take into account the common good, rather than follow only their private interests” (17). Student independence is considered important, but through the lens of the common good.

“Independent is without help from others, autonomous is good, but you need other people around you. We are social beings, we cannot do it alone.”

The suggestion that the official curriculum is “essentially uncritical” is clearly rejected by this group (25). Not that they consider the curriculum perfect; they focus more on the actions of teachers. The reasoning is less in the direction of being critical and more on the right to ‘hold private opinions.’ Being loyal clearly means to these teachers something different than being politically correct:

“I think this is a stereotype, teachers in social studies and even elementary school teachers do not do this, they do not behave in politically correct manner.”

This sensitivity to ‘political correctness’, but also the implicitly held belief that everyone has a place in the system, becomes obvious when one of the respondents discusses tolerance:

“This is somewhat cynical, this tolerance; because children get socialized from a young age on and this citizenship education on top of it is sort of artificial, not authentic. You teach them tolerance and mutual understanding in this artificial manner, while you think, well, the world does not function in this way... people get together with similar people, you cannot force them to get along with everyone. When you look at who you are, at who your friends are, they are like you; so the world is not this huge playground where everyone plays with everyone, it just isn’t like that.”

This critical quote brings us to a prominent theme for the teachers defining the factor, already mentioned in the beginning. As in the example above, the respondents sometimes do things they do not completely subscribe to, out of a sense of duty. For example, they condone the necessity to encourage individual advancement of students, in spite of their own convictions:

“This is indeed so, you have to be the best if you want to succeed, these are the times. This is what they expect from you. You need to become the best. That is expected from them.”
Another respondent then goes on to explain, with certain regret, how young people today are much more conservative and obedient, compared to the previous generation. The wind of change has not been always in the direction of freedom, it seems.

The Loyal Citizens’ Teachers are the only group of teachers who tend to agree with the idea that school is not democratic enough to help students learn about democracy (27). The main reason the teachers give is that schools are not any more or less democratic than any other institution in society. In this sense, the teachers do not ascribe to themselves any exceptional position in society; they are doing their best to make young people aware about basic social mechanisms and to help them find their way in the fabric of society.

In sum, the strong focus on adapted participation, combined with the importance of democratic values and a concern for general social tendencies, places the Loyal Citizens’ Teachers in the hierarchical segment of the group-grid field, with some egalitarian elements.

**Factor 4 - Pluralist Democratic Educators: “Broaden their horizon”**

‘My task is to show them how to get things done,’ declare the Pluralist Democratic Educators. They envision and important role for themselves in the lives of their students: to broaden the horizon of their lives and ultimately to achieve student independence, which they see as the crux of citizenship education. They do this by remaining unbiased and open, offering as many viewpoints and ideas as possible. Yet, they insist on mutual respect, obeying the rules of conduct and ‘the unwritten rules’ of social groups.

Fostering their students’ independence is their most important mission (1). This is because their ultimate goal is to educate students who are confident and feel good about themselves (2). Part of the process is to make them ‘realize how lucky and privileged they are to be born in this part of the world’ (22). The neutrality of the Pluralist Democratic Educators should not be confused with disinterest (who am I to tell them?). It is more accurate to say that the refusal to take a stance or to impose a choice is dictated by a concern for the still fragile student with a shaky ability to set priorities (23). They do not take a back seat in the process of teaching; neither do they assume the role of a devil’s advocate (30), as their Bulgarian colleagues are inclined to do. The Pluralist Democratic Educators ‘explain, never impose’ their position (34), they stimulate their students ‘to look for the reasons of things’ and to form an opinion without ‘following the ones who shout the loudest.’

The Pluralist Democratic Educators define their role clearly as pedagogical, as opposed to being a subject specialist (18). They see themselves as personal
examples of moral behavior (5). The teachers feel that their students need to be
guided and nurtured by human beings who become their role model and guide
them into a world larger than home, beyond the comfortable cocoon of ‘mum,
dad, brothers and sisters.’ In many cases, the Pluralist Democratic Educators con-
fide, their role is to correct the one-sided beliefs received from home and can be
a tool for emancipation.

This inevitably means that the teachers pay more attention to the common
good, but less so than for the Loyal Citizens’ Teachers (17). Instead, participation
is encouraged as a means to help students find their place in the world. However,
participation is not necessarily oriented towards improving the world, as it is the
case with the Action Learning Idealists. Moral categories define teachers’ engage-
ment better than issues and structures (11, 12):

“We should certainly talk about social norms, about how people ought to behave.” (24)

The Pluralist Democratic Educators are neutral about specific knowledge
(9), as they still see knowledge and reasoning as a necessary basis for their peda-
gogical goals. The teachers appear not particularly concerned about discussion,
debate or research skills (14). However, the data reveals a sophisticated look at
various forms of discussion and debate, not only expressing an opinion, as well
as interesting links to politics and not the least, a sense of decency and civility
needed for this kind of work:

‘I would pay more attention to listening first and then putting forth a good argument.’

The Pluralist Democratic Educators adhere to a value-oriented view of citi-
zenship, within the undisputed framework of democracy (22) and do not think
that they should ‘sell’ democracy:

“If you understand democracy in this uncritical way, you have not understood it at all.” (25)

They seize every opportunity to exercise democratic principles also at school,
where they see enough opportunities (27). Students have rights, not only duties,
the respondents explain. One respondent explains how their school adheres to
democratic principles and shows students where and how to participate. Yet an-
other one uses the opportunity to be critical:

“[…] even if there is not enough democracy at school, you have to make this clear to them.”

Being critical does not preclude the importance of mutual respect, obeying the
rules of conduct and ‘the unwritten rules’ of social groups. On these grounds they
disagree with the suggestion that just teaching the rules and laws is enough (4):

“I think that citizenship education is exactly about the grey areas, where you need to make
choices, to let students see the shades and the lack of clarity and to be able to analyze and
make choices.’ ‘If this were citizenship education, it would be a shame.”
This is why the Pluralist Democratic Educators do not wish to spend too much time on the anatomy of government (11). Instead, they work to expose their students to various theories and models of the world (13), in spite of the trace of doubt about the effect:

“It is a dream, but if it works... most students learn for the exam and then forget it, but I hope some things stay with them; I would like them to remember some [of the content], but also that over 10 years someone comes with the memory that is was a nice subject with a good class climate, where they could express their opinion and go in debate with each other.”

In sum, the place of the Pluralist Democratic Educators occupies the space between the individualist and egalitarian position, leaning towards the individualist. These teachers have a lot in common with the Action Learning Idealists, most importantly the focus in action and getting things done. However, the Pluralist Democratic Educators use other means to achieve that and thus differ substantially in the depiction of their role as educators, and not subject specialists. They differ from the Loyal Citizens’ Teachers with an uncompromising stress on independent and critical thinking and the refusal to impose the opinion of any authority.

**CONCLUSION**

The Dutch views are similar to each other and clustered around the individualist-hierarchic diagonal. The aspect ‘good citizen – critical citizen’ does not play a differentiating role, as teachers seem to perceive a critical attitude as a part of a ‘good’ citizen – in other words, the degree of acceptance of the country’s current political arrangements was much higher, compared to the Bulgarian and Croatian groups of teachers. Neutrality is a great concern among Dutch teachers, and most seem to find a pragmatic solution in their own attitude (disclosure of personal views) as they do not feel in any way pressured to defend ideas which are not compatible with their personal convictions. Matters related to the curriculum (attitude vs. knowledge) and to a teaching approach compatible with the schools’ pedagogic signature, seem to be of greater importance for Dutch teachers, against the backdrop of a consensus on a long-established professional field.

The Dutch teachers speak with a coherent voice, share a language to describe their professional preferences and clearly draw upon a tradition which goes back to a common understanding of a school subject (Olgers, 2012; Vis, 2007), through academic training with well-established curriculum, to a practice of teaching that encourages open discussion and frequent exchange. We can say there is a professional community of social science teachers, who are aware of their own choices and often can accurately name the other possible positions
and preferences. Two types of data strengthen this conclusion: two respondents loading on more than one factor were capable of formulating the difference in perspective expressed by the respective factors. Also, the respondents sometimes were invited to reflect on the position of colleagues. Not only they could point out differences, they also added that these differences are openly discussed and conceptualized as strengths and differences, not necessarily as insurmountable viewpoints. Change and innovation are incremental and stable, and the results cannot be spectacular, anyway. This is why Dutch respondents tend to be clear about their own professional boundaries – within the walls of the school, for a number of respondents even within the walls of the classroom.

In the following chapter, the views of the teachers in the three countries will be compared and further discussed.
Chapter Seven.
Teachers’ views compared

In chapters Four, Five, and Six, I presented the teachers’ views in Bulgaria, Croatia, and the Netherlands. In this chapter, the views of the teachers in the three countries are compared. A cross-country comparison is useful in the following ways. First, the comparison exemplifies commonalities of views on citizenship education, regardless of the specific national context. Second, it helps to question views and principles, which are taken for granted in a particular national context, by showing possible alternatives. And finally, the comparison helps to discern any differences between countries with diverse political traditions, which may be taken into account in designing common European projects or in borrowing practices across borders.

How is the comparison made and why?

As already stated in the first chapters, one important objective of the presented empirical work was to create a map of teachers’ views and to explore meaningful ways to create ‘continents’ of distinct views on this map, instead of myriads of ‘islands.’ In this chapter, I will show how teachers’ views on citizenship education indeed form meaningful clusters, within the three explored countries and then across the countries. Some themes emerging from these clusters highlight the difference between the countries; others show how teachers across national borders share an understanding about their professional work, about the core and the boundaries of citizenship education.

The analysis at both levels – intra-country and inter-country - is needed to avoid the trap of using countries as entities, thereby employing clichés and stereotypes. Equally, to ascribe all diversity between countries to individual teachers’ preferences would mean to ignore the shared national context of history, political and educational tradition, and policy-making specifics.

An obvious first step in the analysis was to look for similarities and differences in the three country sets. This was done by a thorough analysis of the factor descriptions and the interviews of the high-loaders per factor. The factors occupying similar spaces in the force-field framework were compared, as well as the overall pattern of distribution of the thought styles per country. The advan-
tage of this approach is that it highlights the role of the national contexts and circumstances.

However, this step is not sufficient: the comparison at the first step remained focused too much on the country level, while the focus of the study is the individual teachers. This is why, the second step was to combine the respondents of three countries in a general dataset and perform a Q factor analysis of the combined data. This approach has one great advantage – it highlights commonalities between teachers, regardless of the country of origin, thereby giving an indication of what might be shared ‘European’ views on citizenship education.

As a third step, the five factors resulting from the factor analysis of the general (combined) dataset were compared to the national factors, through analysis of the general factor descriptions and the interviews with the factor defining respondents. This last step is a narrowly focused, analytical revision of the first step leading to an adjustment of the findings against the newly created canvass of the factors which have emerged through the analysis of the combined factor data set.

Because the analytical logic of a comparison is not the same as the presentation logic, I will present the results below starting with the combined factor analysis (the second step). Then I will explain how the national factors compare to this general pattern (first step and third step combined). The chapter concludes with a discussion of the findings in the light of national and historical contextual factors.

**GENERAL SAMPLE: FACTOR ANALYSIS (G)**

Two issues were considered in performing the analysis of the general sample. First, due to the difference in size of the datasets, the Dutch sample colors relatively strongly the general dataset. However, this effect is tempered to some extent by the relative homogeneity of the Dutch sample. The combined factor analysis helped to highlight some less visible differences in the Dutch sample, as respondents could ‘gravitate’ to factors with predominantly Bulgarian and Croatian respondents. Second, it is important to keep in mind the general limitation of Q methodology, which does not allow for extrapolation of conclusions to larger sets: it is tempting to see the nationality of the respondents who define a factor as an explanatory variable. Nevertheless, in cases where respondents from a certain nationality dominate a factor, interesting questions emerge. These are discussed in the last section of the chapter.

---

31 In the schemes, the general factors are indicated with a G, followed by a number.
A combined sample of 62 respondents was created (17+17+28) and factor analyzed. A five-factor solution with PCA factor analysis and Varimax rotation was chosen as adequate. Other solutions were considered, including judgmental rotation, following Brown (1993), and subsequently discarded, as they did not seem to contribute to better understanding of the data. The main reason judgmental rotation was attempted was to shed some light on the views of a number of confounding respondents in the national samples, to make sure that their distinct perspectives have received enough attention. However, in the solution offered, these confounding loaders ended up loading high on the resulting factors, so their contribution was sufficiently taken into account in the analysis.

The factor matrix with an indication of the respondent defining the factors is presented in Table 12. Keeping the mind the warning in the previous paragraph, we observe that the respondents from the various countries are not distributed evenly among the factors. Factor 2, for example, does not include a single Dutch respondent. In contrast, Factor 5 is defined by Dutch respondents only. Factor 4 does not include Bulgarian respondents, only Dutch and Croatian. This observation strengthens the argument that an analysis on both levels is revealing and necessary. It will be taken further in the discussion of the factors.

