



European
Commission

Citizenship Education

at School in Europe

2017

Eurydice Report

Education and
Training





Citizenship Education at School in Europe 2017

Eurydice Report

*Education and
Training*

This document is published by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA, Education and Youth Policy Analysis).

Please cite this publication as:

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017. *Citizenship Education at School in Europe – 2017*. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Printed version	EC-06-17-161-EN-C	ISBN 978-92-9492-615-9	doi:10.2797/612559
PDF	EC-06-17-161-EN-N	ISBN 978-92-9492-614-2	doi:10.2797/536166
E PUB	EC-06-17-161-EN-E	ISBN 978-92-9492-622-7	doi:10.2797/449741

Text completed in October 2017.

© Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2017.

Reproduction is authorized provided the source is acknowledged.

Cover: 123RF/Kitsana Baitoey.

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
Education and Youth Policy Analysis
Avenue du Bourget 1 (J-70 – Unit A7)
BE-1049 Brussels
Tel. +32 2 299 50 58
Fax +32 2 292 19 71
E-mail: eacea-eurydice@ec.europa.eu
Website: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurydice>

CONTENTS

Table of Figures	5
Codes, Abbreviations and Acronyms	7
Executive Summary	9
Introduction	17
Policy context	17
Conceptual framework	18
Objectives and content	25
Scope	27
Methodology	27
Chapter 1: Curriculum Organisation and Content	29
A. Organisation	29
1.1. Approaches to citizenship education in national curricula	30
1.2. Instruction time	38
1.3. Citizenship education curricula for school-based IVET	41
Summary	43
B. Content	45
1.4. Curriculum content: general aims, specific objectives and learning outcomes	45
1.5. The content of the curriculum	47
Summary	68
Case Study 1: Citizenship Education Curriculum Reform in Austria	69
Chapter 2: Teaching, Learning and Active Participation	75
2.1. Review of the research literature	75
2.2. Learning citizenship in the classroom	80
2.3. Learning citizenship beyond the curriculum	89
2.4. Participation in school governance to support citizenship education	94
Summary	101
Case Study 2: The Citizenship Booster for Schools in the Flemish Community of Belgium	103
Chapter 3: Student Assessment and School Evaluation	109
3.1. Review of the research literature	109
3.2. Official guidelines on student assessment	113
3.3. National tests	118
3.4. External school evaluation	123
Summary	127
Case Study 3: Developing Assessment Tools for Social and Citizenship Competences in Estonia	129
Chapter 4: Teacher Education, Professional Development and Support	133
4.1. Review of the research literature	134
4.2. National policies on initial teacher education	138
4.3. Continuing professional development	148
4.4. Other support measures for teachers and school heads	154
Summary	157
Case Study 4: Teacher Education and Training in France	159
References	165
Glossary	175
Acknowledgements	181

TABLE OF FIGURES

Introduction	17
Figure 1: Typology of approaches to citizenship education	24
Figure 2: The conceptual framework: goals and means of citizenship education in school	24
Chapter 1: Curriculum Organisation and Content	29
Figure 1.1: Approaches to citizenship education according to national curricula for primary and general secondary education (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	30
Figure 1.2: Citizenship education taught as a compulsory separate subject or integrated into other compulsory subjects, according to national curricula for primary and general secondary education (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	34
Figure 1.3: Compulsory subjects integrating citizenship education according to national curricula for primary and general secondary education (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	36
Figure 1.4: Recommended minimum number of hours of compulsory citizenship education as a separate subject during a notional year at primary and general secondary education (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	38
Figure 1.5: Differences between general secondary education and school-based IVET in the approaches to citizenship education as specified in national curricula, 2016/17	41
Figure 1.6: Nature of national curriculum framework for citizenship education: general aims, specific objectives and/or learning outcomes at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	46
Figure 1.7: Citizenship competence areas and specific citizenship competences	48
Figure 1.8: Frequency with which citizenship education competences occur in national curricula for citizenship education by area of competence at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	50
Figure 1.9: The share of citizenship competence areas in the national curricula of citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	51
Figure 1.10: Frequencies of competences related to 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' in national curricula for citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	54
Figure 1.11: Frequencies of competences related to 'thinking critically' in national curricula for citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	55
Figure 1.12: Frequencies of citizenship competences related to 'acting in a socially responsible manner' in national curricula for citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	56
Figure 1.13: Frequencies of citizenship competences related to 'acting democratically' in the national curricula for citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	57
Figure 1.14: Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	59
Figure 1.15: Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'thinking critically' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	62
Figure 1.16: Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'acting in a socially responsible manner' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	63
Figure 1.17: Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'acting democratically' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	66

Chapter 2: Teaching, Learning and Active Participation	75
Figure 2.1: Guidance materials on citizenship education from top level authorities for primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	80
Figure 2.2a: Top level recommendations for extra-curricular activities in primary and lower secondary education (ISCED 1-2), 2016/17	89
Figure 2.2b: Top level recommendations for extra-curricular activities in upper secondary education (ISCED 3) and school-based IVET, 2016/17	89
Figure 2.3: National programmes supporting extra-curricular activities, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	94
Figure 2.4: Student engagement in student councils according to top level regulations and recommendations at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	95
Figure 2.5: Parent engagement in school Governing boards at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	99
Chapter 3: Student Assessment and School Evaluation	109
Figure 3.1: Guidelines on classroom assessment in citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	114
Figure 3.2: Recommended methods and components of classroom assessment in citizenship education, according to official guidelines for primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	117
Figure 3.3: National tests in citizenship education: main purpose and levels of education involved, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	119
Figure 3.4: Aspects of citizenship education included in external school evaluation according to top level regulations and recommendations, in primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	125
Chapter 4: Teacher Education, Professional Development and Support	133
Figure 4.1: Teachers generally responsible for teaching citizenship education in general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 2-3), 2016/17	139
Figure 4.2a: Top level regulations or recommendations on the development of competences during ITE to teach citizenship education – prospective specialist and semi-specialist teachers at general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 2-3), 2016/17	142
Figure 4.2b: Top level regulations or recommendations on the development of competences during ITE to teach citizenship education – all prospective teachers at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17	143
Figure 4.3: CPD activities organised or supported by top level education authorities to help teachers develop the competences needed for delivering citizenship education, 2016/17	149
Figure 4.4: CPD activities organised or supported by top level education authorities to help school heads develop the competences needed to implement citizenship education, 2016/17	152
Figure 4.5: Top level coordinating bodies for CPD, including on citizenship education, 2016/17	153
Figure 4.6: Other forms of support provided by top level education authorities to support teachers and school heads in the implementation of citizenship education, 2016/17	155

CODES, ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Country codes

EU/EU-28	European Union	NL	Netherlands
		AT	Austria
BE	Belgium	PL	Poland
BE fr	Belgium – French Community	PT	Portugal
BE de	Belgium – German-speaking Community	RO	Romania
BE nl	Belgium – Flemish Community	SI	Slovenia
BG	Bulgaria	SK	Slovakia
CZ	Czech Republic	FI	Finland
DK	Denmark	SE	Sweden
DE	Germany	UK	United Kingdom
EE	Estonia	UK-ENG	England
IE	Ireland	UK-WLS	Wales
EL	Greece	UK-NIR	Northern Ireland
ES	Spain	UK-SCT	Scotland
FR	France	EFTA/EEA and candidate countries	
HR	Croatia	BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina
IT	Italy	FY*	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
CY	Cyprus	IS	Iceland
LV	Latvia	LI	Liechtenstein
LT	Lithuania	ME	Montenegro
LU	Luxembourg	NO	Norway
HU	Hungary	RS	Serbia
MT	Malta	TR	Turkey

FY*: Code recommended by the legal service of the Council of the European Union.

Statistical codes

: Data not available

(–) Not applicable

Abbreviations and acronyms

CoE	Council of Europe	ISCED	International Standard Classification of Education
CPD	Continuing professional development	ITE	Initial teacher education
EACEA	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency	IVET	Initial vocational education and training
ICCS	International Civic and Citizenship Education	UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
IEA	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Citizenship education is understood, in this report, as the subject area that is promoted in schools with the aim of fostering the harmonious co-existence and mutually beneficial development of individuals and of the communities they are part of. In democratic societies citizenship education supports students in becoming active, informed and responsible citizens, who are willing and able to take responsibility for themselves and for their communities at the local, regional, national and international level.


In order to achieve these objectives, citizenship education needs to help students develop knowledge, skills, attitudes and values in four broad competence areas ⁽¹⁾:

- 1) interacting effectively and constructively with others;
- 2) thinking critically;
- 3) acting in a socially responsible manner; and
- 4) acting democratically.

Citizenship education involves not only teaching and learning of relevant topics in the classroom, but also the practical experiences gained through activities in school and wider society that are designed to prepare students for their role as citizens.

Teachers and school heads play a key role in this learning process. The training and support provided to them is therefore central to the effective implementation of citizenship education.

The conceptual framework: goals and means of citizenship education in school



The general objective of this report is to provide a current and comprehensive picture of national policies in the area of citizenship education in schools across Europe, at a moment when increasing demands are being made on education and training systems to promote this area of learning.

This report has four chapters, each addressing different aspects of citizenship education: 1. Curriculum organisation and content; 2. Teaching, learning and active participation; 3. Student assessment and school evaluation; and 4. Teacher education, professional development and support.

⁽¹⁾ These broad competence areas, as developed in this report, are based on the EU's reference framework on social and civic competences (European Parliament and Council, 2006), the Council of Europe's competences for democratic culture (Council of Europe, 2016), a citizenship competences literature review (Ten Dam et al., 2010) and the empirical testing of some of these competence areas by Ten Dam et al. (2011).

Four case studies on recent policy initiatives in the area of citizenship education in Belgium (Flemish Community), Estonia, France and Austria accompany the chapters.

The report is based on qualitative data provided by the Eurydice Network on the relevant official regulations and recommendations and is complemented by findings from the academic literature. It does not analyse the implementation of regulations and recommendations and consequently does not examine how citizenship education is delivered in practice at school level. Data for the case studies has been collected through interviews with key actors involved in those policy initiatives.

Overall findings

The analysis in this report shows that in the majority of European countries national curricula tend to be broad in scope covering most of the competences related to democratic and socially responsible action, critical thinking and inter-personal interactions. Regulations promoting student and parent participation in school governance, in particular in general secondary education, have also been introduced almost everywhere. In addition, most of the countries provide teachers with guidance materials and other types of resources to support the teaching and learning of citizenship education in the classroom.

However, in other areas there are significant differences between countries' policies that can affect the implementation of citizenship education in schools. Despite progress in recent years, nearly half of the countries still have no regulations or recommendations on the development of prospective teachers' citizenship education competences through initial teacher education (ITE). Furthermore, although the majority of education authorities organise or support opportunities for teachers' continuing professional development (CPD) in this area of learning, similar opportunities for school heads are rather limited.

Education authorities have also not systematically issued guidelines for teachers on how to assess students in citizenship education. In just over a third of the education systems, there are no central level regulations or recommendations on suitable methods for classroom assessment in this area of learning.

The report finally also shows that education authorities give less attention to citizenship education in school-based initial vocational education and training (IVET) in comparison with general education. This includes fewer curriculum approaches used to teach this area of learning, less guidance material for teachers and fewer recommendations regarding students' participation in school councils or parent representation in school governing boards.

Notwithstanding these differences, citizenship education appears to be an issue, which is currently in the spotlight in a number of countries across Europe. A few countries have recently increased the teaching hours for the compulsory provision of citizenship education in general education. Indeed, a separate compulsory subject is being introduced in Belgium (French Community), while Greece and Finland have extended the number of grades in which the separate compulsory subject is taught. In several countries where the citizenship education curriculum has been revised in recent years, other related reforms have either already been introduced or are currently in progress. These include reforms in the areas of student participation (France and Finland), the introduction of a teacher specialisation in citizenship education (French Community of Belgium, Denmark, Ireland and Luxembourg), and the provision of guidance and support material (France, Italy, Cyprus and Luxembourg). In two of these education systems – French Community of Belgium and France – these developments have taken place in the context of their current top level strategies dedicated to the promotion of citizenship education in schools (see [Annex 1](#) available online only).

Last but not least, the topic remains a priority at the European level, in particular through the work of the European Commission's Education and Training 2020 Working Group on 'Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education'. These ongoing reforms and developments will continue shaping citizenship education at schools in Europe and will therefore require further analysis in order to assess their impact over the coming years.