Table 12 Factor loadings per respondent for all respondents combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSORT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 nlxxxx</td>
<td>0.4024</td>
<td>0.2059</td>
<td>0.1957</td>
<td>0.4469</td>
<td>0.5962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 nlxxxxxxx</td>
<td><strong>0.4988X</strong></td>
<td>0.0630</td>
<td>0.1981</td>
<td>0.1628</td>
<td>0.3846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 nlxxx</td>
<td>0.2978</td>
<td>0.3139</td>
<td>0.4639</td>
<td>0.2401</td>
<td>0.4018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 nlxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1660</td>
<td>0.4182</td>
<td>0.1723</td>
<td>0.0764</td>
<td><strong>0.5675X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.3802</td>
<td>0.1468</td>
<td>0.3649</td>
<td>0.3773</td>
<td>0.5453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 nlxxxx</td>
<td>0.4057</td>
<td>0.2343</td>
<td>0.2027</td>
<td>0.4325</td>
<td>0.3283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 nlxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1879</td>
<td>0.2679</td>
<td>0.1857</td>
<td>0.4842</td>
<td>0.5192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 nlxxxx</td>
<td>0.3465</td>
<td>0.0755</td>
<td>0.4267</td>
<td>0.2631</td>
<td>0.3785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 nlxxxx</td>
<td>0.3786</td>
<td>0.1575</td>
<td>0.2317</td>
<td><strong>0.6525X</strong></td>
<td>0.2073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 nlxxxx</td>
<td>0.2310</td>
<td>0.1848</td>
<td>0.2861</td>
<td><strong>0.7139X</strong></td>
<td>0.3099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 nlxxxxx</td>
<td>0.3231</td>
<td>0.2048</td>
<td>0.2463</td>
<td>0.3109</td>
<td><strong>0.7070X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.3264</td>
<td>0.1658</td>
<td>0.3744</td>
<td>0.3420</td>
<td><strong>0.5180</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 nlxxxxxxx</td>
<td>-0.0030</td>
<td>0.0437</td>
<td>0.2777</td>
<td>0.3578</td>
<td><strong>0.7259X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 nlxxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.3699</td>
<td>0.1611</td>
<td>0.3472</td>
<td>0.2239</td>
<td><strong>0.5670</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 nlxxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.0824</td>
<td>0.2051</td>
<td>0.3127</td>
<td>0.1159</td>
<td><strong>0.6039X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 nlxxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2927</td>
<td>0.0690</td>
<td><strong>0.4008</strong></td>
<td>0.3064</td>
<td>0.5316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 nlxxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.3124</td>
<td>0.1907</td>
<td>0.2820</td>
<td>0.4388</td>
<td>0.4170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSORT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.3065</td>
<td>0.1284</td>
<td>0.1681</td>
<td><strong>0.6832X</strong></td>
<td>0.2759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>-0.0057</td>
<td>0.1809</td>
<td>0.5101</td>
<td>0.3461</td>
<td>0.4962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.3980</td>
<td>-0.1431</td>
<td>0.2445</td>
<td>0.4006</td>
<td>0.3828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 nlx xxxx x</td>
<td>0.0847</td>
<td>0.1081</td>
<td>0.0640</td>
<td>-0.0802</td>
<td><strong>0.6148X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1988</td>
<td>0.2321</td>
<td>0.2252</td>
<td>0.2949</td>
<td><strong>0.5991X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1654</td>
<td>0.1633</td>
<td>0.6083X</td>
<td>0.3588</td>
<td>0.3464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2381</td>
<td>0.3085</td>
<td>0.2248</td>
<td>0.3221</td>
<td><strong>0.7523X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2230</td>
<td>0.4653</td>
<td>0.3626</td>
<td>0.3907</td>
<td>0.5053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 nlx xxxx x</td>
<td>0.0776</td>
<td>0.5175</td>
<td>0.2125</td>
<td>0.5273</td>
<td>0.4850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2218</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
<td>0.2490</td>
<td>0.4786</td>
<td>0.4742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 nlxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.0864</td>
<td>0.2460</td>
<td>0.4803</td>
<td>0.4181</td>
<td>0.3478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2268</td>
<td>0.5074X</td>
<td>0.0895</td>
<td>-0.0666</td>
<td>0.3150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.4385</td>
<td>0.5430</td>
<td>0.3634</td>
<td>0.0997</td>
<td>0.0950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.4627</td>
<td>0.5669</td>
<td>0.2877</td>
<td>0.2876</td>
<td>0.2681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2765</td>
<td>0.4110</td>
<td>0.2786</td>
<td>0.2373</td>
<td>-0.1351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td><strong>0.5819X</strong></td>
<td>0.3609</td>
<td>0.0874</td>
<td>0.2644</td>
<td>0.1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1393</td>
<td><strong>0.5486</strong></td>
<td>0.3833</td>
<td>0.4080</td>
<td>0.2748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1494</td>
<td>0.1978</td>
<td>0.3234</td>
<td>0.4570</td>
<td>0.3130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.3654</td>
<td>0.0357</td>
<td>0.4391</td>
<td>0.2048</td>
<td>0.2844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2474</td>
<td>0.6025X</td>
<td>-0.0669</td>
<td>0.4471</td>
<td>0.0701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.0632</td>
<td>0.3885</td>
<td>0.2499</td>
<td>0.3880</td>
<td><strong>0.5693</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1992</td>
<td>0.1869</td>
<td>0.3486</td>
<td>0.2879</td>
<td>0.1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.4631</td>
<td>0.3966</td>
<td>0.2885</td>
<td>0.1160</td>
<td>0.2930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td><strong>0.6009X</strong></td>
<td>0.2738</td>
<td>0.1313</td>
<td>0.1175</td>
<td>0.1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2095</td>
<td><strong>0.5744X</strong></td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>-0.0023</td>
<td>0.2372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1041</td>
<td>0.1509</td>
<td>0.7203X</td>
<td>-0.0985</td>
<td>0.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.0552</td>
<td><strong>0.6424X</strong></td>
<td>0.3193</td>
<td>0.1570</td>
<td>0.3381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 bgxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1473</td>
<td>0.1168</td>
<td>-0.0464</td>
<td>0.3055</td>
<td>-0.0113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2122</td>
<td>0.4548</td>
<td>0.3037</td>
<td>0.3527</td>
<td>0.3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>-0.0429</td>
<td>0.3550</td>
<td>0.1958</td>
<td>0.2470</td>
<td>0.4206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
<td>0.2257</td>
<td>0.1808</td>
<td>0.6482X</td>
<td>0.0993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>-0.1708</td>
<td>0.2179</td>
<td>0.2868</td>
<td><strong>0.5889X</strong></td>
<td>0.3097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1118</td>
<td>0.3157</td>
<td><strong>0.6553X</strong></td>
<td>0.2408</td>
<td>0.2639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1342</td>
<td><strong>0.5631</strong></td>
<td>0.3492</td>
<td>0.1865</td>
<td>0.3754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.0960</td>
<td>0.4731</td>
<td>0.4829</td>
<td>0.1737</td>
<td>0.4313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.1389</td>
<td>0.4755</td>
<td>0.3160</td>
<td>0.0848</td>
<td>-0.4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>-0.0396</td>
<td><strong>0.4814</strong></td>
<td>0.4839</td>
<td>0.3180</td>
<td>0.4201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 crxxxxxx</td>
<td>0.2580</td>
<td>0.1447</td>
<td><strong>0.6078X</strong></td>
<td>0.0463</td>
<td>0.2449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlation between the factors is considerable, visible from Table 13, but it is lower than the correlation between the Dutch factors. The high correlation is an indication of shared views among respondents. Due to the difference in numbers, the data is skewed in favor of the Dutch sample. This is an extra reason to use the quantitative outcomes only as an indication of an overall trend and as an addition to the qualitative analysis for the three countries. In technical terms, the commonalities are reinforced by the large degree of consensus among Dutch teachers, and some of the extreme views are 'softened' and 'mainstreamed'. For example, the Croatian Patriotic Conservatives seem to be a rather lonely and unique group of teachers. In the general sample however, they got 'coopted' and drawn towards the middle in the general sample. More respondents ‘joined’ some of the concerns expressed in this factor, but in a milder form. To the contrary, the most idiosyncratic factor in the Bulgarian sample (Local Social Guardians) became ‘dispersed’ along similar factors in the general sample: the respondents did not load significantly on any of the general factors. This can be an indication that the views expressed by the Local Social Guardians are somehow typical for Bulgarian teachers only, or that one should look for other feasible explanations: for example, at the type of students which teachers implicitly refer to when they discuss their views.

Table 13 Factor correlations general factors (all respondents combined)
The normalized factors scores of the general factor analysis are presented in Table 14.

Table 14 Standardized factor scores general factors (all countries combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Combined countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need an environment in which they could discuss the problems of society without anyone pointing a finger at them and correcting them.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to teach young people to be independent and to make their own decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage my students to get involved in social life through the established institutions and to listen to expert opinion.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These are the rules, these are the laws. I think this is the bulk of citizenship education.</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher should be a model of honest and decent behaviour, this is the core of citizenship education.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have to teach young people to be critical and not to believe everything they see and hear in the media.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher should make it clear to the students that they need to participate in public life if they want to advance in society.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship education should contribute to the development of competences required by the labour market.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should pay more attention to knowledge: to look at how things really are, instead of just discussing how they should be.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not enough only to engage in discussions about how to improve the world, it is important to give young people the chance to participate in real life.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher should stress first of all the anatomy of government: the separation of powers, the functions and prerogatives of the institutions, the different types and purposes of democratic systems.</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am pleased when my students begin to discover structures and regularities and when they begin to understand the world of politics.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. The goal is to educate thinking citizens who can employ various methods, theories and models to explore the world around them, and who are able to assess facts and to arrive at conclusions.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. It is important that students learn to defend their views in political discussions and social debate; this is why I help them to develop research and discussion skills.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Citizenship education should focus on the development of skills and attitudes, much needed for students to survive in today’s complex world.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Young people may learn the law by heart, but this does not mean they will necessarily obey it.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Students should learn to take into account the common good, rather than follow only their private interests.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I feel that I am first and foremost a teacher and only then a subject specialist. The subject matter is only secondary.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Controversial political problems should not be discussed in class.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Citizenship education should not be associated with politics, because individual acts of compassion and generosity are more important.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The subject “as it is called in the country” is in fact citizenship education. Both are aimed at educating future citizens.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Young people should acquire knowledge about democracy: how it works and why is it worth defending it.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. It is very important that students learn how to analyse social problems, but also select the most important ones.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. The teacher should present to the class only established facts about society. Social norms are not a suitable topic for teaching.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Official citizenship programs are essentially uncritical: democracy is good, we are a democratic state, therefore we are good.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. The democratic approach to inquiry and debate should be demonstrated in class, in order to encourage students’ interest in politics.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Students cannot learn democracy at school, because school itself is not a democratic institution.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Citizenship education means to hold students accountable for their behaviour and to get them involved in charity and community activities.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. It is better that the teacher discusses norms and values instead of stiffly adhering to neutrality.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher should not disclose his or her political views to the students. Quite the opposite, only broadly accepted social and political values should be discussed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>My task as a teacher is to defend state policies and interests, because I am an employee of a state financed educational institution.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I am obliged as a citizen and a teacher to stir things up if necessary, and not only through the so called legitimate political channels.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>In my opinion, citizenship education is an emergency measure by the state against the obviously growing lack of social tolerance.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>We should not declare any ideology to be correct; instead, we should give students an opportunity to get acquainted with various ideas about political and social order.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>The most important task of citizenship education is to inform students about their civil and political rights and freedoms.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should be of some use to society, for instance by contributing to greater safety.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Citizenship education is an outdated concept, because it conveys to students the values of the middle class.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Civic obedience means more than just obeying the law, it means obedience to higher personal standards and higher social interests.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Students should be made to realize that they live in a world of growing interdependence. Even though we do not respect each other, we still depend on each other.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Citizenship education should cultivate a spirit of unity, loyalty to the state and national pride.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>For most students politics is way too abstract and incomprehensible, it belongs more to elite schools.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting factors are visually presented as follows:
In the next section, I will explain what the common issues are, shared by all respondents and how they indicate the existence of a strong, bottom-line sense of professionalism among teachers across the national borders.

**COMMON THEMES**

It is not really surprising that the consensus is more visible on the negative side: it is easier for teachers to agree on what they do not like and do not subscribe to. Statistically, the consensus is only in rejecting certain statements. However, the qualitative data suggest a number of positive consensus topics, which deserve attention and are thus also discussed. There seems to be a *bottom line standard of integrity and professional traits of a high school teacher engaged in political education,* that goes across national borders. None of the teachers sees themselves as just as transmitters of information, of some *fixe* bare minimum body of knowledge about rules and laws (4). Also, none of the teachers thinks it is enough to teach ‘the established facts’ about society (24). Teachers are not enthusiastic about a strictly utilitarian understanding of citizenship education, especially if they see it as an instrument for repression by the state (36).
The strong rejection of the idea that citizenship education should be something for the elites only (41) is a reason for optimism, at first glance: teachers seem to believe that citizenship education is for all future citizens, and not only for some. However, there are indications in two of the country-sets, in Bulgaria and in the Netherlands, that the item is far from undisputed. In Bulgaria, teachers with a relatively large number of disadvantaged students tend to agree with the statement. In the Netherlands, teachers with long experience and a strongly academic approach are also not quick to reject it. The rejection seems to reflect a teacher’s sense of worth and professional identity: a teacher should be able to explain complex matters to its audience, at an appropriate level. There is less discussion on the school system or the expectations of the curriculum in relation to school differentiation, since that was not an immediate topic of the interviews.

The positive consensus, though weaker statistically, rings clearly through the qualitative data, and concerns the following topics:

First, a safe environment in the classroom is valued by all respondents (1). In the context of their overall views, teachers differ in the exact interpretation of ‘safe’ - ranging from ‘free of conflict’ through ‘possible to correct the students when wrong’ to ‘free to express any controversial opinion without fear.’ The didactic implication is that one cannot work on safety and discipline in the classroom without taking into account the general stance of the teacher on handling controversial and politically charged issues.

Second, student independence and the ability to make one’s own decisions are also valued and seen as a worthy goal of citizenship education (2). However, respondents have different ideas about the degree of independence and the areas in which student independence should be developed (or allowed). Some teachers understand independence more as the ability to take responsibility for one’s own actions, while others clearly insist on fostering and actively encouraging independent political judgment.

Three, teachers agree that it is important to invest in developing a strongly skeptical attitude towards the media (6). They see media both as disproportionately powerful and as insufficiently discussed in most teaching materials in the official curriculum. The variation in the degree of approval (from +2 to +4) has to do mainly with the perceived ability of the teachers to counter the influence of the media. Many share stories about their way of handling the issue; some think that they succeed in their task, others feel powerless or ill-equipped to counter the omnipotent media machine. Also, teachers vary in the estimate of their students’ critical judgment. The difference is marked alongside national borders: Dutch respondents tend to believe their students are naive and readily accept everything in the media to
be the truth; among the East European and particularly among the Bulgarian respondents, there are teachers who think that, to the contrary, students are cynical and distrust absolutely everything. Part of the explanation is in the communist past of Eastern Europe, where everyone was trained from a younger age to mistrust and 'translate' Newspeak. To an extent, the estimate of the teachers reflects their own critical attitude, projected on their students. Another aspect is the desolate state of the freedom of press in these countries, particularly in Bulgaria. This makes the problems of modern media much more visible, also to young and inexperienced people.