Main thematic results

❖ Curriculum content is multidimensional, rich and adapted to each education level

Citizenship education is part of the national curricula for general education in all countries. The study confirmed that citizenship education is far more than simply teaching students about a country's constitutional structure. All countries have ambitious curricula to develop a number of competences related to interacting effectively and constructively with others, acting in a socially responsible manner, acting democratically and thinking critically.

The majority of countries cover personal responsibility, cooperation and communication in their curricula across all education levels. As far as the 'critical thinking' competence area is concerned, the majority of the countries studied here promote 'exercising judgement' by students, again at all levels. Other competences, such as 'creativity' are more likely to be taught at the primary and lower secondary levels, while questioning and analytical skills tend to be cultivated in upper secondary schools. Interestingly enough, a large majority of countries deal with respect – whether it is general respect for different opinions and beliefs or for other cultures and religions or for human rights in particular. While human rights is a topic dealt with across all education levels, most citizenship education curricula seek to foster a sense of belonging to the wider community largely during primary education. It is worth highlighting that participation, respecting democracy and rules and knowledge of political institutions are amongst the most frequently cited explicitly political competences.

Overall, the competences related to students' personal development and inter-personal interactions are promoted mostly in primary schools. Critical thinking, on the other, is usually cultivated in lower secondary education, while learning how to act democratically is dealt with at upper secondary level.

❖ Most countries use specific objectives to express the curriculum goals

Top level education authorities have various means at their disposal to express the curriculum goals that are meant to guide schools and teachers. They may opt for general aims, which offer only general guidelines, or they may choose to offer more detailed guidance by issuing specific objectives and/or learning outcomes. The report shows that most European countries do not confine themselves to general aims, but that they also issue specific objectives (30 out of 42 education systems) or learning outcomes (28). No less than 19 European countries combine all three types of curriculum guidance: general aims, specific objectives and learning outcomes (see Figure 1.6).

❖ Citizenship education is usually integrated into other subjects

Across European countries, three main approaches are used in general education for integrating citizenship education in the curriculum: it can be a separate subject, integrated into broader compulsory subjects or learning areas such as the social sciences or language studies, or it may be a cross-curricular objective to be delivered by all teachers. Most education systems use either the integrated or the cross-curricular approach, and many use both at all levels of general education (see Figure 1.1). This implies that a significant proportion of teachers are expected to be involved in citizenship education. Citizenship education is provided less often as a compulsory separate subject, and where this approach is used, it is more usual at secondary level.

❖ Where citizenship education is provided as a separate subject, there are substantial differences between countries in the duration of provision

The emphasis on citizenship education as a compulsory separate subject in general education varies significantly between the 20 education systems concerned (see Figure 1.2). The longest periods of provision can be found in Estonia, France, Slovakia and Finland, where citizenship as a separate subject is taught in each grade for at least seven school years and at most 12. At the other extreme, the compulsory subjects in Croatia, Cyprus, and Turkey are only provided in one grade of general education. These substantial differences are in turn reflected in the recommendations on the average taught time across the whole period of general education, which ranges from six hours in Croatia to 72 hours in France (see Figure 1.4).

❖ Recommendations for student and parent participation in school governance exist almost everywhere

Student councils are important channels through which all students can be provided with practical experience of the democratic process from the earliest stages of education. They can also be channels through which those involved can gain the transversal skills, such as team work, self-efficacy and self-belief that can help them make a difference to the world around them. Moreover, involving parents in schools can help to develop a democratic and inclusive whole school culture which promotes a sense of shared responsibility.

Across European countries, recommendations for student councils at lower and upper secondary levels and parent representation on school governing bodies are almost universal. For primary education, recommendations on parent engagement in school governing bodies are almost universal (the only exceptions are Finland and Sweden which allow schools autonomy in this area) but there are significantly fewer recommendations on student participation through student councils.

❖ The majority of countries provide teachers with guidelines for student assessment in citizenship education

Student assessment, which is an integral part of teaching and learning, is usually acknowledged as a particularly complex task in the area of citizenship education. This is due not only to the broad range of curricular objectives assigned to the subject area but also to the range of contexts in which it is delivered at school. Twenty-six education systems provide teachers with official guidelines on assessment in the classroom which apply to citizenship education (see Figure 3.1). Both traditional assessment methods such as multiple choice tests and alternative methods considered to be particularly suitable in the context of citizenship education, such as project-based assessment or self/peer assessment, are recommended to a fairly similar extent (see Figure 3.2). However, portfolio assessment, which is also among the assessment methods emphasised as particularly suitable for citizenship education is referred to in the national guidelines of eight countries only across primary and general secondary education.

❖ National tests are organised mostly for certification purposes

Next to guidelines for continuous student assessment, the inclusion of citizenship education in national tests may also help in emphasising the importance of the subject as well as improve continuity in the learning process. However, it is important that national tests in the area of citizenship education are designed with caution so that they properly capture all the core dimensions of this complex subject area, i.e. the acquisition of theoretical knowledge, the development of skills such as analytical skills and critical thinking, and the adoption of certain values and attitudes such as sense of tolerance and participating.

National tests in citizenship education are administered at some point in general education in 17 education systems (see Figure 3.3). It is interesting to note that standardised assessment in this area of learning takes place not only in the education systems where citizenship education is taught as a compulsory separate subject but also in others where it is only provided as part of other subjects and/or as a cross-curricular theme.

In the majority of cases, national tests covering citizenship education aim to summarise students' achievements at the end of a school year, prior to awarding certificates or taking formal decisions with regard to student progression to the next stage of education. However, eight education systems – Belgium (Flemish Community), the Czech Republic, Estonia, Spain, France, Lithuania, Slovenia and Finland – administer such tests with a view to evaluating the education system as a whole and/or evaluating individual schools in order to inform improvements in teaching and learning in the area of citizenship education and not to make decisions on student progression. In Estonia, the development of national tests in social and civic competences for improvement purposes is on-going (see Case study 3).

- ❖ **Despite progress in some countries, others still have significant policy gaps with regard to the initial education of citizenship education teachers**

Teachers specialised in citizenship education can facilitate its provision as a separate subject as well as support the knowledge and capacity building in the school, in particular, by helping non-specialists to teach the subject. Whereas in 2010/11, it was only possible in the United Kingdom (England) to specialise during Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in citizenship education, it is now possible in four more education systems (Belgium (French Community), Ireland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands). And in Denmark this opportunity has become available since autumn 2017. Moreover, seven other countries – the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Austria, Poland and Slovakia – train prospective teachers during ITE to become semi-specialists of citizenship education. In other words, they are specialised in citizenship education and up to three other subjects (see Figure 4.2.a).

Another way in which education authorities influence ITE is by establishing sets of competences particularly relevant to citizenship education and ensuring that all prospective primary and/or secondary teachers acquire these before completing their training. Nine education systems have defined competences to be acquired by all teachers which are specifically linked to citizenship education. Indeed, the stakeholders interviewed for the case study focusing on the reforms in France also concluded that the competence framework established for ITE was perceived as helpful in ensuring that all teachers obtain the necessary knowledge, skills, attitudes and values for implementing a transversal teaching area such as civic and moral education (see Case study 4).

The defined sets of competences do not, however, give equal weight to each of the dimensions considered essential for teachers of this area of learning. The top level guidelines in relatively more countries focus on teachers' knowledge of what needs to be taught, their capacity to plan relevant learning activities, and the social skills needed to engage with students, parents, peers and the local community. Fewer countries, however, refer to competences related to teachers' ability to evaluate and improve their teaching and learning practices as well as their understanding and awareness of the values at the heart of citizenship education such as democracy, the rule of law, human rights and equality.

Despite the many positive developments, 17 education systems still have no regulations or recommendations whatsoever on the development of prospective teachers' citizenship education competences through ITE – it is therefore left to higher education institutions to decide how this should

be carried out. These include a number of countries (Greece, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey) where citizenship is provided as a compulsory separate subject. Moreover, only 13 of the 36 education systems where citizenship education has a cross-curricular status (implying that all teachers share responsibility for its delivery) have defined any citizenship education-related competences to be acquired by all prospective secondary teachers.

❖ **The majority of countries provide guidance and support material for citizenship education**

The provision of guidance and support materials to teachers is another vital part of building capacity at school level to implement citizenship education. For instance, during the pilot phase of the new curriculum for citizenship education in Austria, the importance of the availability of guidance material was highlighted by teachers (see Case study 1). This aspect has also been strengthened through recent reforms in France, Italy, Cyprus and Luxembourg.

In the area of citizenship education, guidance and support materials are most frequently provided to teachers at all levels of general education. These materials include subject guidance, national curriculum manuals, ministerial laws or decrees and competence frameworks. Many countries also signpost websites and online resource hubs developed at national level, and resources available internationally such as those from the Council of Europe or UNESCO.

❖ **CPD activities for school heads on citizenship education are organised or supported by only a minority of countries' top level education authorities**

School heads also have a key role to play in promoting a clear and coherent approach that supports citizenship education in the classroom and in the school. Whereas top level education authorities in around two thirds of all European education systems are involved in the provision of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) activities for teachers in the area of citizenship education (see Chapter 4, Figure 4.3), they provide similar opportunities to school heads in only 14 European countries – Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Austria, Poland and Slovenia. The main focus of the CPD activities for school heads is on the promotion of citizenship education in schools through the curriculum, a democratic school culture, work with parents, extra-curricular activities, and through encouraging cooperation between teachers so that citizenship education can be implemented effectively as a cross-curricular topic (see Figure 4.4).

❖ **Less attention is given to citizenship education in school-based IVET, compared to general education**

Across most of the areas covered in this report, differences can be found in the way citizenship education is addressed in school-based initial vocational education and training (IVET) compared to general education.

In a third of the education systems, curriculum approaches to citizenship education used in general education are either not used in IVET or are used to a lesser extent. Depending on the countries, these differences imply for IVET students: fewer compulsory subjects integrating citizenship education; fewer optional subjects integrating citizenship education; no optional separate subject in citizenship education; less provision in terms of compulsory separate subjects or modules; and lastly, fewer or no cross-curricular themes relevant to citizenship education.

Only Belgium (Flemish Community), Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (England) have arrangements for some students in school-based IVET to take national tests in the area of citizenship education. Regulations and recommendations on both student and parent participation are also consistently less widespread in IVET than in general education (see Figures 2.4 and 2.5). And finally, significantly fewer education systems provide guidance and support materials for teachers in IVET (see Figure 2.1).

INTRODUCTION

Policy context

Europe faces important challenges today. Socio-economic problems, violent extremism and a lack of trust in democratic processes are amongst the biggest threats to Europe's shared principles of peace, justice, democracy, respect for human rights, freedom, equality, tolerance and non-discrimination. In this context, education and training have an important role in cultivating mutual respect and fundamental values as well as in fostering inclusion and equality. Citizenship education, in particular, is becoming a key topic in many education systems. It aims to support young people in becoming active, informed and responsible citizens who are willing and able to take responsibility for themselves and for their communities and to contribute to the political process.

Promoting citizenship education at school has in fact been a long-standing objective of European cooperation in the field of education. Social and civic competences are among the eight key competences identified in 2006 by the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union as essential for citizens living in a knowledge-based society ⁽¹⁾. Promoting equity, social cohesion and active citizenship through school education is also one of the main objectives for the present decade in the context of the Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training (ET 2020) ⁽²⁾.

In the wake of the 2015 terrorist attacks in Paris and Copenhagen, the Paris Declaration signed by EU Education Ministers and the European Commission called for action at European, national, regional and local levels to reinforce the role of education in promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination (European Commission, 2015a). It also emphasises the need for strengthening social cohesion and helping young people become responsible, open-minded and active members of a diverse and inclusive European society. The Declaration defines common objectives for Member States and urges the EU to ensure the sharing of ideas and good practice.

Following up on the objectives of the Declaration is a key priority for European cooperation in education and training ⁽³⁾. Actions at EU and Member State level are focussing on the four areas identified in the Declaration, highlighting the importance of citizenship education. These areas are: (i) ensuring that children and young people acquire social, civic and intercultural competences by promoting democratic values and fundamental rights, social inclusion and non-discrimination as well as active citizenship; (ii) enhancing critical thinking and media literacy; (iii) fostering the education of disadvantaged children and young people; and (iv) promoting intercultural dialogue through all forms of learning in cooperation with other relevant policies and stakeholders ⁽⁴⁾.