**FIVE CLUSTERS IN THE THREE COUNTRIES COMBINED: AN OVERVIEW**

The combined findings of the analysis are presented on Figure 14, where the newly emerged 'continents' consist of the factors revealed at the national level, gravitating towards overarching factors in the general sample. The scheme should be read as follows:

First, the scheme is a *visualization only*, resulting from the combination of quantitative data and (comparative) qualitative analysis at the inter-country and intra-country levels as described above. The letters in the corners indicate the four biases in the grid-group scheme as used in the visualization of the national factors as well. The places of the factors in the force-field are indicative and do not capture completely all the idiosyncrasies of the data. For example, the Dutch factors are much more correlated (see correlations in Table 10, Chapter Six) and thus close to each other, but technically this would result in overlapping shapes and unreadable text.

Second, the general factors color the country factors in this analysis; thus some factors have 'shifted' slightly in comparison to their position in the country schemes. This is due to the fact that the general factors highlighted some underlying themes and suppressed others.

Third, the country factors are indicated by a country initial plus a number. The general factors are indicated in a cloud-like contour. Within the contour, the national factors that fit the general one are situated.
Below, short descriptions of the five general clusters are presented: the School Subject, Discipline oriented, the Meritocratic Stability Mentors, the Liberal Democracy Mentors, the Critical Cultivation Coaches and the Democratic Debaters.

**Factor G1. School Subject Oriented**

For this cluster (factor), teaching *social sciences as a school subject* is the main contribution to citizenship education. Discipline as a prerequisite of learning is a common concern of the teachers defining this factor. The cluster occupies the hierarchic quadrant of the group-grid scheme, with some individualist features.

Social cohesion, loyalty and tolerance are highly valued by these teachers (39, 40). The respondents are loyal to the established social order, and not necessarily to the state as a government arrangement (31). They highly value democracy as a set of values. The actual democratic institutions are not accepted uncritically (25), but are seen to be the natural order of things and thereby in no need for drastic repairs.

The teachers have a clear sense of a boundary of their schoolwork, expertise and influence not further than their own classroom (27, 28). They are concerned with order and discipline, and in this light consider themselves as a model of good behavior. The role of supervisors fits them best: they do not see themselves
just as transmitters of knowledge, but lead and guide young people in forming their judgment abilities. The respondents in this group tend to be ‘old-fashioned’ in the way they address their students - at a distance, where they are clearly the seniors. Safety in the classroom is more important than teaching a variety of analytic methods, for example (1, 13).

The Subject and Discipline oriented teachers are focused on subject content and put knowledge in the center of their teaching (9). The respondents in this factor aspire to a certain degree of neutrality (30), and pay less attention to debating skills as opposed to skills needed for problem-solving (12, 23). For them, citizenship education is a core part of teaching politics and a basic understanding of society, and not a transient emergency measure of government (33, 37). Participation in social life and activism are strongly valued, but certainly not as a means to achieve individual success at the expense of the common good (7). The teachers encourage their students to find their place in society, without being destructively critical (3), through equipping them with sufficient knowledge and understanding of the established institutions.

Statistically, the cluster of the Subject and Discipline oriented teachers resembles the Dutch Loyal Citizens’ teachers in their direct approach to systematic knowledge and moderately conformist attitude. The two groups also share a focus on teaching in the classroom. The difference is to be found in the larger weight that the general cluster seems to put on topics of national cohesion, loyalty, and tolerance.

In the previous chapter, the adverse reaction of Dutch teachers towards the statement mentioning national pride (40) was already discussed. In this factor, it is positively valued (+2). This does not come as completely surprising, as a number of the Dutch respondents had indicated nonetheless that ‘there was something worth considering’ in the statement, and added that they would ‘certainly understand’ their East European colleagues if they rate the statement positively. It seems that many Dutch teachers echoed the standard Dutch reaction, in which nationalism is not done, the Netherlands is tolerant by definition, and the PVV (a right-populist party, known by its leader Wilders) expresses the most extreme views in this respect. During the interviews, a few Dutch respondents just hinted to the debate on multiculturalism and subsequently avoided it. This ambivalence about the issue of nationalism and multiculturalism comes to the surface in the School Subject and Discipline oriented cluster. One Dutch respondent is defining the cluster, together with a number of confounding respondents from Bulgaria and Croatia. A closer look at the qualitative data reveals that the teachers in the cluster indeed share a strong concern for discipline, tend to be ‘old school’ and value minimum knowledge requirements. We could say that this group represents the traditional hierarchic school institution as we
know it for the last two centuries, with teachers devoted to their work and doing their job with confidence and few ambitions to influence the lives of their students in any dramatic way.

**Factor G2: Meritocratic Stability Mentors: nurturing structured thinking**

This cluster (factor G2) is clearly situated in the hierarchic corner of the grid-group field. The hierarchic views are ‘softened’ by concern about students’ well-being and the willingness to invest in their development, which makes these teachers closer to the position of Mentor and bordering the egalitarian thought style in this aspect.

The Meritocratic Stability Mentors value critical independent thinking in a structured, theoretical manner, as a tool to foster the growth and development of their students (13, 14). The teachers link independent thinking (2) to identity formation and the strife to achieve national cohesion (40) and a sense of belonging (39). The preference for hierarchy prompts them to value the skill of setting priorities and choosing the important problems (23). The Meritocratic Stability Mentors see knowledge of the law as a prerequisite to obeying it (16).

Consistent with their role as supervisors and mentors of their students, the teachers in this group are moderately concerned with the safety of their students (1). The Meritocratic Stability Mentors tend to shield the students from participation and activism and to postpone these activities for the future (7), when the pupils are prepared enough through school to claim their place in society. Ideally, the teachers would like to see their students finding their place is a social and political system that values hard work and personal merit. This is why they are inclined to hold students accountable for their behavior (28), a logical reciprocation of their own position of role models to young people (5).

This cluster is similar in many ways to the cluster G1. Both clusters are situated in the hierarchic quarter of the group-grid scheme; both value national cohesion and loyalty to the country, but not excessively (40). Both are concerned with the growing interdependence of the world and the need to preserve one’s identity in it (39).

The most pronounced difference between the two groups of teachers is their perceived role (18): the respondents in the first cluster see themselves undoubtedly as subject teachers, while the teachers of factor two prefer to take a more guiding, mentoring, pedagogical role. The Meritocratic Stability Mentors tend to rely on a combination of analytic skills and moral guidance in educating young people.

Two national factors fit this cluster – the Croatian Patriotic Conservatives and the Bulgarian Pragmatic Conservatives. Three of the four defining respond-
ents of the Patriotic Conservatives are loading high in the general factor G2. However, the respondent with the highest loading on Patriotic Conservatives shows a weaker association with the general factor. Three high loaders are coming from the Bulgarian Pragmatic Conservatives. Two more respondents belong to the Bulgarian Personal Growth Facilitators (one whose personals sort was also strongly associated with the Pragmatic Conservatives) and one to the Bulgaria Global Future Debaters, and one each of the Croatian Personal Growth Coaches and the Croatian Reflective Humanists (weaker association).

The analysis of the individual sorts reveals that these additional loaders bring to the factor mainly a nurturing, supportive attitude towards the students. This is how the additional defining respondents account for an overall ‘softening’ of the hierarchic edges of the factor, so that it touches upon egalitarian positions as well. Thus, a factor, which was statistically the least correlated with the other revealed positions, finds a more mainstream place in the general analysis.

We need to be careful with far going implications about the clustering of East European respondents in this factor. (Only two of the respondents associated with the factor are Dutch – one relatively weakly loading and the other one confounding). It is much too easy to fall into clichés about uncritical nationalism and underdeveloped democracy in Eastern Europe: this will be an underestimation of the earnest attempt of the teachers in this group to find a difficult balance between their professional standards and the dominant discourse dictated by the political reality of the day. The mission of these teachers can be seen as directed at emancipation and positive affirmation of the values of nations in transition, still marred by serious corruption scandals, and young and very vulnerable civil society. Yet, the system is irrevocably democratic and worth defending (22), according to the Meritocratic Stability Mentors, regardless of its many flaws.

The qualitative data allows for another plausible reading of this factor, with a skeptical undertone: teachers are disappointed in what increasingly looks like a ‘failed transition’, they look at the past and are nostalgic about what they remember as a meritocratic educational system, quite powerful in shaping students in a certain direction. They feel that they the current political and educational system is undermining their authority and thus their efficacy as teachers.

**Factor G3: Liberal Democracy Mentors - theory and evidence based, learning oriented, pragmatic**

This cluster (factor G3) shares the name of the Croatian Liberal Democracy Mentors, because it is overlapping with it to a great extent. The same Croatian respondents define this factor. They are joined by one Dutch teacher (weakly associated with the Action Learning Idealists), and a Bulgarian respondent (De-
liberative Liberal). The Liberal Democracy Mentors occupy a middle position between the hierarchic and the individualistic quadrants of the grid-group field.

If anything, the Liberal Democracy Mentors in this new configuration have a reinforced evidence based, learning orientation. The teachers define themselves exclusively as a ‘subject specialist’ (18); they see their subject as political education (20). This defines their mentoring style as anchored in subject knowledge and scientific method, rather on their own personality (5). This does not mean, however, that the Liberal Democracy Mentors let go of any normative aspects of teaching. They see it as their task to convey to students the logical necessity of taking “the common good” into account (17); self-interest and ‘advancement in society’ are not particularly encouraged (7). The teachers of this group consider the attempt to change the world a worthy cause (10), and they encourage their students to join them (28, 3) with moderate enthusiasm.

The teachers agree that the most important task of citizenship education is to inform students about their rights and freedoms (35). Democracy also should be studied, as well as civil and political rights, and “the anatomy of government” (11). The teachers see this knowledge transfers as a phase in teaching, as a necessary step, a fundament, upon which critical and systematic thinking can be built (12, 13). This is why they put a relatively strong stress on teaching.

Their idea of teaching can be seen as critical rationalistic - offer adequate information and at the same time encourage students to analyze it and deliberate on it for themselves (2, 26). Theory, evidence and the rules of logic are all important, underpinned by accepting the framework of democracy as worth defending (22).

**Factor 4: Critical Cultivation Coaches: giving direction to students’ development**

The Critical Cultivation Coaches are first and foremost educators, the subject matter comes in second (18). Their teaching style is decidedly student-centered. In the grid-group framework, the Critical Cultivation Coaches occupy the egalitarian position, with some distinct individualistic features.

The Critical Cultivation Coaches encourage participation and active involvement in ‘real life’ situations in their students (10), or at school as a playground for democracy (27). The teachers make an effort to create an open and safe environment in the classrooms, where the students can speak their own mind (1). The teachers see classroom safety as a condition for a successful discussion of controversial issues during lessons (19). The Critical Cultivation Coaches value highly the independent thinking of their students (2), but also actively channel this independence by an appeal to higher moral standards in their behavior (28). They motivate the students to participate, but not at the cost of neglecting the common interest (7).
Unlike the Liberal Democracy Mentors, The Critical Cultivation Coaches take teaching personally. They underscore their personal responsibility as role models (5) and think that it is imperative for teachers to give an example with actions and ‘stirring things up’ when necessary (32). They are engaged, not necessarily neutral at all circumstances (30), and less concerned with teaching content knowledge than with provoking thought and discussion. Structure, models (12) and other ready-made frames (13) not originating from the students are of a relatively low importance, in contrast to the Liberal Democracy Mentors.

The Critical Cultivation Coaches are associated the most with the Croatian Personal Growth Coaches (two respondents defining both factors) and the Dutch Pluralist Democratic Educators (two respondents defining both factors and one relatively strongly associated with the Dutch factor). The contribution of the Dutch Pluralist Democratic Educators shifts the cluster towards the middle, closer to the individualist position, whereas the Croatian Personal Growth Coaches exhibit a stronger accent of student accountability, involvement, and participation, and an even stronger focus on pupils’ personal development.

The Critical Cultivation Coaches are also somewhat similar to the Bulgarian Personal Growth Facilitators, but less ‘soft-skill’ oriented, and thus more inclined to stick to the political core of citizenship education.

Loosely associated with this cluster are the Bulgarian Global Future Debaters. What sets the two groups apart is, first, the considerable attention to analytic methods, problem analysis, and the development of skills and attitudes. Second, they see their role as teachers as a more balanced mix between educating and subject teaching. Third, compared to the Critical Cultivation Coaches, the Bulgaria teachers in this group tend to me more rebellious and openly critical towards political structures, and therefore less inclined to interpret citizenship in a utilitarian fashion.

**FACTOR 5: DEMOCRATIC DEBATERS: KNOWLEDGE ABOUT SOCIETY AND INDEPENDENT THINKING**

The Democratic Debaters occupy the Individualist corner of the group-grid field with some egalitarian elements. These teachers strongly approve of the statement “I am pleased when my students begin to discover structures and regularities and when they begin to understand the world of politics“ (12) Critical, systematic thinking, substantiated by knowledge of political processes, is at the center of their teaching. The central concern of the Democratic Debaters is teaching young people to be critical, giving them the tools of debate and discussion (13). In their interpretation, active deliberation is a means of protecting and defending democracy (22).
This feature makes them akin to the School Subject and Discipline oriented teachers (G1). The two groups also share a sense of boundaries and the preparedness to limit their responsibility to the classroom walls and not further. This is why the Democratic Debaters reject the idea to hold students accountable for their behavior and for participating in charity (28). The Democratic Debaters differ from the Subject Oriented Teachers in the amount of personal freedom they give to students: they do encourage them to participate, but do not prescribe participation as a means of advancement in society (7).

Because the responsibilities of these teachers end with the lesson, further involvement in the ‘real world’ has no priority (10). The Democratic Debaters adhere to ideological diversity and to a neutral, detached presentation of diverse positions (34). They share this position with the Liberal Democracy Mentors. Unlike the Liberal Democracy Mentors, however, they do not reject their role as a role model for their young students as well (5); they seek a balance between being a subject specialist and being a teacher (18).

All but one defining respondents of this factor are Dutch: four respondents belong to the Action Learning Idealists, five are Critical Academics, and one responder loading double on both factors. The Bulgarian respondent is relatively weakly associated with the factor and leans to the position of the Critical Academics. This is why, in the scheme, the two Dutch factors - the Action Learning Idealists and the Critical Academics – are indicated as closely associated with the cluster of the Democratic Debaters.