Other EU policy documents published more recently include Education Council conclusions focusing on particular issues related to citizenship education such as the role of the youth sector in an integrated and cross-sectoral approach to 'prevent and combat violent radicalisation among young people' (Council of the European Union, 2016a), developing media literacy and critical thinking through education and training (Council of the European Union, 2016b) and on 'inclusion in diversity to achieve a high quality education for all' (Council of the European Union, 2017). In addition, a

⁽¹⁾ Recommendation 2006/962/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December on key competences for lifelong learning, OJ L 394, 30.12.2006.

⁽²⁾ Council conclusions of 12 May 2009 on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training ('ET 2020'), OJ C 119, 28.5.2009.

⁽³⁾ 2015 Joint Report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training (ET 2020) – New priorities for European cooperation in education and training. OJ C 417, 15.12.2015, pp. 25-35.

⁽⁴⁾ See also the Eurydice leaflet on the follow-up of the Paris Declaration (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2016b).

Commission Communication on supporting the prevention of radicalisation leading to violent extremism was published in June 2016 (European Commission, 2016). It sets out a number of initiatives to support Member States in their efforts across several policy areas, from promoting inclusive education and common values, to tackling extremist propaganda online and radicalisation in prisons.

Last but not least, since 2016 the Education and Training 2020 Working Group on 'Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education' is providing a forum for exchange on the key policy issues highlighted in the Paris Declaration, with a focus on citizenship, fundamental values and non-discrimination in the different sectors of education and training (focusing on young people as well as adults – parents in particular). The group supports Member States in identifying and implementing measures to meet their national level objectives in compliance with the Declaration; this is achieved by offering opportunities for peer-to-peer learning and the exchange of good practice. Furthermore, based on the sharing of experience on what works and what does not, the group will also offer policy guidance on general principles applicable to other Member States. It has developed (and continues to update) an online compendium of good practice to illustrate how these principles can be implemented at ground level.

Over recent decades, international organisations have also been promoting the development of citizenship education and carrying out research in the field. The Council of Europe, for example, has recently published results from its second monitoring of the implementation of its Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education, which was adopted by all EU Member States in May 2010 (Council of Europe, 2017). Furthermore, the Council of Europe published a reference framework in 2016: *Competences for democratic culture: Living together as equals in culturally diverse societies* (see below in the section on the conceptual framework for more information). UNESCO has likewise been actively promoting the idea of citizenship education on a global scale through its Global Citizenship Education Model⁽⁵⁾. And finally, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) carried out a fourth survey on social and civic competences in 2016 (Schulz, IEA, 2016), which aims to investigate to what extent young people are prepared to assume their role as citizens. This survey covers 15 member countries of the Eurydice Network.

Conceptual framework

The term citizenship education in this report is understood to include not only the teaching and learning of citizenship related matters in the classroom, but also the practical experiences gained through activities in school and wider society that are designed to prepare students for their role as citizens of the democracies they live in. The conceptual framework is based on key documents of the EU, the Council of Europe and the United Nations. In addition, it takes into account the recent scholarly literature and acknowledges the diversity of educational systems and priorities in Europe.

⁽⁵⁾ <http://en.unesco.org/gced>

The fluidity of citizenship education

Citizenship education is a broad and fluid concept. It includes 'knowledge and understanding of formal institutions and processes of civic life' (Schulz, IEA, 2010, p. 22), but confining it to the traditional teaching of civics would be a gross underestimation of its breadth and importance.

The first step towards understanding what citizenship education is, is to understand its function, which is none other than bridging the gap between the individual and the community. These two concepts are not only distinct, but also in tension with each other. The interests and preferences of the individual and the community do not always coincide. Sometimes they even clash with potentially disastrous consequences, as the historical experience from totalitarian regimes, terrorism and racism, or from anomy and political apathy has shown ⁽⁶⁾. Citizenship education, therefore, is a means, firstly, to help individuals realise that they are part of a community or, to be more precise, a set of communities ranging from the narrower communities at the local level, to the wider ones at national and global levels. Secondly, citizenship education aspires to equip students with competences that promote simultaneously the interests of the individual and the community thus enabling the harmonious development of both.

Of course, the understanding of what the right competences are varies across time and space. Factors such as the type of political constitution, level of economic wealth, degree of socio-political stability, national cohesion and peaceful international relations, all exercise a great deal of influence on the public understanding of which competences are most relevant and useful to a citizen. However, all these factors vary between countries and change over time, which is a key reason why citizenship education is a fluid concept.

The fluidity of citizenship education is also associated with the existence of more than one definition and model of citizenship ⁽⁷⁾. For the purposes of the present study, citizenship can be understood as 'that set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society' (Turner 1993, p. 2). Such a broad definition can accommodate the different models of citizenship that scholars have identified (cf. Hyslop-Margison and Sears, 2006; Biesta, 2011; Keating, 2014) ⁽⁸⁾.

A fairly common typology of citizenship models, that was also adopted in the research of the EU's Joint Research Centre (Hoskins et al., 2015), distinguishes between liberal, communitarian and cosmopolitan types of citizenship. The liberal model, which Keating (2014) divides further into social democrat and neoliberal citizenships, emphasises individual rights and equal membership. According to the liberal political tradition, the state at best acts as guarantor of citizen rights (Keating 2014, p. 45), or, at worst, it poses a threat to the liberty of the individual. In both cases, liberalism stipulates that the role (and size) of the state ought to be kept minimal and citizenship education is likely to reflect such an understanding of the state.

⁽⁶⁾ Terrorism, racism and totalitarianism are referred to here as extreme examples of abuse against the individual committed by or in the name of a community. Equally, political apathy and anomy count as extreme examples where the interests of the individual are pursued at the expense of the interests of the community.

⁽⁷⁾ There is also another source of conceptual fluidity resulting from variation in the criteria for granting citizenship. As it is well known, they too vary across time and regions. This issue is not addressed here, because it does not impact on citizenship education directly. Normally, students are subject to citizenship education regardless of whether they are formal citizens of the country they live in.

⁽⁸⁾ For an overview of different citizenship models, see Doğanay (2012).

Unlike the liberal citizenship, communitarian types of citizenship encourage citizens to view themselves as an integral, if not organic, part of the polity and to participate actively in it. The state is not merely the guarantor of rights, but it is the means through which individuals *qua* citizens can reach their, and the polity's, potential in full. As in the liberal model, there are further divisions. A liberal communitarian citizenship prioritises the cultural community over the political; a civic republican citizenship puts participation in the political community or public sphere first; and conservative communitarian citizenship gives prominence to collective identity and morality (Keating 2014, pp. 47-48).

Keating (2014) and others (e.g. Linklater, 1998; Delanty, 2000; Hoskins et al., 2015) identify another category of citizenship, namely, the cosmopolitan or post-national. Contrary to liberal or communitarian citizenship, cosmopolitan and post-national types of citizenship go beyond the political and collective identity limits of the nation-state. On the one hand, such a model is appealing for modern Europe, because of the processes of globalisation and European integration and because European countries are becoming more and more multi-cultural. On the other, post-national citizenship models are criticised for being underspecified (Delanty, 2000), utopian or unsuitable (Auer, 2010) ⁽⁹⁾.

Given that there is not one type of ideal citizen, there is not a single type of citizenship education either. Empirical research has shown that different European countries emphasise different aspects or types of citizenship through education. For example, Hoskins et al. (2015, p. 431) argue that in Nordic countries 'teachers prioritise promoting autonomous critical thinking in citizenship education. [...] [M]edium term democracies with civic republican tradition, such as Italy and Greece, gain more positive results on citizenship values and participatory attitudes. This is also the case for some recent former communist countries that retain ethnic notions of citizenship'. In addition, previous Eurydice studies (Eurydice, 2005; European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a) have shown that citizenship education in Europe is delivered by a multitude of different educational systems, each with its own structures, means, priorities and methods. It is no surprise, therefore, that the research literature identifies or promotes different citizenship education models. Often these models have more similarities than differences (cf. Ten Dam, 2011; Doğanay, 2012; Hoskins et al., 2015), but they remain distinct ⁽¹⁰⁾.

It is clear, therefore, that the understanding of what exactly citizenship education should convey and how is not common to all societies. This is why citizenship education has to be seen within the wider social setting in which it is embedded. In this respect, Kerr (1999) identifies a number of contextual and structural factors that influence citizenship education. Structural factors refer to the organisation of the education system, educational values and aims and funding arrangements (Kerr 1999, p. 8). Contextual conditions refer to a country's historical tradition, geographical position, socio-political structure, economic system and global trends. Keating et al. (2009) and Keating (2014) also acknowledge global trends, such as Europeanisation and globalisation having an impact on how citizenship education is conceived and carried out.

Interestingly, the relationship between citizenship education and democracy is bidirectional. A well-functioning democracy may depend on citizenship education to instil students with the necessary competences to think and act democratically, but the relationship also goes the other way round. Citizenship education tends to flourish when it operates within the framework of a democracy. The

⁽⁹⁾ Utopian because they presuppose a global sovereign state which does not (yet) exist, or unsuitable because they cannot contain Europe's rising populism and ethno-centric nationalism (Auer, 2010).

⁽¹⁰⁾ For the interested reader, Doğanay (2012) provides a review of some of the existing models, and the work of Keating (2014) and of Geboers et al. (2013) is also useful in this respect.

following section illuminates this point by placing citizenship education and its development in a historical context.

Citizenship education in a historical context

For the classical philosophers all education was essentially citizenship education in the sense that well educated individuals were meant to be good citizens. In particular, Plato conceived of the fates of the individual and the polity as inextricably bound and intertwined. Given that his utopian polity was not envisaged as a democracy, Plato did not have ambitious plans for the education of ordinary citizens. Nevertheless, he devised elaborate education instructions for those groups he believed should rule over the polity. As is well known, Plato (1987) distinguished in the *Republic* between three classes of individuals, the guardian-rulers (philosopher-kings), the guardians-auxiliaries (with mostly executive duties) and the rest (the producers). He paid particular attention to the education of the philosopher-kings, because they had the task to lead the state and its citizens to the best possible life.

For Aristotle the fate of the citizen is tied to the fate of the polity they live in. The citizen, representing an integral component of the polity, cannot live or flourish without the community and its institutions (the polity) and vice versa. Thus, the health and well-being of the polity is inseparable from the health and well-being of the individual. It follows, that the citizen ought to think and behave in a way that enhances not only their own personal interests, but also the interests of the polity as a whole.

'Education', Aristotle (1944, p. 635) explains in *On Politics* (§1887a), 'ought to be adapted to the particular form of constitution, since the particular character belonging to each constitution both guards the constitution generally and originally establishes it – for instance, the democratic spirit promotes democracy and the oligarchic spirit oligarchy'. In other words, according to Aristotle, education's goal should not be simply endowing students with certain knowledge and skills that are useful to them as individuals, but also forming them into citizens suitable to 'the spirit' of the constitution of their polity. A democratic polity needs different kind of citizens from a non-democratic polity. Therefore, their education ought to differ accordingly.

Heater (2002) notes that the fate of citizenship education and democratic citizenship are linked. Thus, in the historical context of the Greek city-states and especially of democratic Athens, educating citizens to take part in politics and behave accordingly made sense. However, as the world of city-states gradually gave way to the world of empires, citizenship education started to decline, because 'by the late first century AD [...] active citizenship, as distinct from its legal status, had succumbed to the ineffectiveness beneath the weight of Imperial autocracy' (Heater 2002, p. 459). In the centuries that followed scholarly attention shifted away from the education of democratic citizens to the counselling of the emperor. By defining the attributes of the ideal kingship or by praising the virtues of the ruler, Roman Empire scholarship hoped to educate power holders how to be good rulers rather than citizens ⁽¹¹⁾.

⁽¹¹⁾ For example, Dio Chrysostom (ca. AD 40-120) identified prudence, temperance, justice, omniscience, philanthropy and fortitude as the key qualities the ideal king should strive for (Nemo 2013, pp. 361-362). Similarly, Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. AD 260-340) argued in his panegyric oration to the Roman emperor Constantine that 'through acquaintance with the divine he clothes his soul in raiment embroidered with temperance and justice, piety and the remaining virtues, truly the fitting attire for a sovereign' (quoted in Nemo 2013, p. 375).

Political education in the form of advice on how to be a role model ruler, reached its pinnacle between the 13th and 16th centuries (Nemo, 2013). During this period the so-called 'mirror of princes' literature flourished. Such treatises were meant to reflect the attributes of the ideal ruler and to instruct them how they ought to act toward their subjects, their friends and foes and towards other rulers and principalities (¹²).