Two other factors are leaning towards the cluster of the Democratic debaters, but are distinct enough not to belong to it completely: the Croatian Reflective Humanists and the Bulgarian Deliberative liberals:

The Reflective Humanists stress analytic methods and analysis even stronger, sometimes at the expense of knowledge. More importantly, the Croatian teachers are more aware of the importance of the issue of interdependence and tolerance.

The Bulgarian Deliberative Liberals are mostly concerned with propagating civil rights and freedoms, at the same time less inclined to give students limitless independence. They do not share the criticism of their Dutch colleagues on official citizenship educational materials; rather, they see citizenship education as an essential and important innovation in Bulgarian schools, thereby endorsing a moderately utilitarian goals of citizenship education.

Finally, loosely associated with the Democratic Debaters is the Bulgarian group of Global Future Debaters, which is reflected in the names of both groups. However, the Bulgarian group has a distinct cosmopolitan, specifically European, orientation, while the respondents in the general group of Democratic Debaters simple are not sensitive to the theme of identity.
DISCUSSION: SHARED OWNERSHIP OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION, COUNTRY DIVIDES VISIBLE

The analysis of the combined data reveals a consensus on teachers’ independent professional position as owners of the citizenship education curriculum. They see the core of citizenship education as political education, which encourages critical and independent thinking. This agreement runs across the barriers of national contexts and arrangements and can form the basis for a common European discourse on citizenship education among professionals as curriculum gatekeepers.

The differences also become visible. Graphically, we see the Dutch teachers clustered around a middle, moderately conformist position; the Croatian teachers spread alongside the market-hierarchy axis; and the Bulgarians spread around the edges of the force-field, with a fragmented discourse. The underlying source of this difference is the attitude towards politics. In Bulgaria, the level of mistrust towards politics and government is high and politics is defined mainly in the narrow terms of everyday political games. Croatia and the Netherlands share a much broader and more positive outlook on politics and tend to see politics in positive terms, to include broader aspects of social life.

The combined data analysis reveals a deeper layer of difference between the three countries and a divide between East and West, particularly in the way respondents perceive the impact of their work. The Dutch teachers exhibit the features of an established professional community with realistic ideas and expectations about the degree of their influence and about the effects of their work. Their Bulgarian colleagues, and to a lesser degree the Croatian teachers, are torn between frustration and optimism in an attempt to cope with problems the Dutch teachers do not have to face. While the Dutch teachers feel confident in their professional expertise, their East European colleagues have to find ways to bridge a great discontinuity in their work.

A substantial number of Bulgarian and Croatian teachers tend to focus more on problems and on the need for a place to discuss and eventually alleviate them, and less on participation. The societies they operate in seem to be troubled ones, with normal channels of dialogue frequently blocked, very visibly in Bulgaria and to a lesser extent in Croatia. The teachers’ mission can be seen as directed to emancipation and positive affirmation of the values of nations in transition, still marred by serious corruption scandals, and young and very vulnerable civil society. In this sense, the teachers in both countries are less inclined than their Dutch colleagues to remain neutral towards ideologies they see as harmful.

In post-communist countries, the breach between the totalitarian and post-totalitarian generation is so great that teachers often are ready to abdicate from the role of ideological guides for the younger generation, out of fear of contaminating
them with what they see as the irreparable damage of being brought up not free. By the same token, the opposite position is also possible: teachers tend to minimize the differences between the two ‘systems’ and by this implicitly accusing their students in rejecting everything from the past, including ‘the good things’.

After the reforms started, the teachers in Bulgaria and Croatia got to hear that what they did was all wrong: not only the old ideology had to be discarded, but also the teaching methods, the general attitude towards school and students had to be changed. In many cases, citizenship education programs were seen as the vehicle to promote change, to introduce more interactive and student-centered ways of teaching. Sometimes these objectives were more attractive and seen as more important that the substantive goals of citizenship education. The new mix of ideas and approaches was imposed from the outside, so teachers never became owners of the reforms. Many teachers embraced the opportunity, but many others were left behind, feeling frustrated and even lost, and the attempt to restore some continuity resulted in a cynical position — nothing is changed, it is the same old thing, except we used to call it socialism, and now we call it democracy! This undercurrent of frustration is the big divide between the East European and the Dutch teachers.

This brings us to another point of division: the teachers’ perception of the influence of the European policy, as described in the first chapter, on the national practice of citizenship education.

In the Netherlands, teachers were hardly aware of official policy provisions on citizenship education at the European level. Most knew that there was a national policy, but did not feel it was directly relevant to their work. Instead, they referred more often to the ‘pedagogical signature’ and to the specific policies of their schools. In the case of the Netherlands (Naval, Print, & Veldhuis, 2002), the influence of European policies is more complex. This is partly due to the fact that national tradition in different forms of political and value education has never been breached, and partly due to the fact that Dutch national ideas about citizenship education were fed into the European citizenship education policy documents and studies, directly and indirectly, through scholarly works and expert involvement (Peschar, 2010; van Gunsteren, 1992; Veldhuis, 1997; Veugelers, 2007). For Dutch teachers, the introduction of citizenship education has been incremental, in no way different than any other curriculum adjustments. It could be speculated that in this context, the insufficient involvement of teachers in citizenship education policy and curriculum development remains less visible.

In the East European countries, the picture is different. Both in Croatia and in Bulgaria, citizenship education was a part of the EU accession package and was perceived as mandatory and imposed from outside. In Bulgaria, most teachers were aware of this circumstance and of the curriculum arrangements around
citizenship. In Croatia, the teachers openly discussed the fact that they felt left out of the process of implementing the new subject of citizenship education, which was imposed top-down ‘from Brussels’.

In ‘new’ and ‘established’ democracies alike, it appears that teachers were faced with so many contradictory demands that they did not know how to respond to them. Many of the demands looked far-fetched and unrealistic. Teachers needed to take care of the acquisition of political knowledge, but also to work on critical thinking and foster participation. In Eastern Europe, teachers were told that everything they taught in the past was indoctrination, the curriculum was biased and servicing the old totalitarian regime, and thus became obsolete overnight. In Western countries, the national tradition was supplemented with promoting European aspects of citizenship, active citizenship and participation, so teachers needed to make hard choices to include it in their already overloaded curriculum. With no direct stimuli to do so, such as an exam, many teachers thought that the whole ‘citizenship thing’ was just a fad that would go away any time soon (Rus, 2008).

It seems that, from their professional point of view, teachers did not play a major role in shaping citizenship education, for two different reasons: in the Netherlands, the link between what teachers saw as their ‘core subject’ (social studies) was seen as implicit and self-explanatory; in Bulgaria and Croatia, the discrepancy between the teachers’ daily work and what they saw as an imposed policy was too great to bridge in a predictable way.

In terms of the force-field aspects in chapter Two, common themes are organized around the aspect ‘indoctrination vs. neutrality.’ Teachers tend to choose a middle ground and although they name it as a dilemma in the interviews, at the end it doesn’t seem to be such a divisive issue, in spite of differences in accents.

The consensus around a bottom line knowledge component of the curriculum coincides with the basic orientation along the hierarchic-individualist axis (the aspect ‘knowledge vs. attitude’). Although initially most teachers would claim that both knowledge and attitudes were important, later they made a clear choice in one direction or another. Also, though many of them initially would stress the importance of skills and attitudes at the expense of knowledge transfer, eventually they would come back to the idea that knowledge remains important. Two things are worth noticing in this respect. First, there seems to be a shared consensus of a minimum required knowledge that students should acquire in the course of their education, no matter what the teaching style and preference of the teachers. Second, the more experienced the teachers, the less inclined to focus on skills without a solid knowledge base. This explains partly why Croatian teachers overemphasized the importance of skills and attitudes in teaching.
citizenship – they were all excited about the yet to be introduced subject, but did not have experience teaching it this way yet.

The aspect ‘coach vs. supervisor’ turned out to be important in delineating the professional role of teachers, both at the international and at the intra-country level. However, the differentiation ‘mentor-coach’ on the grid axis proved to be equally relevant, though not anticipated in the model. The aspect ‘individual rights vs. social obligations’ seems to matter only in conjunction with the other aspects and plays a role in coloring the choices along the line ‘critical vs. good citizens.’

The fatalist quadrant is populated by a factor in Bulgaria and shares some features of factors in Croatia. The egalitarian quadrant is considerably less populated than what could be expected from the literature. This finding is in contrast to a number of theoretical models discussed in chapter two and also to at least one empirical study: in the Netherlands (Leenders et al., 2008) found 53% of the teachers as subscribing to critical democratic citizenship, which, in this book, fits the not overly populated egalitarian corner. Obviously, in the last five years, these teachers did not disappear or leave school: they were just labeled more progressive, due to the conflated hierarchic and critical democratic types of citizenship. The conflation is rooted in the interpretation of ‘active participation’ as critical-egalitarian by definition; the more conventional hierarchic type of participation is overlooked. Since democracy also comes in many shades in pluralistic societies, some more critical, others more conventional. Based on my empirical finding, it seems that the teachers may be more main-stream than many people would like them to be.

This observation has direct implications for policy choices and for teacher professionalization, which will be discussed briefly in chapter Eight.
Chapter Eight.
Wrapping up, moving on: conclusions and discussion

Is last chapter contains two parts. The first part is a summary, point by point, of the findings of the book, revisiting the questions posed in the opening chapter. The second part is a dialogue, in a loosely Socratic fashion, between two fictional characters, on a number of important themes. The dialogue ends with a research agenda for the future. As the book was intended to be a conversation with teachers from different countries, the concluding discussion is meant as an invitation to others – scholars, teachers, policymakers, students – to join this conversation, to expand it and deepen it in different directions.32

PART ONE. CONCLUSIONS

In chapter one, I formulated the main task of the study as follows: to map the diverse views of secondary school teachers on citizenship education in Bulgaria, Croatia, and the Netherlands, to explore these views and to compare them, in order to arrive at a richer understanding and possibly to suggest ways to improve practice. I deliberately stayed clear from a ‘research question’ form. I believe it is not only a matter of style, but a position, stemming directly from an interpretive style of research and analysis (Yanow, 2000): the answers are never final, meanings are unpacked and reveal other sets of questions which give rise to the formulation of new tasks. By implication, the empirical findings of the study are the point of departure for suggesting possible new directions for practical applications in the field of policy, curriculum development, and teacher professionalization.

In what ways was the main task fulfilled?
First, the views of teachers in the three countries were mapped and revealed a greater diversity within the countries and unity across countries than originally anticipated,. The book focused on authentic teachers’ voices, with teach-

32 Please excuse the author for taking the liberty to use this device and to create characters who are just a tiny bit more daring in their speculation and more than a bit immodest in their judgment. Any resemblance with persons and events in real life is completely coincidental.
ers talking freely about the way they perceive citizenship, citizenship education programs and curricula, politics and their role in the lives of their students and in their society. The framework developed and used in this study can possibly accommodate the plurality of approaches and perspectives in more countries, to ensure a fruitful dialogue and debate, which go beyond terminology and clarification of concepts. Teachers’ voices receive a place in the debate, not only as isolated colorful illustrations of some general ideas, but as representing and generating general discourses rooted in everyday teaching practice. Thus, a shared playfield is created where diversity within countries is seen against the backdrop of a shared context across countries. Professionalism and a commitment to democracy form the background canvass on which a dialogue between the clearly discernable groups of teachers is possible.

Second, the grid-group based force-field of dimensions and aspects of the discourse on citizenship education proved to work as a meta-organizing and analytic tool. Four ideal types of views were constructed – individualist, egalitarian, hierarchic, and fatalist, based on a number of aspects, concerning the teachers goal (critical vs. good citizen), approach (indoctrination vs. neutrality), concern (individual rights vs. social obligations), role (coach vs. supervisor), and focus (knowledge vs. attitudes). Also, the choice for Q-methodology proved to be productive in two senses. First, allowed indeed to discern variations of the ideal types in the three countries, as well as common themes shared by respondents. Second, the interview technique allowed for rich qualitative data and engaged teachers in a researcher-mediated discussion of each other’s views.

Not all aspects described in chapter Two turned out to be of equal importance and weight, but all were recognized and served to discriminate between positions. Some new and patterns, not underlined in the theoretical model, emerged and came to the forefront. For example, most teachers had a more sophisticated idea about the relationship between knowledge and (critical) attitudes. Also, the differentiation Coach – Supervisor on the grid axis turned out to be less prominent than ‘mentor – coach’ on the group axis. The egalitarian position, popular among theorists and policymakers, did not prove to be prevalent in our sample. In other words, teachers may exhibit more mainstream ideas and attitudes and are less critical and radical than some have might expected.

Third, the types of views found in the different countries are comparable as they are placed in the same context, although the local accents differ. These are to be seen in the labels, which are chosen to depict the most typical for each pattern.

In Bulgaria, five groups of teachers adhere to the following views: The Pragmatic Conservatives, a Bulgarian brand of moderately hierarchic teachers, predominantly concerned with rules of social behavior; the Deliberative Liberals, populating the individualist corner, who see themselves as ‘provocateurs into
freedom’; the Local Social Guardians, who care for their vulnerable students; the Personal Growth Facilitators, whose main concern is student happiness and human development; and the Global Future Debaters with a mission to educate the future global citizens. Bulgarian teachers’ views are typified by a shared sense of responsibility and academic bravery, on the one hand, and a fragmented discourse in the face of growing cynicism about the country’s political development.

In Croatia, four groups of teachers were identified: The Reflective Humanists see their modest contribution in teaching students (self-)reflection; The Patriotic Conservatives are adamant about decency and order at school; The Liberal Democracy Mentors prepare students for their role as democratic citizens; and the Personal Growth Coaches focus on student independence and responsibility. The common concern of Croatian teachers is critical thinking and innovative teaching methods, as well as the need to conquer and preserve the place of citizenship in the curriculum.

In the Netherlands, the four factors are: the Action Learning Idealists, a change-oriented, student-centered group of teachers; the Critical Academics who teach no-nonsense academic analytic skills as a key to understanding the world; the Loyal Citizens’ Teachers, the Dutch brand of hierarchic predisposition with a focus on stability and structure; and the Pluralist Democratic Educators, concerned with broadening their students’ horizons and with encouraging them to get things done. The Dutch teachers display a great deal of consensus on their professional identity and about a pluralistic basic attitude in teaching.