During the long interval between the end of the classical era and the dawn of the Enlightenment, the classical ideas about citizenship and its education did not die out completely (Heater, 2002). To the extent that the books of Plato and Aristotle were still being studied, their respective ideas on citizenship and education remained alive. However, it was only when the *ancien regime* in Europe started crumbling in the late 18th century that citizenship education was to be treated again seriously and systematically. Locke, and especially Voltaire, Rousseau and Montesquieu argued fervently for popular sovereignty, the nation, citizenship, and a constitution. The notion of virtue 'especially in its civic form' (Heater 2002, p. 461), originally developed by Aristotle, was re-discovered by Voltaire and the other *philosophes*. Thus, in the age of the revolutions in Europe and Northern America the need for citizenship education re-emerged (Heater 2002, p. 460).

It is worth noting that in the 18th century citizenship education was perceived to have a narrower content than it did during the classical era. On the one hand, broadening access to education intended to help promote some of the new era values among the newly founded citizens, such as secular morality, republican political virtue, respect for the law and national identity. On the other, citizenship education was no longer the holistic education classical scholars had in mind. Instead, citizen education started resembling civic education, which involved the teaching of the essentials of the country's constitutional order, history, in addition to instilling a sense of national loyalty.

Drawing lessons from the cases of France, England and the United States, Heater (2002) concludes that in the 19th and 20th century citizenship education was driven forward by a number of factors. In particular, the key factors were the extension of the right to vote, growing feelings of nationhood, decolonisation, concerns about personal and civic immorality in the growing industrial cities, and the integration of immigrants. In all three countries instigating a sense of patriotism was a central task of citizenship education, which was in tune with the wider educational priorities of past centuries across Europe. As Keating et al. (2009 p. 146) put it, '[t]he nation-building projects of the 18th and 19th centuries forged a close and powerful connection between the legitimacy of the nation-state and the education of citizens, particularly in Western societies' (¹³).

The 20th and early 21st centuries did not remove the fluidity of the concept of citizenship education. If anything, they heightened it. Globalisation in its various manifestations (economic, cultural, technological, etc.) has made it obvious that citizenship education can no longer be only about creating citizens in a narrow, strictly national (and nationalist) sense. To the extent that 'global injustice and inequality, globalisation and migration, concerns about civic and political engagement, youth deficit, the end of cold war and anti-democratic and racist movement [*sic*]' contributed to the growth of interest in citizenship education (Doğanay, 2012), it can be argued that the same factors are likely to have influenced the expectations from, and consequently the content and/or delivery of citizenship education (¹⁴). Furthermore, the foundation of new international institutions active on educational

(¹²) The best known example of such treatises is Machiavelli's 'The Prince' (Machiavelli, 2008) originally published in 1532. The treatise is infamous for instructing the ruler to put his reign above everything else, not shying away from the use of force or deceit if necessary.

(¹³) On the relationship between education and nationalism see, for instance, Hobsbawm (1989) and Smith (1991).

(¹⁴) On the notion of a global citizenship education and its curriculum goals, see Zahabioun et al. (2013). For more on the conceptual problems regarding a post-national citizenship education, see Marshall (2009).

matters, such as the EU, the Council of Europe and the United Nations, may have also exercised some influence on the content and/or the delivery of citizenship education (Rauner, 1999; Philippou et al., 2009; Keating, 2014). While the link between citizenship education and nationalism still applies according to some scholars (e.g. Zajda, 2009), modern citizenship education is bound to be different. Both the means at the disposal of the educational authorities and the challenges European societies have to respond to differ from those of previous eras.

Citizenship education in this report

The present study aims to present the different approaches to citizenship education in Europe in all their diversity and richness. Consequently, it would have been a mistake to adopt a narrow understanding of citizenship education when the report's aim is to include as many approaches to the subject as possible. Nevertheless, as the study is theoretically informed, certain choices had to be made.

First of all, the report builds on international policy documents and academic research (e.g. Maslowski et al., 2009; Ten Dam et al., 2011; Hoskins et al., 2015) that view citizenship and/or citizenship education in terms of competences. In particular, the report draws on the EU's 'Key competences for lifelong learning – European reference framework', which incorporates a number of relevant civic and social competences⁽¹⁵⁾. The report draws also on the work of the Council of Europe, which has a long record of work on citizenship education (Keating et al., 2009). Following the adoption of a 'Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education' (Council of Europe, 2010), the Council of Europe developed a sophisticated model of competences, which 'enable an individual to participate effectively and appropriately in a culture of democracy' (Council of Europe 2016, p. 12). Last but not least, UNESCO (2015) also relies on the concept of competences for its Global Citizenship Education model.

Secondly, whereas there appears to be broad consensus that citizenship education ought to refer to the development of certain competences, there is no agreement on the identity or the composition of these competences. Thus, both the EU (European Parliament and Council, 2006)⁽²²⁾ and the Council of Europe (2016) maintain that competences are composed of elements related to knowledge, skills and attitudes. However, the Council of Europe (2016) adds a fourth dimension, namely, values. Doğanay (2012) puts attitudes, values and dispositions under a single roof, Ten Dam et al. (2011) replace values (or dispositions) with reflections, Keating (2014) keeps values but drops attitudes, Hoskins et al. (2015) keep values and adds social justice as a civic competence dimension, while Maslowski et al. (2009) use a different terminology altogether talking of citizenship values, normative and action competencies instead. Since the concept of attitudes is akin to values or dispositions, and since reflections is not too far from knowledge either, the current report follows the EU's reference framework of key competences for lifelong learning, which distinguishes only between knowledge, skills and attitudes.

⁽¹⁵⁾ 'These include personal, interpersonal and intercultural competences and cover all forms of behaviour that equip individuals to participate in an effective and constructive way in social and working life, and particularly in increasingly diverse societies, and to resolve conflict where necessary. Civic competence equips individuals to fully participate in civic life, based on knowledge of social and political concepts and structures and a commitment to active and democratic participation'. Recommendation 2006/962/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning, OJ L394. 30.12.2006, pp. 16-17.

Figure 1: Typology of approaches to citizenship education

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


Source: Kerr (1999, p. 12).

Thirdly, the study adopts the view that there may be different approaches to citizenship education. As Kerr (1999) argues, the different citizenship education approaches can be placed along a theoretical continuum ranging from minimalist to maximalist ideal types (see Figure 1). In practice, maybe there is no country combining all features of either of the two ideal types. Nevertheless, the figure helps to illustrate that in some countries citizenship education may tend toward a more traditional pattern of knowledge dissemination and touch upon a limited range of topics, whereas in others citizenship education may be understood more broadly, covering a wide array of topics and relying on a variety of learning methods.

Fourthly, the current report takes into account that within a school context citizenship education can be delivered not only via formal learning (i.e. teaching in the classroom), but also via informal (Maslowski et al., 2009; Sundström and Fernández, 2013) and non-formal learning experiences (Jansen et al., 2006). Geboers et al. (2013) found that extra-curricular and out of school learning activities have an impact, even if it is not as large or as clear as the impact of curricular learning. Therefore, citizenship education in this report goes beyond classroom teaching encompassing informal learning aspects, such as school culture, classroom climate, participation structures, and non-formal learning aspects, such as participation in volunteering schemes or in arts projects and sport events.

Finally, it is obvious that the unit of analysis cannot be only the learner, because learning in school does not take place in vacuum. Teachers play an indispensable role in the learning process (Salema, 2005), and trying to improve the delivery of citizenship education by making support available to teachers and schools is something which the study investigates.

Figure 2: The conceptual framework: goals and means of citizenship education in school



Source: Eurydice.

The study does not, of course, prescribe what the content of citizenship education ought to be and which competences it should pursue. However, because of the great number of potentially relevant competences ⁽¹⁶⁾, and in order to facilitate the work of the survey respondents, four broad areas of competences have been identified. As Figure 2 illustrates, the study conceives citizenship education to be aiming at the promotion of knowledge, skills and attitudes conducive to (i) interacting effectively and constructively with others, (ii) thinking critically, (iii) acting in a socially responsible manner, and (iv) acting democratically. These broad competence areas have been devised after taking into account the EU's reference framework on social and civic competences (European Parliament and Council, 2006 ⁽²²⁾), the Council of Europe's competences for democratic culture (Council of Europe, 2016), a citizenship competences literature review (Ten Dam et al., 2010) and the empirical testing of some of these competence areas by Ten Dam et al. (2011). They balance the social and communitarian aspect of citizenship (interacting with others, acting in a socially responsible manner) with the individual and liberal (critical thinking) ⁽¹⁷⁾, while acknowledging the democratic connotations surrounding the concept of citizenship (acting democratically).

In sum, the 2017 Eurydice report on citizenship education at school level in Europe relies on a conceptual framework that is as broad as possible, in order to accommodate all the types of citizenship education existing in Europe in 2016/17. As noted above, the content and objectives of citizenship education may vary. Some countries may place more emphasis on ensuring that students have the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes to be active and socially responsible citizens. Others may prioritise effective and constructive interaction within and between communities, or they may pay more attention to the development of personal attributes, such as critical thinking. Naturally, it is also conceivable that some European countries cover all broad citizenship competence areas and/or other competence areas that have not been explicitly mentioned here. Whatever the content, citizenship education helps narrow the gap between the individual and the community, ideally in a way that advances the interests of the community while enhancing the liberty of the individual.

Objectives and content

Within the conceptual framework described above, the general objective of this report is to provide a current and comprehensive picture of citizenship education at school in Europe. The report provides an overview of national policies in the area of citizenship education in all the European countries covered (see below in the scope), hence describing citizenship education in its current state (2016/17 school year), but also the main reforms since the previous Eurydice report on citizenship education (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a). Wherever possible, the data in the 2012 and 2017 reports are compared. In addition, the report captures some national policy responses to emergent priorities, including dealing with increased social diversity as well as violent extremism, enhancing critical thinking and promoting media literacy. However, it is important to bear in mind that the report does not analyse the implementation of regulations and recommendations; consequently it does not necessarily depict how citizenship education is delivered at school level in practice.

The report starts with an overview of the national strategies and action plans addressing citizenship education that exist across Europe. This is followed by four chapters, each dealing with a different aspect of citizenship education at school in Europe (see below). Specific examples of national policies and practices presented throughout the report provide practical illustrations of the general statements made in the comparative analysis, or they show exceptions to what is seen as a general trend in the

⁽¹⁶⁾ The Council of Europe (2016, pp. 69-70) identifies as many as 55 competences relevant to a culture of democracy.

⁽¹⁷⁾ On critical thinking as a citizenship competence, see, for example, Ten Dam and Volman (2004).

countries. Each chapter includes findings from the research literature as well as a case study on an interesting, recent policy initiative related to the area discussed in the chapter.

Chapter 1 provides firstly an overview of how citizenship education is integrated into national curricula. Provision may either take the form of a cross-curricular theme to be included in all school subjects, a dedicated separate school subject (named differently from one country to the next), or a topic integrated within other subjects (such as social sciences, languages, etc.). The recommended taught time for the compulsory separate subjects dedicated to citizenship education is then reviewed. The chapter also includes a comparison of citizenship education in national curricula for general secondary education and school-based initial vocational education and training (IVET) respectively. The second part of chapter 1 deals with the content of the curriculum. Firstly, it looks at whether official top level guidelines are issued as general aims, specific objectives or learning outcomes. Next, the methodology for the content analysis of the curricula is addressed, including the presentation of the individual citizenship competences and their grouping according to the four broader competence areas (interacting effectively and constructively with others, thinking critically, acting in a socially responsible manner, and acting democratically). The remaining part of the chapter looks at how the distribution of citizenship competence areas develops across education levels, and how individual competences are organised across education levels and pathways and across countries.

Chapter 2 addresses teaching and learning for citizenship education. The first section comprises an analysis of where the top level authorities provide recommendations and guidance materials to support curricular learning, with insights into the types of pedagogical approaches illustrated through the survey. The second section builds on this approach to address extra-curricular learning, exploring top level recommendations on types of learning activities, mapping nationally supported programmes of extra-curricular learning and illustrating specific examples from different education systems. The final section expands the perspective to give an overview of student and parent engagement in school governance via student councils and school governing bodies. This section offers a comparison with results from the 2012 study, illustrating the trends in engagement across the different levels of education from primary to school-based IVET.

Chapter 3 considers student assessment and school inspection in relation to citizenship education. The first section presents a brief overview of the scientific literature regarding the main issues surrounding student assessment in the area of citizenship education. The second section provides a comparative analysis of the official guidelines provided to teachers for assessing their students in the area of citizenship education. The third section describes the main characteristics of national testing in the area of citizenship education. Finally, the chapter analyses whether and how citizenship related issues are considered in external school evaluation.

Chapter 4 presents an overview of the existing top level regulations and recommendations as well as some practices across Europe that aim to promote teachers' professional competences for citizenship education and to provide them with relevant education, training and support. The sections following the literature review present, firstly, policies related to the initial education of teachers responsible for citizenship education and, secondly, the existing continuing professional development (CPD) activities in the area of citizenship education that are organised and/or supported by top level education authorities, targeting teachers as well as school heads. The chapter ends by presenting some of the other support measures, such as resource centres, networks and websites, made available to teachers and school heads to foster the implementation of citizenship education in schools.

Finally, more detailed information about national policies and measures related to the different topics discussed in the four chapters of the report are available in the [annexes](#) ⁽¹⁸⁾.

Scope

The report provides information on all countries that are part of the Eurydice Network ⁽¹⁹⁾, except Albania, numbering 42 education systems in total. It covers ISCED levels 1, 2 and 3 in school education, in both general and school-based vocational programmes. The scope is thus enlarged compared to the previous Eurydice report on citizenship education (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012), which was limited to primary and general secondary education. The purpose of including school-based IVET was to investigate the differences in citizenship education provision between the different pathways of education systems, taking into account data collection limitations due to institutional autonomy in this sector. The reference year is 2016/17.

The Eurydice data is confined to public sector schools with the exception of the three Communities of Belgium and the Netherlands. In these countries, government-dependent private institutions account for a significant share of school enrolments and follow the same rules as public schools. Hence, these are included in the analysis.

Methodology

Information on policies and measures issued by top level education authorities has been gathered by the Eurydice Network using a questionnaire prepared by the Erasmus+: Education and Youth Policy Analysis Unit – the unit of the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) which coordinates the Eurydice Network.

Official recommendations, regulations as well as national strategies or action plans have been the primary sources of information for answering this questionnaire.

The case studies have been selected on the basis of information received from the Eurydice National Units about their recent reforms in each of the four main dimensions analysed in the chapters of the report (citizenship education curriculum, teaching and learning approaches, student assessment and school evaluation, and teacher education, professional development and support). They have been conducted by interviewing relevant actors, i.e. the main national stakeholders involved in the development and implementation (if applicable) of the policy initiative under investigation, in each of the four selected countries. The interviews were carried out between March and May 2017. The findings obtained during the interviews were complemented by an analysis of the relevant official documents.

In addition, the report presents some of the key issues identified in the current research literature on the concept and content of citizenship education, effective teaching, learning and assessment approaches in this area, as well as the key elements of the preparation of and support provided to the teachers responsible for implementing citizenship education.

The preparation and drafting of the report was coordinated by the Erasmus+: Education and Youth Policy Analysis Unit. It was checked by all the Eurydice National Units. All contributors are acknowledged at the end of the report.

⁽¹⁸⁾ The annexes are available online: <http://dx.publications.europa.eu/10.2797/1072>

⁽¹⁹⁾ http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/index_en.php

CHAPTER 1: CURRICULUM ORGANISATION AND CONTENT

This chapter analyses national curricula for citizenship education. It looks at how this area of learning is integrated within national curricula, and examines curriculum content in terms of general aims, specific objectives and learning outcomes.

The term 'national curricula' has been interpreted in a wide sense, to mean any official steering documents issued by top level authorities containing programmes of study or any of the following: learning content, learning objectives, attainment targets, guidelines on pupil assessment or syllabuses. Specific legal decrees in some countries have also been taken into account. More than one type of steering document containing provisions relating to citizenship education may be in force at any one time in a country and these may impose different levels of obligation on schools to comply. They may, for example, contain advice, recommendations or regulations. However, whatever the level of obligation, they all establish the basic framework in which schools develop their own teaching to meet their pupils' needs (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice 2011, p. 41).

In examining the organisational aspects of citizenship education curricula, section 1.1 identifies three approaches which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Citizenship education may be provided as a cross-curricular theme, a separate subject, or it may be integrated into other subjects or learning areas. This section also deals with the question of whether the subjects through which citizenship education is taught are compulsory for all students or not. Section 1.2 presents information about the instruction time allocated to citizenship education, but only where it is taught as a compulsory separate subject. Whereas the information in the earlier sections focuses on students in general education at primary and secondary levels, section 1.3 provides a comparison between provision for these students and that available in school-based initial vocational education and training (IVET).

Section 1.4 looks firstly at the nature of the guidance issued by education authorities on citizenship education, in terms of whether they contain general aims, specific objectives or learning outcomes. Section 1.5 looks at four broad areas of citizenship competences and, in particular, at how these are distributed across ISCED levels. This section concludes with a look at how the specific components of these competence areas are distributed not only across education levels, but also across countries.

A. Organisation

Unlike mathematics or languages, citizenship education is not a traditional school subject acknowledged consistently as a topic in its own right in curricula issued by top-level authorities. It is often defined in terms of social and civic competences which, like the other cross-curricular or 'transversal' competences (COM, 2012) such as the digital, entrepreneurship or learning to learn competences, have a wide application and are linked to many subjects across the whole curriculum. As a result, citizenship education has not been integrated into national curricula in the same way as traditional subjects (see Halash and Michel, 2011).

There are three main ways in which citizenship education is integrated into national curricula (Eurydice, 2005 and European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a):

- Cross-curricular theme: citizenship education objectives, content or learning outcomes are designated as being transversal across the curriculum and all teachers share responsibility for delivery.
- Integrated into other subjects: citizenship education objectives, content or learning outcomes are included within the curriculum of wider subjects or learning areas, often concerned with the

humanities/social sciences. These wider subjects or learning areas do not necessarily contain a distinct component dedicated to citizenship education.


- Separate subject: citizenship education objectives, content or learning outcomes are contained within a distinct subject boundary primarily dedicated to citizenship.

An important challenge for the integration of the transversal competences embodied within subjects such as citizenship education is to enhance their status to bring them more into line with the traditional subject-based competences (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b).

1.1. Approaches to citizenship education in national curricula

At each level of general education, the vast majority of countries provide citizenship education provision for all young people (see Figure 1.1). This is, however, not necessarily the case at each grade (see [Annex 2](#) for comprehensive information on citizenship education at each grade and level of education).

Figure 1.1: Approaches to citizenship education according to national curricula for primary and general secondary education (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

Most countries integrate citizenship education in their curricula in several ways, and the approaches used may vary between levels of education or particular grades. See [Annex 2](#) for exhaustive information on citizenship education at each level of education.

For comparability purposes, the figure focuses on subjects that are compulsory for all students – if the subject associated with citizenship education is optional either for students or schools, it is not taken into account.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE fr): For ISCED 1, Figure 1.1 shows only the situation in schools offering a choice between different courses in religion and moral studies. Since 2017/18, a compulsory separate subject has also been taught in these schools at ISCED 2 and 3. In the other schools, the content and objectives of 'education in philosophy and citizenship' must be acquired through all subjects.

Spain: According to the Basic curriculum established by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports applying nationwide and complemented by the Autonomous Communities in their own jurisdiction, citizenship education is a cross-curricular theme and integrated into other compulsory subjects at each ISCED level of general education. In addition, some Autonomous Communities (e.g. Andalucía at ISCED 1 and Extremadura at ISCED 2) provide citizenship education as a separate compulsory subject.

Portugal: Since 2017/18, the teaching of a new compulsory separate subject 'citizenship and development' in grades 5 to 9 is being piloted in 230 public and private school clusters (comprising around half of the total number of schools).

United Kingdom (ENG): The legal requirement that all schools at ISCED 1, 2 and 3 must provide a 'balanced and broadly based' curriculum which 'promotes the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school and of society' is not shown in the figure as no specific content is prescribed. For students in grades 7 to 11, a programme of study for citizenship, set out as a separate subject, is compulsory in maintained schools and may optionally be used by academies (publicly funded independent schools, attended by around 70 % of secondary students ⁽¹⁾). However, as part of their autonomy, the approach to delivery is left to schools.

Switzerland: For ISCED 1 and 2, information is based on the *Plan d'études romand*, the curriculum which applies only to the French-speaking Cantons.

The two most widespread approaches are the integration of citizenship education components into other subjects and its mention as a cross-curricular objective. They can each be found in at least thirty education systems in all levels of primary and general secondary education. By contrast, citizenship education is provided as a compulsory separate subject in a much more limited number of education systems: 7 at primary level, 14 at lower and 12 at upper secondary levels.

A combination of the approaches mentioned above is generally used to deliver citizenship education (see Figure 1.1). The most widespread model is to have the integrated approach combined with some teaching as a cross-curricular theme. This applies to 23 of the 42 education systems covered by this report at primary level and 20 at both lower secondary and upper secondary levels. In addition to these two approaches, in six education systems at primary level, eight at lower secondary level and six at upper secondary level, citizenship education is also taught as a compulsory separate subject. The remaining countries organise citizenship education either according to a single approach, or still according to alternative combinations, i.e. cross-curricular and separate subject or integrated and separate subject.

Citizenship education is offered as an optional separate subject in some countries and at some education levels – this may be in addition to some compulsory provision or it may be the only provision made. Hence, Spain at primary level, as well as Serbia throughout the whole general education pathway, offer separate subjects in citizenship education in the form of core curriculum options ⁽²⁾ as an alternative to religious education. In Serbia, this is the only provision for citizenship education, while in Spain citizenship education is also integrated within several compulsory subjects. Ireland, Poland, Slovenia, Montenegro and Turkey offer optional separate subjects on citizenship education at lower and/or upper general secondary education, following compulsory provision for all students in previous year(s) of schooling. In Finland, upper secondary general education students can choose to take an optional course in 'social studies', in addition to the three courses in the same subject compulsory for all during that level of education. Romania offers various optional separate subjects at each level, in

⁽¹⁾ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/623124/SFR28_2017_Main_Text.pdf

⁽²⁾ Core curriculum options are subjects that all schools must offer as part of a set of optional subjects.

addition to compulsory separate subject provision at primary and lower secondary levels. Finally, in Norway, where there is no compulsory separate subject on citizenship education, the optional subjects 'democracy in practice' and 'politics: individual and society' are offered at lower and upper secondary levels respectively.

Countries also offer optional subjects that integrate elements of citizenship education. These optional subjects are usually made available at secondary level. However, in Belgium (French and German-speaking Communities), Germany (most *Länder*), Hungary, Malta, Poland and Slovakia, the subjects ethics and/or religious education, which integrate elements of citizenship education, are provided as core curriculum options throughout the whole general education pathway. Interestingly, in Luxembourg, 'life and society' replacing the two former moral and religious subjects has progressively been introduced as a single subject compulsory for all throughout the whole general education pathway as of 2016/17.

To summarise, it is rare for citizenship education not to be specified in top-level curricula for each level of general education, either as a cross-curricular theme, or under a compulsory integrated or separate approach. Nevertheless, this is the case in Ireland at upper secondary level, Bosnia-Herzegovina in primary schools, the United Kingdom (England) for primary education, academies, and the final two grades of upper secondary education, as well as Serbia throughout the whole general education pathway. Making citizenship education optional for students is the approach in Ireland and Serbia in the education levels mentioned above. In the United Kingdom (England), it must be noted that alongside general requirements set out in legislation (see country note to Figure 1.1), there is a non-statutory programme of study for citizenship that primary schools can choose to follow in fulfilment of the general requirements. For all grades and all types of school, the approach to delivery is not prescribed.

1.1.1. Citizenship education as a compulsory cross-curricular theme

The status and purpose of cross-curricular themes is often set down in national curriculum documents in sections that do not deal with specific subjects. These may include the introductory sections, but there may also be specific sections devoted to cross-curricular skills, competences or themes. Alternatively, cross-curricular guidelines relevant to citizenship education can also be found in top-level thematic documents or circulars which complement curricula. For instance, in Austria, citizenship education is a cross-curricular educational principle for all school types, grades and subjects, as specified in the general ordinance 'Citizenship education in schools'. Germany offers a unique approach with regard to the cross-curricular status of citizenship education. Although subject curricula are defined at the level of each *Land*, several official documents dealing with human rights education ⁽³⁾, intercultural education ⁽⁴⁾, democracy education ⁽⁵⁾, media literacy ⁽⁶⁾, and historical and political education ⁽⁷⁾ apply to all *Länder* and therefore make citizenship education a cross-curricular feature of the whole education system.