The comparison between the countries revealed the following general clusters of views: The School Subject, Discipline Oriented, who see teaching social science as a subject as central to citizenship education; the Meritocratic Stability Mentors, who nurture independent thinking in a structured, theoretical manner; the Liberal Democracy Mentors with a theory- and evidence-based, learning oriented, pragmatic orientation; the Critical Cultivation Coaches who are first and foremost educators with a student-centered teaching style, willing to venture ‘real life’ experiences outside school to encourage democratic participation; and the Democratic Debaters who based their work on cultivating critical, systematic, independent thinking and active deliberation. The main outcome of the comparison is that teachers across borders claim ownership of citizenship education and put the knowledge components at the core of their work, as well as a shared understanding of professionalism. The most surprising outcome is that the country divides became very visible, as well as the West-East divide (The Netherlands vs. Bulgaria and Croatia). The breach between East and West is also in the way European citizenship education policy is perceived. All three countries see European Citizenship as imposed from above. However, while the teachers from the Netherlands just overlook it and carry on according to their own ideas,
their East European colleagues are struggling to implement something which they value as innovative but ill-fitting the local processes and demands.

PART TWO. DISCUSSION: A DIALOGUE

On a bright sunny day, during a break at the World Congress for Very Inquisitive Scholars, Prof. Ing. Guy Kriticksen from Denmark and Prof. Dr. Nina Crediousu from Romania found themselves sitting at the same table and carrying the same book. This was not really a coincidence, as the author knew both of them and had just given them a signed copy of her work. Sipping the excellent espresso and gazing over the busy congress crowd, the two scholars struck a conversation.

OPTIMISM OR PESSIMISM, SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

‘So,’ said Dr. Crediousu, ‘this book made me really optimistic about the future of citizenship education in Europe. It was fine to read that teachers in different corners of the continent are committed to educating young people about politics and democracy.’

‘Are you sure we’ve read the same book?’ replied Prof. Kriticksen, ‘because I was just about to say that it is time to call the whole thing off.’

‘Well, Guy, let’s give it some more consideration, shall we? I suppose we both agree that the book delivers what it promised in the first chapter – to map the views of teachers on citizenship education in Bulgaria, Croatia, and the Netherlands, through holding structured conversations, using Q methodology and cues selected and checked for completeness on basis of grid-group theory framework. I also think it is refreshing to read a study in which teachers take center stage and come out in a very flattering light indeed.’

‘Yes, Nina, I agree with that part. But we seem to read the conclusions through different glasses: you see reasons for hope and I am very, very skeptical. Let’s take stock of the issues one by one.’

The waiter brought some fine pastries to go with the coffee. It was a well-organized congress, after all.

‘All right then’, uttered Guy after a somewhat lengthy silence. “Let’s talk about the book a bit more systematically. First, we seem to have divergent ideas about the central message of the work. Let’s investigate this and give our arguments. Then we can discuss topics that came up while reading the book. I think that a few issues raised by this study are intriguing and deserve our attention.’

‘Good idea,’ answered Nina enthusiastically. The prospect of spending the next hour or so in the company of the Danish professor, whose blue tie conspicuously matched the color of his eyes, filled her with joy. ‘And at the end, of course, we can talk joined projects, inspired by this book, shall we?’
‘Of course, projects, this is what science is about these days’ mumbled Guy, while leafing through the book. ‘So tell me, Nina, what made you so optimistic about this whole citizenship education project in Europe?’

‘The reason that the book makes me happy, Guy, is that it delivers a fine portrait of teachers across these three countries: teachers who are dedicated and caring about their work, who think that they can make a difference in educating Europe’s youth. For me, the most important finding is that teachers take citizenship education seriously. They make a sincere effort to contribute to preparing young people to participate in the social and political life of Europe. They keep working, in spite of frustrations.’

‘That’s right, frustrations: this was the main theme for me, Nina! Teachers fall back to their sense of professionalism, and that is not at all a positive sign. Many teachers have the reflex that they have seen it all, that citizenship is nothing new and this is why they should not be too concerned about any type of policies their national governments come up with, let alone European policies. They do not particularly care about curriculum, either. They just do what they want.’

‘Listen, Guy, this independent behavior is actually a good thing! The comparative analysis reveals a consensus on an independent professional position, and on the core of citizenship education as political education, which encourages critical and independent thinking. Let me put it in another way: across the state borders, high school social science teachers speak a professional language, they have their own clear idea about what it is like to teach citizenship education, and, at the end of the day, they assign a central role to the knowledge component of citizenship education, because that’s what school is about. You see, this can be the basis for a common European discourse on citizenship education, without having to pass first the barrier of national contexts and arrangements.’

‘Oh, come on, Nina! Do you really believe this stuff? Citizenship education was launched to address the democratic deficit of Europe, and did it? Look at where we are now! I think that the results of this survey show how and why the whole undertaking failed, for reasons both unique and shared for the three countries studied in the book, in Eastern Europe more visible than in Western Europe.’

‘Wait, wait, Guy, we need to discuss this more thoroughly. But before we move to why citizenship education does not seem to be a dazzling success in these three countries and across Europe, let us stay with the teachers for a while and see what matters for them, shall we?’
TEACHERS AS GATEKEEPERS

Guy felt this was the moment to touch upon a favorite subject: ‘There is an ongoing discussion on the value of seeing the teacher as street level bureaucrats. One view is — as argued by Taylor 2007 - that teachers used to have a great amount of discretion, which made them a classic Lipsky case. Some consider them to be classic street-level bureaucrats, because they enter their personal views, including their sense of social justice, into their classroom work. They are seen as relatively free to follow what they believe to be best for their students and to construct their subjects as they see fit. (Taylor, 2007, p. 556) Taylor then goes on to claim that nowadays teachers are losing a lot of this discretion due to New Public Management…’

Nina interjected with a slight agitation: ‘Oh, come on, don’t start pitying teachers as the victims of neoliberalism! I think they are not street-level bureaucrats at all, and if they are, they cannot teach citizenship! You see, citizenship education needs to problematize exactly the rules which are supposed to guide street-level bureaucrats in their daily work. Besides, a student is not exactly a citizen yet, nor is she a client, to use your neoliberal newspeak.’

Guy looked at her with a mix of annoyance and delight: ‘What do you suggest then?’

Nina replied: ‘Well, the concept of gatekeeper seems much more suitable to me. My takeaway consists of three points: First, teachers are good at putting aside whatever frameworks someone imposes on them, if they do not see fit to use them as professionals. Second, they appreciate assistance, material and training, but will only pick what fits their style and conviction. And the last point is that, under the same circumstances, the gatekeeping reactions of the teachers may differ radically from one another, particularly when the circumstances are perceived as extreme in some ways. We see this clearly in Bulgaria and to a lesser degree in Croatia as well. In both countries, the ‘distance’ between the different thought styles, the different types of reactions, is larger than in under Dutch teachers.’

‘Yes, the data seems to confirm that teachers’ personal views have greater influence on their work than external policies (Kerry J Kennedy et al., 2002). But, Nina, how is this feeding your optimism on the future of citizenship education?’

‘It does, Guy, because it tells me that, if sensible plans are made, there will be teachers ready to carry them on and to modify them to make them work in different circumstances. It makes me hopeful, because the concept of gatekeeper receives a positive, constructive connotation. There has been so much research on teachers omitting, simplifying, and avoiding parts and aspects from the curriculum, and little to none on teachers getting a message across in spite of poor material and lacking guidelines (Bailey, 2013, p. 11).’
‘Let me see if I follow you, Nina: you say that teachers are serious about teaching citizenship, but we have to put up with their conservatism and be careful with linking citizenship education to innovation. Too much stress on innovative teaching methods without taking into account the teachers’ idea of ‘no nonsense’ teaching may unnecessarily alienate many teachers who derive their sense of professionalism from their subject knowledge. For those eager to introduce yet another innovative competence-oriented teaching method in the area of citizenship education, this outcome from the study may be a warning to take a closer look.’

‘You are implying that no innovation whatsoever would be possible, Guy? I can understand that it is frustrating to realize that training programs cannot be easily targeted at whole countries, but training is still needed and possible.’

‘I am not implying that it is impossible, but that it will be complicated and will also require a shift in thinking, from whole countries as target groups to types of teachers and thought styles. If we take the typology presented in the book seriously, the assumption is that learning will lead to moving from one ideal thought style to another. The immediate implication is that teachers will receive a centrally imposed policy change in different ways, but not random. The starting position will be different for the different empirically revealed types of teachers, so training programs and policy designs should take these into account (Hoppe, 2011). To be honest, I think it is a long way to go…’

Still, I am glad you are beginning to see my side of the story, Guy,’ interrupted Nina, eager to smooth over the practical difficulties and careful not to wander too soon towards ‘how’ questions. She knew that Guy Kriticksen’s pessimism had deeper roots and did not want to get there just yet.’

**Does the disciplinary background matter?**

‘What do you make, Nina, of the diverse academic background of the teachers included in the study? For instance, Bulgarian teachers were predominantly philosophers, Croatia had a few economists, and the Netherlands is clearly sociology dominated.’

‘I am glad that you mention subject knowledge, Guy. For one thing, Bulgarian philosophers are not the average Dutch philosophers. Their university curriculum has many more elements of social and political philosophy, which makes them akin to Dutch political scientists and to some extent sociologists. In Croatia, teachers with economics background were likely candidates to stand out with divergent views, but the data suggest they did not.’

Nina stopped to see if Guy was still listening and continued: ‘Besides, a great deal of confusion exists about the importance of a subject core when it comes

---

33 The teachers with economic background did not seem to be grouped together in this sample. Other type of study is needed to established the relationship between academic background and teachers’ views.
to citizenship education. You know the study on Australian teachers (Kennedy et al., 2002), which observes that teachers are greatly influenced by their subject background. The book we are discussing now confirms that teachers, logically, stick to their disciplinary identities, as they are a part of a school system, organized largely along disciplinary guidelines. This is also in line with the findings of the Eurydice report, as you very well know. (Eurydice, 2012, p. 87 - 91)

‘Nina, your positive look at this matter is enviable, but I see two problems: one related to policymaking and one methodological. For policymakers and curriculum designers, the mixed model (a subject partially overlapping with citizenship education) can turn out to be problematic indeed, because of unclear mandates and boundaries. The research confirms that the subject is leading for the vast majority of teachers. They do not see citizenship education as pertaining only to the pedagogical task of education, but they do not necessarily see it as fully compatible with their subject. The relationship remains complicated. It seems logical that, because the concept of citizenship education remains blurred for them – the teachers would tend to stick to their subject as much more anchored and clearly defined, with disciplinary boundaries fitting the school structure. Given that the arrangement ‘a comprehensive school program and one subject partially overlapping with citizenship education objectives,’ is prevalent in Europe, there is some redesigning on the way. The data seems to be an argument in favor of introducing a subject ‘citizenship education’, which will be taken seriously, will fit the school structure and will gain in status and importance. However, recent developments in England, where there are attempts to curb citizenship, do not offer much food for optimism: the tide seems to turn exactly the other way there.’

‘Oh, wait a minute, Guy: our discussion threatens to become disorderly. You are going too far ahead now, giving policy advice. I know, I know it is tempting, but let’s pay attention to your methodological remark as well.’

‘Ah, a conversation tends to run in circles, doesn’t it? As someone who has been involved in citizenship education both from an academic and a practical perspective, I immediately think about broader implications and associations, and the book just feeds my own thinking in this respect.’

Nina moved her chair a bit, away from the sun, as Guy was trying not to stare at her face, suddenly glowing from the changed light-fall. ‘Talking about implications, the curricula of the subjects teachers in the three countries are engaged with, share important core elements, and this appears to be more important than the difference in academic background of the individual teachers. There is another aspect to consider: who gets to teach a particular subject is a question of a long-established path dependency.’

‘You mean, Nina, that the boundaries between school-subject and the academic subjects are not as clear-cut as they look?’
'They certainly aren't. In the Netherlands, the schism between historians and social scientists has to do with the failed attempt to create a broad Social Studies subject, which also includes history (De Rooij, 2004). This led to teacher certification turf wars on both sides and ultimately to the unfortunate situation in which cooperation between these two subjects is problematic, to say the least.'

‘Wait, Nina, I have been thinking about this issue – the link between social studies and history. Please, remind me to come back to it later. But for now, is it the same in Bulgaria and Croatia?’

‘Yes and no, Guy. In Croatia, the line of division can be traced to former Yugoslavia and is more along the lines of religious and secular education. In Bulgaria, as you probably know, teachers in philosophy, for all kinds of reasons, managed to preserve their strong presence at secondary schools. Thus, after the change of regime in 1989, they were the ones directly involved in developing and implementing the new citizenship education programs, in spite of a visible rivalry with the history camp (Dimitrov & Boyadjieva, 2009). The sociologists and the political scientists, on the other hand, were never offered teacher training as part of their academic education. They also saw the importance of citizenship education and their own interest in getting involved in these programs. However, from the position of an outsider, the natural role available to them was that of a Watchdog and a side-line critic. You certainly know some of the examples (Dimitrov, 2008; Dishkova, 2003; Vatzov, 2011)

‘I know, I know, Nina! Particularly in the 1990s and the beginning of this century, you could almost certainly guess one’s academic background and affiliation, depending on the Western counterpart they worked with. We should actually research this, it will tell us a lot about the dynamics of establishing and implementing citizenship education in Eastern Europe.’

**IS IT STILL ABOUT THE EAST AND THE WEST THEN?**

‘Ach, Guy, you are not suggesting that it is still about East and West, are you? Get over it, it happened almost thirty years ago! We are dealing now with different realities, the old divides are becoming more and more irrelevant…’

‘I hate to say you are wrong, my dear friend. You of all people should know better. Plus, the author herself indicated the significance of this divide for setting up the whole project. What I learned from the book is that, much to the author’s own surprise, the division between East and West was still very much present and defining the shape and the outcomes of citizenship education policy in so many ways! And this divide between Europe and ‘the other’ Europe (Michaels & Stevick, 2009) is a major sort of frustration to me! This is where the deeper explanation of the different patterns of teachers’ views in the three countries should be sought.’
Nina sighed. She knew Guy had a point. She also knew that the inevitable moment has come, when she would be addressed as a stand-in for all East-Europeans, just because she happened to be Romanian. Like all others living in the West and sharing her plight, she was very ambivalent about the situation. She prepared to listen carefully.