While the cross-curricular approach to citizenship education is often combined with other approaches (separate or integrated subject) (see Figure 1.1), six education systems address this area of learning

⁽³⁾ https://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/1980/1980_12_04-Menschenrechtserziehung-englisch.pdf

⁽⁴⁾ http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/1996/1996_10_25-Interkulturelle-Bildung.pdf

⁽⁵⁾ http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2009/2009_03_06-Staerkung_Demokratieerziehung.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2012/2012_03_08_Medienbildung.pdf

⁽⁷⁾ http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2014/2014_12_11-Empfehlung-Erinnerungskultur_englisch.pdf

by defining only cross-curricular objectives and leaving its practical implementation to be determined at school level.

In **Belgium (Flemish Community)**, secondary school teams are collectively responsible for deciding how to implement various broad curricular objectives concerned with citizenship education (e.g. taking responsibility, showing respect, being critical, etc.) as well as other more specific objectives (e.g. those relating to the political-judicial context).

In **Denmark**, the curricula for upper secondary education state that both educational programmes and the school culture should help prepare pupils for participation, co-responsibility, rights and responsibilities in a free and democratic society.

In **Croatia**, schools at ISCED 1 and 2 are required to implement the 2012 curriculum for citizenship education⁽⁸⁾ as a cross-curricular and interdisciplinary topic, but they may decide to teach citizenship education as a separate subject

In **Hungary**, the National Core Curriculum makes 'education for active citizenship and democracy' a key development task across the whole education system and leaves schools the freedom to integrate 'homeland studies' as a compulsory separate subject at primary level.

In **Portugal**, according to specific guidelines issued in 2012, citizenship education must be implemented as a transversal curricular area. It can also be implemented through the development of projects and activities, under the framework for the relationship between school and community, or as a compulsory separate subject in primary and lower secondary schools. Under the new national strategy for citizenship education introduced in September 2017, a new subject 'citizenship and development' is currently being piloted in the form of a compulsory separate subject in the second and third stages of general education, and as a cross-curricular area in the rest of the general education pathway.

In **Iceland**, in the national curriculum for upper secondary general education, democracy and human rights are established as fundamental pillars of this level of education and an intrinsic part of all school subjects and activities.

Some countries allocate specific curriculum time to learning activities which must help implement cross-curricular objectives relevant to citizenship education.

For instance, in **Greece**, according to the Cross-Thematic Curriculum Framework for compulsory education, two or three teaching periods per week are devoted to interdisciplinary project-based activities related to a range of topics relevant to citizenship education, including 'participating in school and out-of-school activities'; 'using the media'; 'gender equality'; 'intercultural communication and interaction'; and environmental themes.

In **Finland**, schools at each level of general education are required to implement multi-disciplinary learning modules relevant to citizenship education, where pupils take an active part in planning the learning content and process.

1.1.2. Compulsory integrated or separate subjects⁽⁹⁾

Across Europe, in the national curricula for primary and general secondary education, citizenship education is usually integrated into other subjects or learning areas rather than being treated as a separate subject (see Figure 1.2).

Indeed, in 19 education systems, citizenship education is integrated into other compulsory subjects or learning areas without featuring in the curriculum as a subject in its own right. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that in Ireland, Cyprus and Norway, the compulsory separate subjects have now been supplanted by integrated approaches, whether before or after the reference year for the data in this report (2016/17). In addition, in Spain, the 2013 national education reform removed the obligation for all Autonomous Communities to provide a compulsory separate subject throughout general education, so that they are now free to decide their own policy on the matter.

In **Ireland**, the formerly separate subject 'civic, social and political education' taught throughout the whole of lower secondary education until 2016/17 becomes part of the compulsory area of learning 'wellbeing' from 2017/18.

⁽⁸⁾ http://www.azoo.hr/images/Kurikulum_gradanskog_odgoja_i_obrazovanja.pdf

⁽⁹⁾ For a similar and previous analysis of the integration of citizenship education in national curricula of European countries, see Bozec, 2016.


In **Cyprus**, the content of the compulsory separate subject 'civics' that was taught in grade 9 until 2014/15 and grade 12 until 2016/17 is being covered by other subjects as of 2017/18, i.e. mainly 'history' and 'modern Greek'.

In **Norway**, the compulsory subject 'pupil council work' previously taught at lower secondary education was removed from the curricula from 2012/13. The topics of student involvement and participation were consequently integrated into the subject 'social studies'.

In 17 other education systems, citizenship education is both integrated into other compulsory subjects/learning areas and delivered as a separate subject. But only in France does this combination of approaches occur at each grade of general education. A similar combined approach has also been progressively taken in Belgium (French Community) since 2016/17, in schools that offer a choice between different courses in religion and moral studies. In 13 of the countries where a combined approach is used ⁽¹⁰⁾, citizenship education is taught as an integral part of other subjects for a longer period than it is as a compulsory separate subject, which begins either in the upper grades of primary education or during general secondary education. Still a different configuration can be found in Romania and Slovakia, where the two approaches are used alternately: citizenship education is integrated into other subjects in the first years of schooling before becoming a subject in its own right.

Finally, in Croatia, the United Kingdom (England)⁽¹¹⁾ and Bosnia and Herzegovina, citizenship education is provided as a compulsory separate subject without being integrated into other compulsory subjects.

Figure 1.2: Citizenship education taught as a compulsory separate subject or integrated into other compulsory subjects, according to national curricula for primary and general secondary education (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

Figure 1.2 is limited to subjects compulsory for all students in the grade(s) concerned. It only includes citizenship education as a cross-curricular theme where it is mentioned in the curriculum documents for the specific subjects (see Figure 1.1). See Annex 2 for exhaustive information on citizenship education at each grade and level of general education.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE fr): For ISCED 1, Figure 1.2 shows only the situation in schools offering a choice between different courses in religion and moral studies. Since 2017/18, a compulsory separate subject has also been taught in these schools at secondary level. In the other schools, the content and objectives of 'education in philosophy and citizenship' must be acquired through all subjects.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, Greece, Cyprus, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovenia, Finland, former Republic Yugoslav of Macedonia, Montenegro and Turkey

⁽¹¹⁾ See country-specific note to Figure 1.2.

Ireland and Cyprus: Since 2017/18, the compulsory separate subjects shown in Figure 1.2 have been integrated into wider learning areas.

Spain: Information on the subjects integrating citizenship education reflects the basic curriculum of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports applying nationwide and complemented by the Autonomous Communities in their own jurisdiction. The separate compulsory subject is based on information provided by Andalucía (for grade 5) and Extremadura (for grade 8).

Poland: The subject 'knowledge about society' must be taught for one in the three grades of ISCED 3 general, up to the school head autonomy.

Portugal: Since 2017/18, the teaching of a new compulsory separate subject 'citizenship and development' in grades 5 to 9 is being piloted in 230 public and private school clusters (comprising around half of the total number of schools).

Romania: The grade referred to as the first grade of ISCED 1 in Figure 1.2 corresponds to a preparatory grade.

Slovenia: During ISCED 3, although there are no separate compulsory citizenship subjects, all students have to follow one module on 'citizenship culture' and another module on 'education for peace, family and non-violence'.

Finland: At upper secondary level of general education, there is flexibility for students regarding the grades at which they will complete the three compulsory courses in social studies.

United Kingdom (ENG): For students in grades 7 to 11, a programme of study for citizenship, set out as a separate subject, is compulsory in maintained schools. As long as the content is covered, the approach to delivery is left to schools. The programme of study may optionally be used by academies (publicly funded independent schools, attended by around 70 % of secondary students).

Switzerland: For ISCED 1 and 2, information is based on the *Plan D'études Romand*, the curriculum which applies only to the French-speaking regions.

Separate subject provision

Secondary education seems to be the preferred level for a compulsory separate subject on citizenship education. Nine education systems provide this only at lower secondary level (Ireland until 2016/17, Lithuania, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro) or only at upper secondary level (Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus until 2016/17 and Luxembourg). In addition, in Poland, Slovakia, the United Kingdom (England)⁽¹²⁾ and Bosnia and Herzegovina, citizenship education is provided as a compulsory separate subject during lower and upper secondary levels.

Fewer countries offer a compulsory separate subject before secondary education. Estonia, France and Finland are the only ones to start providing a separate subject at primary level and continue it without any interruption throughout general secondary education. However, in Finland, where the separate subject 'social studies' previously compulsory from lower secondary level has been taught to all students from grade 4 since 2016/17, there is flexibility for students regarding the grade(s) at which they choose to take the social studies courses at upper secondary level. In addition, a compulsory separate subject is provided at some grades of primary and lower secondary education in Romania, primary, lower and upper secondary education in Greece, primary education (Turkey) and all grades of primary education in schools that offer the choice between different courses in religion and moral studies in Belgium (French Community).

The number of grades during which a separate compulsory subject is taught throughout the general education pathway varies substantially between countries, ranging from 12 down to one (see Figure 1.2).

Both France, and Belgium (French Community)⁽¹³⁾ as from 2017/18, have the highest number of grades in which citizenship education is provided as a compulsory separate subject, since this approach is used from the first to the last grade of general education in these two countries only. Estonia, Slovakia and Finland come next, with respectively 7, 8 and 7 to 9 grades of compulsory citizenship education provision as a separate subject. In Slovakia, the compulsory separate subject is taught at each grade of general secondary education. In both Greece and Romania, students are taught compulsory citizenship education subject in five and four grades respectively, distributed between primary, lower and/or upper secondary education. In Poland, students are taught compulsory citizenship education as a separate subject in four grades across lower and upper secondary education. Luxembourg provides compulsory separate citizenship education during the four grades of

⁽¹²⁾ See country specific note to Figure 1.2.


⁽¹³⁾ In schools that offer the choice between different courses in religion and moral studies.

upper secondary level, whereas in the United Kingdom (England⁽¹⁴⁾), it is also provided in five grades across lower and upper secondary level. Ireland (until 2016/17) focuses its compulsory separate citizenship provision on the three grades of lower secondary education. The remaining countries do so either in two grades (Bulgaria, Lithuania, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro,) or one grade (Croatia, Cyprus until 2016/17 and Turkey) of general education.

Subjects integrating citizenship education

In a few countries, components of citizenship education are integrated into the curricula of all or most subjects (see Figure 1.3). This applies to Denmark and Latvia for compulsory education, Belgium (French Community) for primary and lower secondary education, Cyprus and the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) at lower secondary level, as well as to Estonia, Finland and the United Kingdom (Scotland) for the entire general education pathway.

Figure 1.3: Compulsory subjects integrating citizenship education according to national curricula for primary and general secondary education (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

Figure 1.3 shows the subject(s) compulsory for all in which components of citizenship education are integrated. It only includes citizenship education as a cross-curricular theme where it is mentioned in curriculum documents in relation to specific subjects (see Figure 1.1). Ethics and religious education are ticked for the countries where both subjects integrate components of citizenship education. See Annex 2 for exhaustive information on citizenship education in general education.

⁽¹⁴⁾ See country specific note to Figure 1.2.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE nl): Citizenship education is integrated into social sciences only at ISCED 1.

Czech Republic: The compulsory subject that covers natural sciences, i.e. 'people and their world', is taught only at ISCED 1.

Ireland: Citizenship education is integrated into history, geography and science only at ISCED 2.

Spain: Information reflects the basic curriculum of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports applying nationwide and complemented by the Autonomous Communities in their own jurisdiction.

France: Citizenship education is integrated into 'earth and life science' from ISCED 2.

Lithuania: The teaching of the compulsory subject 'home economics' only applies to ISCED 2.

Hungary: The teaching of the compulsory subject 'history, social and citizenship studies' starts only at ISCED 2.

Poland: The teaching of the compulsory subject 'history and society' only applies to ISCED 1. For upper secondary education, citizenship education is integrated into 'introduction to entrepreneurship'.

Romania: The subjects related to personal development are taught only at ISCED 1.

Slovakia: The social studies subject integrating components of citizenship education, i.e. 'homeland' is taught only at ISCED 1.

United Kingdom (NIR): At ISCED 2, all the compulsory learning areas include components of citizenship education.

Switzerland: For ISCED 1 and 2, information is based on the *Plan D'études Romand*, the curriculum which applies only to the French-speaking regions.

Liechtenstein: 'Home economics' starts from lower secondary level.

Among the remaining countries, the subjects that most often include components of citizenship education belong to the social sciences and are concerned with society and the relationships between individuals within society. While at primary level, social sciences are usually taught as a specific subject (or learning area) ⁽¹⁵⁾, at secondary level this area of the curriculum is more often implemented through subjects such as history or geography. Another difference between education levels is that the compulsory subjects dealing with personal development ⁽¹⁶⁾ are more often taught during compulsory education. Across the three levels of general education, both ethics and religious education and languages and literature are the second areas of the curriculum most often highlighted by countries as including components relevant to citizenship education, although far behind the social sciences. Mathematics and sciences come next, and finally physical education.

Subjects incorporating citizenship education vary in the degree of emphasis placed on the topic. In a minority of countries, some subjects include specific components dedicated to citizenship education.

For instance in the **Czech Republic**, the compulsory learning area 'people and the society' includes 'civic education' in grades 6 to 9 and 'basics of civics and social sciences' in grades 10-11.

In **Cyprus**, the subject 'health education' incorporating citizenship education at primary level includes 'active citizenship' among its main topics.

In **Lithuania**, the subject 'discovery of the world' taught in the first four grades of primary education includes a section 'people living together'.

In **Hungary**, the subject 'history, social and citizenship studies' taught in grades 5 to 12 includes sections on 'basic citizenship knowledge', 'media models and institutions' as well as 'social knowledge'.

In **Austria**, citizenship education is being integrated in the subject 'history, social studies and citizenship education' from grade 6 onwards (previously it was only integrated from grade 8). This integration takes the form of specific modules: grade 6: 'laws, norms and values: possibilities for political action'; grade 7: 'election and voting/identities'; grade 8: 'media and political participation/political participation' (see the case study on recent curricular reforms in Austria for more information).

⁽¹⁵⁾ 'Man and society' (Flemish Community of Belgium and Bulgaria), 'people and their world' (Czech Republic), 'social sciences' (Germany and Spain), 'social studies' (Latvia, Malta, Sweden, Iceland, Montenegro, Norway and Turkey), 'discovery of the world' (Lithuania), 'personal and world orientation', 'man and society' (Netherlands); 'general and social studies' (Austria); 'history and society' (Poland), 'society' (Slovenia and former Republic Yugoslav of Macedonia), 'homeland' (Slovakia); 'humanities and social sciences' (Switzerland), 'humanity and environment' (Liechtenstein). In Belgium (German-speaking Community), France, Italy and Luxembourg, 'social sciences' are already taught through history and geography as of primary education.

⁽¹⁶⁾ 'Personal development' (Romania), 'personal, social and career development' (Malta), 'social, personal and health education' (Ireland), 'personal and social development, well-being and cultural diversity' and 'personal and social education' (United Kingdom – Wales), 'personal development and mutual understanding' (United Kingdom – Northern Ireland), 'life skills' (Liechtenstein).


1.2. Instruction time

Although the vast majority of countries address citizenship education in their national curricula at each level of general education, not all specify the amount of instruction time to be devoted to this subject area. Recommendations regarding instruction time exist mainly in the countries where citizenship education is taught as a separate subject. They vary significantly from one country to another and, in some countries, have been subject to recent changes following reforms in the approaches to the teaching of citizenship.

For comparability purposes, the focus in this analysis is placed on the teaching hours for citizenship education delivered as a compulsory separate subject, where the recommendations are generally more precise. Some of the countries that have adopted the integrated approach, have also specified the instruction time to be devoted to the subject or to the learning areas that encompass aspects of citizenship education. However, in these cases, the instruction time specifically allocated to citizenship-related themes cannot usually be clearly identified. As a consequence of limiting the analysis to compulsory separate subjects, the number of hours presented in Figure 1.4 may be significantly less than the amount of time allocated in practice to citizenship education. Indeed, in most of these countries, the separate subject approach is not the only model in use, and the time spent on citizenship education can be extended through the other approaches previously mentioned in this chapter.

In 20 of the education systems covered as well as in some Autonomous Communities in Spain, citizenship education is taught as a compulsory separate subject (see Figure 1.2). The recommended time allocated to the topic can be indicated in each of these countries except in the United Kingdom (England), where it is not the normal practice to specify the instruction time for any curriculum area; it is left to schools to decide how to distribute curriculum time to specific subjects within the framework of school autonomy.

Figure 1.4: Recommended minimum number of hours of compulsory citizenship education as a separate subject during a notional year at primary and general secondary education (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



	BE fr	BG	EE	IE	EL	ES	FR	HR	CY	LT	LU	PL	RO	SI	SK	FI	BA	FY	ME	TR
ISCED 1	25.0		4.4		7.0	5.8	36.0						10.1			9.5				12.0
ISCED 2			26.3	23.0	18.7	11.7	18.0			8.8		16.5	13.7	17.7	24.8	28.4	6.4	12.0	10.2	
ISCED 3		12.6	26.3	0.0	31.3		18.0	6.6	7.5	0.0	29.9	7.5			14.0	28.4	12.0	0.0		

Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure shows the average minimum number of hours (periods of 60 minutes) per year to be devoted to the compulsory teaching of citizenship as a separate subject in primary, lower and upper general secondary education. The instruction time given in this figure is based on national recommendations for the indicated reference year. Recreational or other breaks of any kind, or the time set aside for optional lessons, have not been taken into account.

The annual instruction time has been calculated by multiplying the number of hours per week allocated to citizenship by the number of instruction weeks in the school year for each grade that citizenship is taught as a compulsory separate subject. The annual instruction time recommended for grades in the same education level (primary, lower and upper general secondary education respectively) have been added up to obtain the total instruction time devoted to citizenship per education level. The total has then been divided by the number of years covered by each educational level to obtain the instruction time per notional year.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE fr): Figure 1.4 only applies to schools that offer the choice between different courses in religion and moral studies. See country note to Figure 1.2 for more information.

Ireland: The recommendations on taught time for delivering 'civic, social and political education' (CSPE) within the new compulsory area of learning 'wellbeing' as of 2017/18 set out the same time allocation as required previously (minimum 70 hours spread across the three years of ISCED 2). Schools also have the flexibility to allocate more time to the component areas of wellbeing, including CSPE, in line with their priorities and students' needs, and overall time for 'wellbeing' will rise from 300 hours to 400 hours within three years.

Spain: The figure shows data for the Autonomous Community of Andalucía at grade 5 (ISCED 1), and data for the Autonomous Communities of Extremadura at grade 8 (ISCED 2).

Cyprus: From 2017/18, the recommendations on taught time for the compulsory separate subject 'civics' in grade 12 no longer apply, as its content is now covered by other subjects, mainly history and modern Greek.

When comparing the annual average recommended number of hours devoted to citizenship education taught as a compulsory separate subject, caution is required, since there are substantial structural differences between countries such as variation in the length of primary and secondary education and the number of years of provision of citizenship education (see Figure 1.2).

At the three education levels examined, the average annual time devoted to citizenship education taught as a compulsory separate subject differs considerably between European countries. However, these differences are often related to the number of grades per education level during which citizenship education is taught as a compulsory separate subject (see Figure 1.2).

Among the eight education systems which have recommendations on instruction time for citizenship education at primary level, Belgium (French Community) and France present the two greatest average annual allocations (25 and 36 per year respectively). These are also the only two education systems where citizenship education is taught continuously throughout primary level. The least amount of instruction time at that level of education is in Estonia (4 hours), where citizenship education lasts only one year at this stage of education, but is given more attention in secondary education.

At lower secondary level, the four greatest average annual allocations are in Finland (28), Estonia (26), Ireland (23) and Slovakia (25), where citizenship education is taught at each grade of this education level. In the two other countries where citizenship education is taught throughout the whole lower secondary level, the recommended allocated time is slightly below 20 hours, i.e. 18 hours in France and 16.5 hours in Poland. Among the countries where citizenship education is taught in only one grade at that stage of education, the recommended annual allocation is, interestingly, almost 20 hours in Greece, while it is 12 in Spain and 6 in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Three of the countries with the highest values at upper secondary level, i.e. Estonia, Luxembourg and Finland, show a recommended number of hours ranging from 25 to 30. These countries are also among those where the separate subject is taught continuously throughout this level of education, with some flexibility in that matter existing in Finland (see country note to Figure 1.2). In the two other countries with continuous provision at upper secondary level, the recommended taught time is 18 hours in France and 14 hours in Slovakia. In contrast, in Greece, the recommendation amounts to 31 hours even though the separate compulsory subject is taught in only two grades of upper

secondary education. Croatia, Cyprus and Poland, where citizenship education is taught in only one grade at upper secondary level, have the least number of recommended hours, with 7 hours only.

When looking across the entire period of general education, there is evidence of a strong relationship between the high levels of taught time in countries and the number of years or grades in which citizenship education is provided as a separate subject. This can be observed at all ISCED levels. Indeed, three of the four countries with the highest average recommended time allocation for the whole general education pathway, i.e. Estonia (56), France (72) and Finland (66), are also among those where citizenship education is taught the longest, i.e. seven, twelve and seven to nine grades respectively. However, the fourth country with the highest time allocation, Greece (57), provides the compulsory separate subject only in five grades, which might indicate that a special emphasis is put on the subject in the grades concerned.

When comparing the present data with those from the previous Eurydice study on citizenship education (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice 2012a, p. 26), some important changes can be observed.

Some of the changes which have taken place in the recommended time allocated to the compulsory separate subjects in citizenship education are due to changes in the approaches chosen by countries to deliver this subject area. Hence, taught time for citizenship education is no longer recommended in Cyprus and Norway at lower secondary level because the integrated approach is now used rather than the separate approach. Conversely, there are now recommendations on taught time in Belgium (French Community) because a separate subject has recently been introduced.


The increase in Greece in the recommended taught time at upper secondary level from 15 hours in 2010/11 to 31 in 2016/17 arises from an increased emphasis on the separate subject in citizenship education in this education system. Indeed, from 2013/14 onwards, a separate subject 'civics' is now taught to all students in two grades of upper secondary education rather than in one grade, as before. In addition, the curriculum reform of 2015 introduced a new curriculum for this subject in these first two grades of upper secondary education.

Finally, in Finland, recommendations on taught time for the separate subject 'social studies' were newly introduced in 2014 for compulsory education and in 2015 for upper secondary education, in the context of curriculum reforms aiming to provide a more uniform foundation for local curricula. Furthermore, the subject 'social studies' is now taught from the fourth grade of primary education, whereas prior to 2016/17, it was only taught during secondary education. Moreover, a new compulsory course in social studies, 'Finland, Europe, and the changing world', was added at upper secondary level to the two courses existing prior to 2016/17, 'Finnish society' and 'economics'.

1.3. Citizenship education curricula for school-based IVET

A comparison between curricula for school-based initial vocational education and training (IVET) and those applying to general secondary education reveal that the teaching of citizenship education is the same in both sectors in 17 of the 41 education systems concerned (see Figure 1.5).

Figure 1.5: Differences between general secondary education and school-based IVET in the approaches to citizenship education as specified in national curricula, 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

For this study, the coverage of initial vocational education and training is mainly focused on the curriculum common to all students (core curriculum), and to optional subjects available to all students, regardless of the particular vocational branch they are following.

Figure 1.5 considers the following curricular approaches for citizenship education: as a compulsory separate subject, as an optional separate subject, integrated into other compulsory subjects, integrated into other optional subjects, and as a cross-curricular theme. The 'differences in approaches' relate not only to the approaches used but also to the range of cross-curricular themes addressing citizenship education and/or the range of subjects related to citizenship education, as well as to their compulsory or optional nature.

Country-specific notes

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education. The available programmes which have a vocational dimension have similar citizenship education provision to that found in general ISCED 3 provision.

Poland: There are differences in the approaches used for citizenship education between basic vocational schools and upper secondary general education, but not between the latter and technical secondary schools.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision. Therefore the approach to citizenship for students who may be taking some vocational courses is the same as for those taking general education courses.

Iceland: Most IVET programmes are integrated within upper secondary schools and fall under the approaches to citizenship education set for ISCED level 3 general education.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

In the remaining education systems, the citizenship education provision for students in school-based (IVET) differs to some extent from the one in the corresponding years in general secondary education. The extent of the differences between general education and IVET varies according to the way citizenship education is integrated within national curricula for general education: as a separate subject, integrated into other subjects or as a cross-curricular theme. The most important differences between general education and IVET relate to the number of subjects integrating components of citizenship education, which are often fewer in IVET.