‘I think, Nina, that citizenship education as an European project remained pretty much an East European thing, a sort of integration course for new members to be allowed to join the club. Not only that citizenship education remained largely tokenistic, it effectively impeded and side-tracked the democratization of these countries, to the extent education has a role to play in this process! Exactly the fact that citizenship education programs were imposed from outside, provided these countries with the ‘borrowed’ discourse, needed to pay lip service to the process of political education and to stay on the safe side, avoiding controversy. ‘

‘Wait, wait, this is a harsh estimate. You will have to be more specific, this is an academic conversation, in spite of the pastries and the nice view. Can you substantiate your claim?’

‘Certainly,’ Guy smiled. He knew he had struck a nerve and that the discussion might become heated from now on. ‘Let me state that the processes are similar, but not identical for Bulgaria and Croatia. To begin with Bulgaria, we saw a discourse, which was all over the place. This was discussed, of course, but if we move beyond the specific data, we will find something that is a reason for great concern.’

‘Do you mean the empirical study on Bulgarian teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards citizenship education lead by Kabakchieva (Kabakchieva, 2011)?’

‘Partly, yes. Two things are interesting, as they relate to the book we discuss. The first one is that Bulgarian students exhibit exactly the same negative attitude towards politics as their teachers. The students mistrust the political class in Bulgaria and more importantly, do not have faith in their own power to change the course of events in any way. At the same time, the research team observes that students, in their turn, do not describe their activity in terms of what they see as ‘the empty terminology’ of citizenship education. They do not recognize it as political and they cannot make use of the conceptual apparatus acquired at school to discuss political events (Yakimova, 2011).’

‘I have seen this study as well, Guy. What the study mentioned about the ambivalent attitude towards Europe, is confirmed there as well. Young people thought of European institutions as something very far from their life, something that did not apply to Bulgaria, since there no one obeyed the law (Kabakchieva, 2011, p. 136).’

‘Exactly, Nina. European practices are seen as something alien, something that does not match Bulgarian political reality. As a result, citizenship is often seen as a project, detached from Bulgaria’s political reality: ‘Students make
projects and that’s what citizenship is about.’ In this, she shares the harsh assessment of Bulgarian citizenship education given by others who called it ‘a naïve idyllic democratic ideological lullaby’ (Vatsov, 2011, p. 16).

‘Yes, I recognize the paradox: the considerable effort to introduce citizenship education was aimed at promoting democracy and easing the process of transition. Instead, it offered a neutral, ‘politically correct’ and abstract language to pretend talking about politics. The one specific topic which could not possibly be addressed by the European policymakers due to a lack of awareness and experience, was the communist past of the East European countries. Citizenship education, instead of providing instruments for reflecting upon and coming to terms with the communist past, in fact provided a safe escape from dealing with this painful theme: the excuse was compliance to European demands!’

‘Similarly, in Croatia, the past is not talked about, but influences every facet of the process of introducing citizenship education in the country. You have read, of course, that the interviews with the teachers were taken at the time, when the pilot on citizenship education was running, so it was assumed it would get implemented. And then it didn’t.’

‘Yes, Nina, I heard about that. The pilot was postponed, and then postponed again, and it is very unlikely now that it will be implemented (Spajić-Vrkaš, 2014). I think that it will be interesting to do a detailed policy case study on the whole process and the dynamics that lead to its failure, as many stakeholders are involved and had their share. Citizenship education is mainly pushed by international and local non-profit organizations outside the mainstream education system. The effort is thus unsystematic and depending on individual initiatives of schools and teachers, working in a still highly centralized school system, inherited from former Yugoslavia (Pantić, 2012).’

‘This is interesting indeed, let’s not forget to add to our list of research projects at the end,’ interjected Nina somewhat impatiently.

‘But this is just the superficial part. My version is that the same underlying mechanism, which we see at play in Bulgaria is visible in Croatia as well – a discrepancy between a dominant national discourse and a ‘imported’ European idea of citizenship. In Croatia, this discrepancy has taken then form of a clash between citizenship education and religious education. The attempt to address core values through citizenship education results in a true battle between the Catholic Church, the main motor of religious education in Croatia, and the secular part of society. Both are fighting on moral grounds for an evaluation of the country’s past and of its newly gained place in the European Union.’

34 The names of a handful of people (literally) and a few NGOs pop up in all projects, regardless of who is funding them.
But where is the paradox then?

The paradox is that, like in many East European countries, nothing is what it seems and a lot can be explained by looking back at the times of communist rule. It thus becomes clear that the Catholic Church is seen as progressive and pro-Western, because it is associated with anticommunism and the fight against Yugoslavia (Bacevic, 2014, p. 95-100). It is an unlikely marriage of conservatism, anticommunism and openly anti-European moralism that leads to a successful blockage to introduce citizenship education at schools. The latter is presented as a direct threat to religious education, religious freedom, and independence at all! Do you see it now, Nina?

I see it, Guy, but these issues do not concern Western countries. We see a different, solid, uncomplicated pattern of moderate and self-confident teachers in the Netherlands. The other countries will get there eventually, I think.

Sorry, Nina, but your idea of the West is slightly naïve, too. This self-confidence may be not so deep-rooted as it appears. Maybe it is more reticent, in the face of a poor track-record of citizenship education in remedying acute social problems. In this sense, there is not too much ground for high hopes in citizenship education as a corrective of neoliberalism and global social injustice (Campbell, 2006; Dorf, 2008; Moutsios, 2008; Olssen, 2008; Papastephanou, 2008). If a state is failing in all other basic ways, economically, politically, morally, you cannot expect miracles from education alone. This would inevitably place a disproportionately high burden on teachers to correct social wrongs. As Ross notes, it is so easy to expect schools to just tell children the virtues of democracy and then to blame the schools when things go wrong (Ross, 2002, in Scott & Lawson, 2002, p. 48).

Creating conditions to support teachers in their work

Would you like another cup of coffee, Guy? Before you rush into another round of gloomy predictions, let me state that I still hold on to the positive portrait of teachers that came out of the conversations with them. There may well be specific national trends and threats that put teachers’ responses in context, but the manners in which teachers meet these challenges vary more within the countries and shows considerable similarities across the countries. Let me give you an example. In all three countries there is a good rationale to avoid controversial issues. In Bulgaria, the ‘hot’ political issues are avoided, as they are considered a bad example of what politics should look like; also, often it seems safer and even more sophisticated to talk about tolerance at the European level, and not

35 The role of the church and religion also turned out to be particularly prominent and challenging in the Czech Republic and Hungary. (Buk-Berge, 2006) (p. 542).
about the huge problems with the Roma, for instance. In Croatia, the teachers exhibit the typical behavior known in post-conflict regions (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009): they tend to see the school as a safe heaven, shielding children away from wounds past and present. And in the Netherlands, most teachers are not keen on being put in the role of political commentators of current events; they shy away from the controversial topics of the day, because they are more concerned about the academic image of their subject. However, within the countries, the self-reported willingness to engage in controversial issues varies significantly. It also seems to depend on the teachers’ estimate of their own skills in discussion and other forms suitable for tackling controversy (Oulton, Day, Dillon, & Grace, 2004). So, Guy, instead of just rehearsing all doomsday adages on the plight of Europe, why don’t we start talking about what should be done to support these wonderful teachers?’

Guy took a sip of his third cup of espresso. ‘I shouldn’t be drinking so much coffee’, he said to himself, while trying to think how to relate to the upbeat mood of his attractive conversation partner. There was something in people who lived through communism that made them either bitter or unbreakably wise. Nina Crediousu seemed to be of the second type and he found that increasingly fascinating. ‘As much as I share your optimism, Nina’ he continued slowly ‘ I can’t help it to conclude that, if anything, the citizenship education enterprise did not prevent the rise of nationalism across Europe. A paradoxically up-to-date paper from 2007, compares the post-Soviet citizenship education projects of Russia and the Ukraine. The authors argue that ‘the discourses of active democratic citizenship and nation-building do not easily coexist in the citizenship education policies of both countries following the break-up of the Soviet Union.” (Janmaat & Piattoeva, 2007, p. 529). They describe the parallel processes of Ukrainisation and Patriotic education (Russification) in the two countries, with a marginal and tokenistic role for democratic education. We all have followed the news in the last year and maybe we should take a closer look at countries where the discrepancy between national and European citizenship discourses is also prominent.’

‘There you go, Guy!, replied Nina almost triumphantly. ‘I was waiting for the moment you will come to the topic of nationalism and loyalty; I knew you had to. So let me state the matter for you, before you make it look too black again. Nationalist pride, loyalty, identity, though deliberately not put at the center of the book’s research, came out as a divisive issue, begging for explanation. The explanation is not at all trivial. It is important to notice indeed the obvious mismatch between the intended European dimension of citizenship and its national expressions and accents. Of course we could state that Bulgarians seek

36 The historical ethnocentric narratives in Croatia and to a great extent in Bulgaria are homogenized, filtered and validated by the education authorities. (Pantić, 2012, p. 5)
pride in their past, because they need some sense of continuity in history, that Croatians are obviously linking identity, breaking loose from Yugoslavia, and democratization, and the Dutch... Well, the Dutch also start to deal with their recent and distant history, although still quite reluctantly (Minispecial NRC, 2015). Other established democracies in Europe, such as France and England, also traditionally pay attention to national identity (Osler & Starkey, 2001). Worldwide, ideas about whether a good citizen is patriotic, vary substantially (Lee & Fouts, 2005)…'

‘Nina, Nina, I must have touched a sore spot here, slow down! I don’t even want to go deeper into this topic. It is quite obvious to me that some see nationalism as ‘pathological’, while others think it is inevitable and not necessarily bad (Haste, 2004). But one thing is very important for our discussion here, and you mentioned it too: there seem to be two discourses on citizenship, with different variations, in all European countries – a synchronically oriented one, focusing on values, institutional arrangement, participation, in the present and in the future; the other one is diachronic, dealing with the past. I can discern two streams in this latter discourse – one is the necessity to look for continuation and a unified narrative of one’s identity; the other one, closely related, is about addressing painful events and even epochs of the past. Students seem to be exposed to contrasting, even incompatible narratives about their past and about their future. This may be less visible in West Europe, but it is still valid. So I believe that also in the so-called established democracies citizenship education will remain just a ‘mask of democracy’ (Caetano, Rodrigues, Ferreira, Araújo, & Menezes, 2012), if they do not also provide meaningful ways for young people to engage with their countries’ past.’

‘All right, Guy, you got me there: this is a critical issue to address. But it is also critical that we stick to our topic here. So specifically for teachers, it means - it is imperative to organize interdisciplinary ties and cooperation between two large groups of teachers: ‘the past people’ - history and literature teachers mainly, and ‘the future people’ – social scientists teaching citizenship. Obviously, some borders need to be abandoned, at all levels: international and national policy, academic research, and school organization.’

‘Just to add to this: it makes more sense indeed to let teachers work together than to invest in books too much. What I gathered from the empirical data is that teachers are grateful about good schoolbooks, but they can work around bad ones. They adopt written teaching material, but not according to some directive or a theoretical model, but based on their own convictions and professionalism. Teachers, particularly good teachers, seem to be able to work with any material and tailor it to their need and to the needs of their students. As another empirical study reveals about Australian teachers, teachers may use the materials, but
they will not necessarily be persuaded by the underlying perspective on citizenship the materials suggest (Kennedy et al., 2002, p. 79). Writing books is easier to organize and relatively accessible to analyze, so school materials attract a lot of attention (e.g. Zimenkova, 2008). However, investing in books in order to achieve social change is not grounded in any evidence and is mostly based on faith (Weinstein et al., 2007). Just to make sure we are not talking about that kind of cooperation, Nina.’

‘No, no, I think it is more about abandoning the discussion, whether to have a separate subject or to make citizenship education the responsibility of the whole school. The tension is between school curricula rooted in historical concepts and responses to particular societal changes (Arthur et al., 2008, p. 5) and a definition of citizenship education, which, in order to be universal, becomes void of concrete meaning, and in any case, in danger of losing its political core (Frazer, 2007).’

**Political Core and Democratic Citizenship**

Guy looked up at Nina with surprise: ‘Do you mean Frazer’s paper on depoliticizing citizenship? I personally think that, while many others abuse the term by claiming that some type of citizenship is depoliticized, while it is only *not their type* of citizenship, she does a good job of explaining, first, that there are different ways to look at politics and to define ‘political’. Just like we saw that teachers attributed a broader and a narrower definition of politics, she insists on differentiating between a negative (Machiavelian), a positive (directed at problem-solving) and a neutral (related to structures and functions) connotation of ‘politics.’ I like her plea for sticking to the political core of citizenship education, which requires commitment. In this sense, I can share some of your optimism, because we saw that the teachers are basically weary of watering-down the concept of citizenship education and insisting on a core of political knowledge.’

Guy suddenly stopped talking. Nina captured his gaze and thought ‘It would be nice if you could continue this conversation at dinner, but not the *conference dinner*, for heaven’s sake!’ She thought she needed to switch gears quickly, otherwise the conversation would die out. Now *that* would be a pity for so many reasons.

“Thus, Guy’ said Nina, ‘we should better stick to political education instead of democratic education? Is that what you are aiming at?’

‘But Nina, these three terms – citizenship, politics, and democracy, are interconnected (Crick, 2007). What kind of democracy are we talking about? Certainly the interviewed teachers had different ideas about democratic arrangements, relating loosely to the continuum of ‘thin’ and ‘strong’ democracy (Bar-
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And not many of them are at the end of the spectrum close to Martha Nussbaums’ idealistic view on citizenship education and education as a whole.’

‘Listen, Guy, we need to differentiate between Martha Nussbaum’s unconditional promotion of one particular vision on citizenship (egalitarian/critical in her case) and the general thrust of her argument – that education should be about much more than just utility. Teachers subscribe to this statement as a part of their professional core and we should take them seriously.’

**Democratic teaching practice**

‘Nina, have you considered the possibility that we should pay attention to practice, if we really want to take teachers seriously? I mean, how can we claim that the book sheds light on teachers’ practice at all? After all, theory and practice are senseless without each other. To use the words of Parker (1996), the two ends of the tension are political engagement and democratic enlightenment: the latter remains scholastic without participation, and the former can be destructive without enlightenment. Paradoxically, at least in Eastern Europe, citizenship education in its current form seems to block the vital link between democracy and political practice! So this brings us to the beginning of our discussion – are there any sources of optimism? Let’s indulge in a bit of philosophy, shall we?’

‘With pleasure, Guy. I was wondering how Jeliazkova, an admirer of John Dewey, could write this book without ever mentioning Biesta? I think his depiction of a central theme in John Dewey’s work, namely the intricate connection between knowing and action, or in more common terms between ideas and practice, provides a solid basis for understanding the implications of the empirical findings of the book.’

‘Let me see if I can follow the logic, Nina. For Dewey, knowing is not about a world ‘out there,’ but concerns the relation between our actions and their consequences (Morgan, 2014). Particularly relevant for the study we are discussing is what Dewey calls ‘habits’, predispositions to act. So by mapping these ‘habits’ the researcher has established the direction in which acting will most probably occur, as it will be never random trial and error.’

‘Exactly, and in the understanding of Biesta, we should not expect to be able to ‘predict’ future action in the direct causal sense of the word. This is because, for Dewey, professional action of teachers, first, does not involve tried and tested recipes, neither is it based on following exact steps based on prior knowledge; and second, professional action always involves reflection and judgment in situations which are concrete and thereby by definition unique.’ (Biesta, 2007, p. 16-17). Thus, for education in general, but particularly for citizenship education, a core part of the professional teacher’s action is an awareness of the *desirability* of
these actions towards a certain end. In other words, the normative dimensions of teaching are taken into consideration. This is what the map of teachers’ views explicates – how teachers deal with these normative dimensions and translate them into everyday practice.’

‘This is it, Nina, this is what I needed in order to grasp the meaning and the utility of the Q study, thank you! Based on this position, the Q study outcomes are a momentary picture, a glimpse of how teachers cope with the challenge of teaching citizenship the way they understand it, without the need to provide any prescriptions for the future. The most we can do is pose other questions for further research, which can allow a look at the everyday practice of teaching in different ways and from different angles.’

‘Yes, and we have the typology of views as a guideline to formulate these questions,’ interjected Nina.

‘Nina, this reminds me all of a sudden of the work of Cherryholmes (Cherryholmes, 1980). Her argument, if pursued systematically, provides in my opinion the necessary fundament to the proponents of democratic citizenship and salvage it from its images of ‘soft’ and idealistic wishful thinking. In her essay, Cherryholmes links particular views about citizenship education not that much to particular political or pedagogical views, but to fundamental epistemological stances and paradigms instead. She rejects the liberal view of criticism that reduces citizenship education to a rational choice decision-making exercise and prefers the discourse-oriented, reflective inquiry view on citizenship, directly derived from linking ethics and science in the views of Habermas, thereby putting ‘ongoing, unconstructed discourse’ at the heart of the social studies. (Cherryholmes, 1980, p. 139)

‘Yes, indeed, and this line is also elaborated by Parker (Parker, 1996; Parker, 2001) His principle argument is that citizenship education, if not explicitly linked to democratic values, will educate ‘barbarians’ instead. And, as I already mentioned, the line of providing a philosophical fundament under democratic education is continued by Biesta (Biesta, 2007), Drawing mainly on the UK context, but sufficiently familiar with the broader European context, Biesta links democratic education to the very existence of humanity, to the core of human nature.’

‘Let’s drink to this!’, said Guy and decided not to engage further in the philosophical detour. The little restaurant at the far end of the bay had caught his attention yesterday as an alternative to the obligatory conference dinner. He was wondering if Nina would join him there in this little act of revolt. But he did not ask her. Instead, he said, ‘How about we jot down some topics for joint projects, it is obvious that the book raised a few questions of interest to both of us.’
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RESEARCH AGENDA

‘Yes, we have a few questions indeed, Guy, and we can address them in a truly interdisciplinary manner: you educational researchers are not known to cooperate often with other disciplines, when it comes to citizenship education (Brooks & Holford, 2009).

‘To prove you wrong, Nina, I was just going to suggest a further interdisciplinary theoretical elaboration of the force-field framework. It will be interesting to link other aspects based on educational theory, political philosophy, policy studies, culture studies, and why not psychology. In this way, the force-field can gain in stability and stature as a common playfield for debate on citizenship education.’

‘I like this, Guy, you know why? Because I am always bothered by the way democracy and citizenship education are seen as automatically connected: experts and scholars may be tempted to just tell teachers and schools what they should think. Maybe not exactly tell them, but expecting them to adhere to one particular view of citizenship comes down to the same thing, no matter how noble and appealing the idea of participation and democracy might be (Biesta, 2007; Davies, Flanagan, Hogarth, Mountford, & Philpott, 2009; Leighton, 2004). In a policy discourse on citizenship education, in which students who receive it are often perceived as lacking and not (yet) capable of participating in a particular prescribed way (Nelson & Kerr, 2006), teachers find themselves in a double bind position – not only their own views are ignored, but they also get the message to impose particular limited views on their students. How do teachers define the boundaries of their own responsibility in shaping their students’ views on democracy?’

‘Well, Nina, you have a point here, but how to transform this in a research project? It seem that an obvious first step is to extend the Q study to other European countries. The model is already described in detail, including the idea to train scholars from the participating country in Q methodology and to work together on expanding the list.’

Exactly, Guy! As you know, I prefer empirical work. It is important to expand the number of countries, because at the moment, the temptation is strong to make The Netherlands ‘stand’ for all Western countries, and for Bulgaria and Croatia to be the face of Eastern Europe. When there are Q-studies from other countries, we can talk about other varieties and more common patterns and themes. It will be interesting which of the findings so far will hold and whether new types of teachers’ views will surface. Would we see more teachers leaning towards the egalitarian thought style? Maybe other issues will emerge and get accentuated, which received relatively little attention by the interviewees in the
three countries?’

‘Dear Nina, you know as well as I do that East and West often differ in degree and not in kind. How about if it is the other way around: the former communist countries are exhibiting problems similar to the West, only more exaggerated? This is what Carole Hahn was talking about, when discussing comparative citizenship education – it allows us to look back at practices in our own cultural context and see taken-for-granted assumptions and practices in a mirror, through the eyes of the others.’ (C. Hahn, 2008).

‘Oh Guy, this is quite a generalization. I tend to agree with you, but could you make it more specific and link it to our research agenda?’

‘Let me give it a try, Nina. Two issues deserve further investigation and I think that they are connected. The first one are the missing fatalists. Are they really only a Bulgarian phenomenon? I don’t think so. The second issue is the surprising fact that only a few Dutch teachers subscribed to the idea that political education is for the elites only. On the other, the Dutch system is deeply segregated, and the students at the vocational level even get a different subject, called Citizenship Competencies, much more geared at ‘soft’, apolitical, decent behavior-like skills, compared to the curriculum taught by the teachers interviewed in this study. These are diverging worlds, with separate professional communities and methods of assessment. The segregation in education just reinforces a general social process, which is not unique to the Netherlands. The gap between educated and uneducated citizens in terms of participation and political influence is steadily widening, which caused Bovens and Wille to make up the term ‘diploma democracy’ (Bovens & Wille, 2009). Do you agree with me that the reproduction of such a segregation of the school-system could not have been the intention of citizenship education and in the long run will undermine democracy?’

‘You hit upon something important here, Guy: it is not only about the teachers’ views. It is not only about the students. It is about the way the relationship between a student and a teacher is defined. And this does not happen in a vacuum, of course. In this sense, the comparative way of working can be expanded in two ways: to explore the mutual reflections of students’ and teachers’ views, but also the ideas teachers have about each other. The author actually shared an interesting observation: Dutch teachers thought that the typical social studies teacher is adhering to leftist views. However, many of the Dutch respondents defined themselves as center and right of center and added, almost apologetically, that they were ‘an exception.’ It would be interesting to explore these perceptions and assumptions more systematically.’

‘All right, Nina, this is one line of research; the other one is to engage in comprehensive case studies around the Q findings. The case studies would allow for more in-depth analysis of processes that are critical for developing particular
views. Important aspects would be the specific national policy processes, key actors involved in them; the interaction between education and politics, the role of the school system, particularly the difference between schools. School-culture can enhance particular thought styles and frustrate others. A mismatch between teachers’ views and the general school climate is possible, for instance. What are the consequences from this?’

‘If we are still talking about methodology, Guy, why not just do a large R study: the results of the Q study provide a solid ground for developing a questionnaire, which could be administered to a large number of teachers. The most important outcome will be data about the spreading and share of certain thought styles discovered during the comparative Q study.’

‘And, Nina, it would be fun to use some modern data-mining techniques and to see if the types of teachers’ views can be found in some form in policy documents, teaching and research materials. Let’s hire a junior researcher to do that!’

‘While we are at it, Guy, don’t forget to add the textbooks. Particularly the link between social science and history textbooks can be revealing in the different and sometimes incompatible ways in which they depict citizenship education. I will be particularly interested in finding out if teachers adhering to a particular type of views also exhibit these when they interpret and use textbooks in their classrooms. This will be a different approach to the ‘hidden/enacted curriculum’ line of research.’

‘Indeed, Nina, and the huge theme of the relationship between national and European identity became obvious in this study as well and it can be meaningfully approached only in an interdisciplinary fashion. However, Nina, let us stick to more specific and immediate projects, shall we?

‘We will do that, Guy, but do not forget that an important aspect of future work is to find ways to organize meaningful opportunities for learning and cooperation between teachers, to address their training needs based on their own personal and professional preferences and convictions. For example, when the types of teachers’ views are taken into account, training and professional development will look different, as they will have not one, but four or five points of departure. Also, this will be more of a design project and less so research, I think. We need to sit down and make specific plans for this.’

‘The last question remains unanswered, Nina: who is going to finance all this?’ Would you like to join me for dinner?’
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Summary

The aim of the study presented in this study is to map the diverse views of secondary school teachers on citizenship education in Bulgaria, Croatia, and the Netherlands; to explore these views and to compare them, in order to arrive at a richer understanding and possibly to suggest ways for engaging in a debate aimed at daily teaching practices. The book focuses on authentic teachers’ voices, with teachers talking about the ways they perceive citizenship, citizenship education programs and curricula, politics, and their role in the lives of their students and in their society.

Chapter One states the main goals of the study. Important issues around defining citizenship education as an instrument for promoting European integration and democracy are discussed. Attention is paid to the difficulties stemming from the attempt to put the inherently contested and multifaceted concept of citizenship education at the core of coordinated educational policy. The role of social science teachers as gatekeepers, as key actors in formal citizenship education, is highlighted. Arguments are put forward for the necessity to engage in in-depth conversations with teachers about their views on citizenship in a comparative mode. The choice for the three countries – Bulgaria, Croatia, and the Netherlands – is also explained.

Chapter Two presents a typology of views on citizenship based on grid-group (cultural) theory. The theory is used to sort out tensions inherent to the contested political concept of citizenship education, by depicting diversity as a structural feature of the concept, and to accommodate for its controversial political dimensions.

The resulting force-field of citizenship education aspects describes four ideal types of views: individualist (the student leads), equity oriented (democratic education) hierarchical (know your laws), and fatalist (keep them out of trouble). These four types are built on the following aspects, each accommodating a continuum of possible views: goal of citizenship education (the good versus the critical citizen); approach to citizenship education (neutrality versus indoctrination); main concern (individual rights versus social obligations); main teacher’s role (supervisor versus coach), and main focus (knowledge versus attitudes).

The four ideal types are substantiated and illustrated with examples from the literature. Popular typologies of citizenship education are discussed and placed within the force-field framework. The framework developed and used in this study can accommodate the plurality of approaches and perspectives in more countries, to ensure a fruitful dialogue and debate, which goes beyond terminology and clarification of concepts.
Chapter Three presents a detailed account of the research design. Q-Methodology as an approach to mapping teachers’ voices is explained step by step. In short, Q-Methodology is based on ranking statements about the topic at hand by individual respondents, combined with detailed qualitative interviews. Since the same set of statements is used, results between respondents and between groups of respondents (e.g. per country) are comparable. Through a combined use of qualitative and quantitative techniques of data analysis, Q-Methodology can make types of views (‘narratives’) explicit, by identifying groups of respondents with most similar views.

The result is a number of typical teachers’ views per country, situated in the force-field presented in Chapter Two. The types are described by narratives emerging from authentic teachers’ voices during interviews and data interpretation. This allows to discern variations of the ideal types in the three countries, as well as common themes shared by all respondents. The types of views found in the different countries are comparable as they are placed in the same context, although the local accents differ. This research approach ensures that teachers’ voices receive a place in the debate, not only as isolated colorful illustrations of some general ideas, but as representing and generating discourses rooted in everyday teaching practice. Thus, a shared playfield is created where diversity within countries is seen against the backdrop of a shared context across countries.

Chapter Four presents the results in Bulgaria. Five groups of Bulgarian teachers display the following views: The Pragmatic Conservatives, a Bulgarian brand of moderately hierarchic teachers, predominantly concerned with rules of social behavior; the Deliberative Liberals, populating the individualist corner, who see themselves as ‘provocateurs into freedom’; the Local Social Guardians, who care for their vulnerable students; the Personal Growth Facilitators, whose main concern is student happiness and human development; and the Global Future Debaters with a mission to educate the future global citizens. Bulgarian teachers’ views are typified by a shared sense of responsibility and academic bravery on citizenship education, on the one hand, and a fragmented discourse in the face of growing cynicism about the country’s political development, on the other hand.

In Croatia, Chapter Five, four groups of teachers were identified: The Reflective Humanists see their modest contribution in teaching students (self-)reflection; The Patriotic Conservatives are adamant about rights and obligations, decency and order; The Liberal Democracy Mentors prepare students for their role as democratic citizens; and the Personal Growth Coaches focus on student independence and responsibility. The common concern of Croatian teachers is critical thinking and innovative teaching methods, as well as the need to conquer and preserve the place of citizenship in the curriculum of the country, sometimes as a competing discourse against religious education.
In the Netherlands, Chapter Six, the four groups are: the Action Learning Idealists, a change-oriented, student-centered group of teachers; the Critical Academics who teach no-nonsense academic analytic skills as a key to understanding the world; the Loyal Citizens’ Teachers, the Dutch brand of hierarchic predisposition with a focus on stability and structure; and the Pluralist Democratic Educators, concerned with broadening their students’ horizons and with encouraging them to get things done. The Dutch teachers display a great deal of consensus on their professional identity and about a pluralistic basic attitude in teaching, as well as little interest in centrally imposed citizenship education policy.

Chapter Seven presents a comparison between the countries. The following general clusters of views are revealed: The School Subject Oriented, who see teaching social science as a subject as central to citizenship education; the Meritocratic Stability Mentors, who nurture independent thinking in a structured, theoretical manner; the Liberal Democracy Mentors with a theory- and evidence-based, learning oriented, but pragmatic orientation; the Critical Cultivation Coaches who are first and foremost educators with a student-centered teaching style, willing to venture ‘real life’ experiences outside school to encourage democratic participation; and the Democratic Debaters who base their work on cultivating critical, systematic, independent thinking and active deliberation. The main outcome of the comparison is that teachers across borders claim ownership of citizenship education and put the knowledge components at the core of their work, as well as a shared understanding of professionalism. The most surprising outcome is that the country divides became very visible, as well as the West-East divide (The Netherlands vs. Bulgaria and Croatia). The breach between East and West is also in the way European citizenship education policy is perceived. All three countries see European Citizenship as imposed from above. However, while the teachers from the Netherlands just ignore it and carry on according to their own ideas, their East European colleagues are struggling to implement something which they value as innovative but ill-fitting the local processes and demands. The egalitarian position, popular among theorists and policymakers, did not prove to be prevalent in our sample. In other words, teachers may exhibit more mainstream ideas and attitudes and are less critical and radical than some might have expected.

Chapter Eight presents the conclusions of the study, as well as a discussion on some topics, which emerged from the research and deserve further attention. The reasons for optimism and pessimism about citizenship education in the future are discussed. Optimism stems mainly from teachers’ devotion, professional attitude, and commitment to democratic values. Pessimism arises from a structural mismatch between the specific national discourses, particularly in Eastern Europe, and the inadequacy of official policy instruments aimed at promoting
citizenship education. The role of teachers as gatekeepers is discussed again and conclusions for developing more adequate policies, which actually take into account this role, are suggested. The necessary conditions for supporting teachers’ work are discussed, as well as the possible ways to engage in democratic teaching practice. Finally, a research agenda is presented, first aimed at expanding this study to include other countries. A deeper exploration of teachers’ attitudes towards democracy is suggested, as well a more systematic exploration of the views of teachers about their students, and the necessity to look at ways in which the relationship between a teacher and a student is defined in the context of citizenship education.
Het doel van dit onderzoek is het in kaart brengen van de verscheidenheid in opvattingen van docenten maatschappijleer op middelbare scholen over burgerschapsonderwijs in Bulgarije, Kroatië en Nederland. De opvattingen van de docenten worden verkend en vergeleken, om ze beter te kunnen begrijpen en inzicht te krijgen en mogelijkheden te creëren voor een debat over dagelijkse onderwijspraktijken. Het onderzoek probeert de stem van docenten zo authentiek mogelijk te laten klinken door docenten zelf aan het woord te laten over hoe zij aankijken tegen burgerschap, beleid en curricula voor burgerschapsunderwijs, over politiek in het onderwijs, en over hun rol als docent in de opvoeding van hun leerlingen.

Het eerste hoofdstuk formuleert de doelstellingen van het onderzoek. Het gaat in op belangrijke kwesties rond de definitie van burgerschapsunderwijs als instrument ter bevordering van Europese integratie en democratie. Het bespreekt de problemen die ontstaan wanneer een politiek omstreden en veelzijdig begrip als burgerschapsunderwijs tot kern van een samenhangend onderwijsbeleid wordt gemaakt. Daarbij wordt de rol onderstreept van docenten maatschappijleer als ‘poortwachters’ en centrale actoren in formeel burgerschapsunderwijs op middelbare scholen. De rol van docenten als ‘poortwachters’ vormt het belangrijkste argument voor de noodzaak om met docenten diepgaand en vergelijkend in gesprek te gaan over hun opvattingen over burgerschapsunderwijs. Ook de keuze voor de drie landen – Bulgarije, Kroatië en Nederland – wordt in dit eerste hoofdstuk verantwoord.

Het tweede hoofdstuk ontwikkelt een typologie van visies op burgerschap op grond van group-grid (culturele) theorie. Deze theorie is gebruikt om de spanningen die inher- rent zijn aan een politiek omstreden begrip als burgerschapsunderwijs te ontrafelen. De theorie biedt de mogelijkheid om recht te doen aan de controversiële politieke dimensies van een concept, door verscheidenheid (diversiteit) te beschouwen als een structureel kenmerk van het concept zelf.

Het resulterende ‘krachtenveld’ van aspecten van burgerschapsunderwijs beschrijft vier idealtypische visies: individualistisch (de student is leidend), egalitaristisch (democratie-gericht onderwijs), hiërarchisch (ken uw wetten) en fatalistisch (voorkom ellende met autoriteiten). Deze vier idealtypen zijn opgebouwd rond de volgende aspecten die telkens een continuüm van opvattingen beslaan: doel van burgerschapsunderwijs (de goede versus de kritische burger); benadering van burgerschapsunderwijs (neutraliteit versus indoctrinatie); rol van de leraar maatschappijleer (‘supervisor’ versus ‘coach’); en onderwijsdoel (kennis versus attitudes en vaardigheden).

De vier idealtypen zijn gefundeerd en worden geïllustreerd door de academische literatuur over burgerschapsunderwijs. Veelgebruikte typologieën van burgerschapsunderwijs worden besproken en geplaatst in het krachtenveld van opvattingen. Het krachtenveld raamwerk dat in dit onderzoek is ontwikkeld, kan gebruikt worden om de verscheidenheid van opvattingen, benaderingen en gezichtspunten in meerdere landen te accommoderen. Dat gaat verder dan terminologie en definities van concepten en kan de basis vormen voor een vruchtbare dialoog en debat in het veld.
Het derde hoofdstuk is een gedetailleerde verantwoording van de onderzoekspopzet. Q Methodologie als aanpak om de opvattingen van docenten maatschappijleer systematisch in kaart te brengen wordt stap voor stap uitgelegd. Q Methodologie is gebaseerd op het rangschikken van stellingen over het onderwerp door individuele respondenten en tegelijkertijd een diepgaand gesprek met de respondenten tijdens het ordenen. Om dat steeds dezelfde verzameling stellingen wordt aangeboden, zijn de uitkomsten tussen individuen en tussen groepen van individuen (bijvoorbeeld, per land) vergelijkbaar.

Door een gecombineerd gebruik van kwalitatieve en kwantitatieve technieken van data analyse, kan Q-Mmethodologie typen opvattingen ('narratives') expliciet maken, door groepen respondenten te identificeren die opvattingen in sterke mate met elkaar delen. Op deze manier wordt het mogelijk om zowel de variaties in typen opvattingen per land, als de door alle respondenten gedeelde thema's in beeld te brengen. De typen van opvattingen die aangetroffen worden in de verschillende landen zijn vergelijkbaar omdat ze in dezelfde gedeelde context geplaatst worden, hoewel de plaatselijke accenten kunnen verschillen. Deze onderzoekspopzet geeft de stem van de docenten een eigen plaats in het publieke debat – niet louter als kleurrijke maar geïsoleerde illustratie van algemene ideeën, maar als een manier om hun eigen discourses, die hun bron vinden in dagelijkse docentenpraktijk, te genereren en samenhangend te representeren. Op deze manier ontstaat een gedeeld 'speelveld' waar de diversiteit binnen landen wordt geschetst tegen de achtergrond van een gezamenlijke context tussen landen.

Het vierde hoofdstuk presenteert de uitkomsten voor Bulgarije. Bulgaarse docenten maatschappijleer blijken onder te verdelen in vijf groepen: Pragmatisch Conservatieven, een Bulgaarse variant van gematigd hiërarchische docenten, die zich vooral bekommeren om regels voor correct sociaal gedrag; Deliberatieve Liberalen, geplaatst in de individualistische hoek van het krachtenveld, die zichzelf vooral zien als ‘provocateurs van vrijheid’; Lokale Sociale Beschermers, die zich voor alles bekommeren om hun kwetsbare leerlingen (uit bedreigde lagere sociale en inkomensgroepen); Persoonlijke Groei Bevorderaars, die zich vooral richten op het welbevinden en de persoonlijke ontwikkeling van hun leerlingen; ‘Global Future Debaters’ ofwel Bepleiters van de Geglobaliseerde Toekomst, die als missie hebben hun leerlingen op te voeden tot toekomstig wereldburger. De opvattingen van Bulgaarse docenten maatschappijleer kenmerken zich door, enerzijds, een gedeeld gevoel van sterke verantwoordelijkheid voor het vak en academische moed, en, anderzijds, een versnipperd discours in een politiek klimaat van groeiende cynisme over de ontwikkeling van het land.

In het vijfde hoofdstuk worden vier typen opvattingen van Kroatische docenten maatschappijleer geïdentificeerd: Reflexieve Humanisten zien hun bescheiden bijdrage in het aanleren van (zelf)reflectie bij hun leerlingen; Patriottisch Conservatieven richten zich op rechten, plichten en orde; Liberale Democratie Mentoren bereiden hun studenten voor op hun rol als democratisch gezinde burgers; Persoonlijke Groei Coaches willen hun studenten vooral onafhankelijkheid en verantwoordelijkheid bijbrengen. De gedeelde zorg van Kroatische docenten maatschappijleer is kritisch denken en innovatie in de manier van lesgeven, zo goed als het veroveren en behouden van een plaats voor burgerschapsonderwijs in het middelbare schoolcurriculum van het land, soms als een concurrerend discours ten opzichte van godsdienstonderwijs.

In het zesde hoofdstuk worden vier typen opvattingen onder Nederlandse docenten maatschappijleer onderscheiden: Actiegericht-Onderwijs Idealisten vormen een cluster
van docenten die de leerling helemaal centraal stellen en veranderingsgedacht onderwijs voorstaan; Kritische Academici, die no-nonsense academische vaardigheden willen onderwijzen als sleutel tot begrip van de (politieke) wereld; Leraren van Loyale Burgers, de Nederlandse variant van hiërarchisch gerichte docenten met een habitus van inzicht kweken in (politieke) stabiliteit en structuur; Pluralistisch-Democratische Opvoeders, die vooral de horizon van hun leerlingen willen verbreden en hen aanmoedigen om in actie te komen. Nederlandse docenten maatschappijleer vertonen een grote mate van consensus over hun professionele identiteit en een pluralistische grondhouding in hun onderwijs, samen met weinig belangstelling voor (inter)nationaal beleid voor burgerschapsonderwijs.

Het zevende hoofdstuk trekt een vergelijking tussen de drie landen. Dit levert de volgende landenoverstijgende clusters van opvattingen op: Schoolvak-Georiënteerden, die het onderwijs in sociale wetenschap beschouwen als de kern van burgerschapsonderwijs; Meritocratische Stabiliteit Mentoren, die voeding willen geven aan onafhankelijk denken, maar wel op theoretisch gestructureerde wijze; Liberale Democratie Mentoren, met een houding tegenover onderwijs die theorie- en ‘evidence-based’ gefundeerd wordt, maar overigens pragmatisch georiënteerd is; Coaches voor de Cultivering van Kritiek, die voor alles een leerling-georiënteerde onderwijsstijl hebben, en ‘levensgeachte’ buitenschoolse ervaring met democratische participatie aanmoedigen; Democratische Debaters, die in hun onderwijs kritisch, systematisch onafhankelijk denken en actieve deliberatie willen cultiveren.

De belangrijkste uitkomst van deze vergelijking tussen docentengroepen over de landsgrenzen heen is dat zij allen eigenaarschap over burgerschapsonderwijs opeisen en de kenniscomponent in hun werk centraal stellen, evenals een gedeeld begrip van professionaliteit. De meest verrassende uitkomst is dat zowel de verschillen tussen de drie landen afzonderlijk als de West-Oost scheiding (tussen Nederland enerzijds en Bulgarije en Kroatië anderzijds) scherp zichtbaar worden. Het onderscheid tussen Oost en West betreft onder andere de manier waarop Europees burgerschapsonderwijs wordt gezien. Alle drie landen zien ‘Europees Burgerschap’ als van bovenaf opgelegd. Maar Nederlandse docenten merken dat nauwelijks op en gaan ongehinderd hun eigen ‘nationale’ gang; terwijl hun Oost-Europese collega’s worstelen met de invoering van een curriculum wat ze wel vernieuwend vinden, maar wat niet past bij lokale processen en politieke behoeften. Egalitaire opvattingen over burgerschap en burgerschapsonderwijs, erg populair onder theoretici en beleidsmakers, slaan niet zo goed aan bij de respondenten van dit onderzoek. Met andere woorden, docenten maatschappijleer vertonen vermoedelijk gemiddeld meer (politieke) ‘mainstream’ ideeën en houdingen en zijn minder kritisch en radicaal als sommigen hadden verwacht en gehoopt.

Het achtste hoofdstuk bevat de conclusies uit het onderzoek en bespreekt een aantal onderwerpen die uit het onderzoek naar voren kwamen en aandacht verdienen. Een eerste conclusie betreft de redenen voor optimisme en pessimisme over de toekomst van burgerschapsonderwijs. Optimisme komt vooral voort uit de toewijding van de docenten, hun professionele houding en sterke democratisch engagement. Redenen
voor pessimisme liggen vooral in de tegenstellingen/verschillen tussen specifieke nationale discoursen, vooral in Oost-Europa, en de ongeschiktheid van de officiële beleidsinstrumenten voor het bevorderen van burgerschapsonderwijs. In dit verband wordt opnieuw de rol van docenten maatschappijleer als ‘poortwachters’ onder de aandacht gebracht; en worden enkele conclusies geformuleerd voor meer adequate beleidsvorming die met die poortwachtersrol wel rekening houdt. Ook wordt ingegaan op noodzakelijke voorwaarden voor het ondersteunen van goed en professioneel burgerschapsonderwijs, en het gebruik van democratische onderwijsmethoden. Als laatste thema wordt ingegaan op suggesties voor vervolgonderzoek. In de eerste plaats gaat het dan om uitbreiding van dit vergelijkend onderzoek met een veel groter aantal landen. In de tweede plaats is een diepgravender onderzoek naar de houdingen van docenten maatschappijleer ten aanzien van (typen van) democratie aan de orde; alsook een meer systematische verkenning van de manier waarop de leraren hun leerlingen zien; en, in dat verband, van de manieren waarop de leraar-leerling relatie in het kader van burgerschaps-onderwijs kan worden gedefinieerd.