In 10 countries, there are fewer compulsory subjects integrating components of citizenship education in IVET as compared to general secondary education. Hence, in school-based IVET, some compulsory subject(s) integrating components of citizenship education in upper secondary general

education are optional in Bulgaria and Slovenia (some IVET programmes). These compulsory subjects are fewer in number in IVET in France, Lithuania, Malta and Montenegro; and not taught at all in Greece, Latvia (first year of school-based IVET), Luxembourg and Romania. Besides, in Austria (part-time vocational school/apprenticeship) and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, there are no compulsory subjects integrating components of citizenship education in school-based IVET but students receive a compulsory separate subject in citizenship education which is not provided in the corresponding years in general education.

Moreover, in Spain, Hungary and Turkey, citizenship education is integrated into compulsory subjects in general education while in IVET it is part of modules which are likely to have a more reduced and specific scope in terms of citizenship education. For instance, in Hungary, while all students in general upper secondary education have to follow 'history, social and citizenship studies', students in IVET take 'community development'.

Differences in the offer in terms of optional subjects that have components of citizenship education can also be highlighted. Indeed, in Greece, Spain, France, Hungary, Malta, Romania and Slovakia, the optional subjects which integrate aspects of citizenship education at upper secondary general education are not offered in IVET. Finally, in Latvia, Lithuania and Poland (basic vocational schools), fewer optional subjects which incorporate aspects of citizenship education are offered to IVET students.

The separate subjects in citizenship education delivered to all students in general secondary education are also provided in IVET in all of the education systems concerned. In Slovenia, students in IVET do not receive the modules 'citizenship culture' and 'education for peace, family and non-violence' compulsory for all students in general upper secondary education. In four countries, the requirements on teaching the separate compulsory subject are fewer in IVET.

In **Bulgaria**, 'citizenship education' is optional in school-based IVET.

In **Greece**, 'civic education' is taught in the first and second grades of upper secondary general education but only in the first grade of school-based IVET.

In **Lithuania**, 'civic education' is taught during the last two grades of lower secondary general education but only in one grade in the corresponding years of school-based IVET.

In **Finland**, school-based IVET students are taught a separate subject 'civic skills and working life competences', which is more specific and limited in scope compared with the 'social studies' taught in general education.

Of the eight countries where optional separate subjects in citizenship education are available to students in upper secondary general education ⁽¹⁷⁾, only Poland (basic vocational schools), Romania and Finland do not offer this subject provision in IVET. Besides, in Hungary, although schools decide whether to teach the separate subject in general upper secondary education, 'social studies' is compulsory for all IVET students.

When citizenship education is defined as a cross-curricular theme of general upper secondary education (see Figure 1.1), it also applies to IVET in the vast majority of the countries concerned. However, in four countries, the requirements for the cross-curricular themes relevant to citizenship education are more reduced in scope in IVET, compared with general education.

In the **Czech Republic**, while five cross-curricular themes relevant for citizenship education are specified for general upper secondary education ('personal and social education', 'thinking within European and global context'; 'multicultural education'; 'environmental education'; and 'media education'), this number is reduced to two in the case of IVET ('democratic citizenship' and 'environmental education').

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ireland, Poland, Romania, Finland, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia and Turkey

In **France**, the requirements for general upper secondary education in terms of supervised personal work relevant to citizenship education do not apply to IVET, while the 'citizen pathway' applies to both education sectors.

In **Slovakia**, the cross-curricular themes defined for general education do not apply to IVET.

In **Finland**, multi-disciplinary learning modules relevant to citizenship education are provided only in general upper secondary education.

In addition, in Denmark and Portugal, where citizenship education is addressed at general upper secondary level only through cross-curricular objectives and is left to schools to decide how it should be implemented, different approaches apply to IVET.

In **Denmark**, in two of the three IVET pathways (i.e. the first course of the basic programme and *Eux* – leading to a general upper secondary qualification), citizenship education is always integrated within the compulsory subject 'social studies'. IVET students enrolling later than 12 months after they have finished compulsory school start on the second basic course and do not take 'social studies'.

In **Portugal**, the students following professional and apprenticeship courses are taught a compulsory separate subject in citizenship education, while for those enrolled in education and training courses, citizenship education is integrated into other compulsory subjects in this pathway.

Finally, in the Netherlands and Switzerland, more autonomy is allowed in relation to the approaches to citizenship education used in school-based IVET than in upper general secondary schools.

In the **Netherlands**, while citizenship education is integrated into the compulsory 'social studies' learning area at upper general secondary level, IVET schools decide whether to deliver the topic of citizenship education as a separate subject or integrate it into other subjects.

In **Switzerland**, the framework curriculum for IVET is not organised according to subject but by learning area, schools have the autonomy to adapt this to their teaching and learning.

Summary (A. Organisation)

The analysis of national curricula reveals that in almost all countries citizenship education provision must be delivered to all young people in all levels of general education. Three main approaches are used, although there is good deal of variation between countries in how these are applied, as well as across the different levels of education. Citizenship education can be a cross-curricular theme, a separate subject or it may be integrated into broader subjects or learning areas. The most widespread model is to have the integrated approach combined with some teaching as a cross-curricular theme. This applies to 23 of the 42 education systems covered by this report at primary level, and 20 at both lower secondary and upper secondary levels. In addition to these two approaches, in six countries at primary level, eight at lower secondary level and six at upper secondary level, citizenship education is also taught as a compulsory separate subject. Six education systems address this area of learning by defining only cross-curricular objectives and leaving its practical implementation to be determined at school level⁽¹⁸⁾. The remaining countries organise citizenship education still according to alternative combinations (e.g. cross-curricular and separate subject).

In short, it is rare for citizenship education not to be specified in top-level curricula for each level of general education, either as a cross-curricular theme, or using a compulsory integrated or separate subject approach. However, this is the case in Ireland at upper secondary level, Bosnia and Herzegovina in primary schools, as well as Serbia throughout the whole general education pathway. It is also partly the case in England, where there are not any specific requirements for citizenship

⁽¹⁸⁾ ISCED 1: Croatia, Hungary and Portugal; ISCED 2: Belgium (Flemish Community), Croatia and Portugal; ISCED 3 general: Belgium (Flemish Community), Denmark, Portugal and Iceland.

education for primary schools, schools providing for students in the final two grades of upper secondary education and academies (all grades). However, aspects of the subject may be taught under the general requirements that apply to every publicly funded school: that the curriculum must be balanced and broadly based and must promote the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of pupils at the school and of society.

Across the general education pathway, the subjects that are most often cited in curriculum documents as incorporating components of citizenship education are social science subjects, which are also the subjects most concerned with society and the relationships between individuals within society. Other subject areas are involved to a much smaller extent, these are languages, personal development, mathematics, sciences, as well as ethics and religious studies.

The number of school years in which citizenship education is provided as a compulsory separate subject during general education varies significantly between the countries concerned. The longest provision can be found in Estonia, France, Slovakia and Finland, where separate subjects are taught continuously during periods ranging from seven to 12 grades. At the other extreme, the compulsory subjects in Croatia, Cyprus and Turkey are provided only in one grade of general education. The number of school years in which separate subjects are provided in the remaining countries varies between two and five and occur mostly at secondary level. These substantial differences in the number of grades during which a compulsory separate subject in citizenship education is taught are reflected in the recommendations on average annual taught time, which also show significant disparities. Countries with the highest recommended time allocation, are also usually among those where citizenship education is taught the longest. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that a few countries have recently increased the compulsory provision of citizenship education as a separate subject. Indeed, a separate compulsory subject is being introduced in Belgium (French Community), while Greece and Finland have extended the number of grades in which the separate compulsory subject is taught.

Students enrolled in school-based initial vocational education (IVET) receive similar provision of citizenship education in slightly less than half of the education systems considered. In contrast, in a majority of education systems, the integration of citizenship education in national curricula differs between IVET and the corresponding school years in general secondary education, although students in school-based (IVET) also receive citizenship education. The most important differences between general education and IVET relate to the number of subjects that incorporate aspects of citizenship education, which is less in IVET.

In 10 countries, there are fewer compulsory subjects integrating components of citizenship education in IVET as compared to general secondary education. The optional subjects which integrate aspects of citizenship education in upper secondary general education are either not offered at all or are less frequently offered in IVET in 10 countries. The separate subjects in citizenship education delivered to students in general secondary education are also generally provided in IVET. However, in four of the countries concerned, the provision is less in IVET in terms of either number of grades, targeted population or scope. Finally, when citizenship education is defined as a cross-curricular theme for general upper secondary education, it also applies to IVET in the vast majority of the 32 countries concerned. However, in four countries, the requirements for the cross-curricular themes relevant to citizenship education are more reduced in scope in IVET, compared with general education.

B. Content


1.4. Curriculum content: general aims, specific objectives and learning outcomes

Differences in the structure and operation of the different education systems imply that there will be also be differences in the ways that top level education authorities frame the curriculum. For this reason, the Eurydice National Units were asked to provide not only the content of the citizenship education curriculum in terms of the knowledge and skills to be transmitted to students, but also to indicate the type of framework in which the curriculum operates. In particular, national units were given the opportunity to state whether citizenship curriculum guidelines provide a broad framework i.e., general aims, or whether specific objectives and/or learning outcomes are also set.

According to the survey results, all countries have established some general aims relating to citizenship education (see Figure 1.6). This shows that even though there may be some degree of school or teacher autonomy regarding how and what to teach in citizenship education, all countries provide at least some broad instructions to guide schools and teachers in their work. Naturally, the level of detail in these general aims differs between countries. The great majority of European countries participating in the study have confined themselves to issuing relatively short texts or lists of general aims for citizenship education. This is understandable, given that general aims, as the term suggests, are designed to offer only a broad indication of the areas to be covered and the goals to be achieved. However, the Czech Republic, France, Croatia, Austria, Poland, Romania and Switzerland all reported more detailed general aims. It is worth mentioning that the countries with more in-depth general aims for citizenship education tend to have a more detailed approach to the curriculum as a whole. This means that the specific objectives and/or the learning outcomes of in their respective curricula are also relatively lengthy and more comprehensive.

While all countries have general aims for citizenship education at virtually all education levels, the same cannot be said for specific objectives and learning outcomes (see Figure 1.6). In a way, specific objectives and learning outcomes are two sides of the same coin. The former refer to the content of citizenship education from the perspective of the education authorities, school or the teacher, whereas the latter refer to the same content from the perspective of the learner (Harvey, 2004). In the context of this report, learning outcomes have been defined as statements of what a learner knows, understands and is able to do on completion of a level or learning module. Learning outcomes demonstrate actual attainment levels while learning objectives define the competences to be developed more generally.

Figure 1.6: Nature of national curriculum framework for citizenship education: general aims, specific objectives and/or learning outcomes at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Country-specific notes

Denmark and Romania: There is no common curriculum for all students in IVET.

Italy: Because of a high degree of school autonomy, there are no specific objectives or learning outcomes defined at central level.

Austria: For IVET, the curriculum of part-time vocational schools and apprenticeships are taken into account.

According to the survey findings, as many as 28 European educational systems feature learning outcomes in the citizenship education curriculum⁽¹⁾. As shown in Figure 1.6, learning outcomes are normally specified for all school education levels, but there are a few exceptions. In Belgium's French Community, learning outcomes are specified only for ISCED 1 and 2. This may change in the near future, given that citizenship education will start being taught as a separate subject in ISCED 2, 3 and IVET from the beginning of the 2017/18 school year. As in the French Community of Belgium, learning

⁽¹⁾ Belgium (French and Flemish Communities), Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Spain, France, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Hungary, Malta, Austria, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Switzerland, Iceland, Montenegro, Norway and Turkey

outcomes exist only for ISCED 1 and 2 in the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) and in Denmark, bearing in mind that there is no common citizenship education curriculum for all IVET students in Denmark. In Finland learning outcomes are specified only for IVET and in the United Kingdom (Wales) only for ISCED 1. Finally, Switzerland specifies learning outcomes for ISCED 1 and 2 and for IVET, but not for ISCED 3.

The curricula of 20 education systems contain both specific objectives and learning outcomes ⁽²⁾. In 12 of these, there are specific objectives and learning outcomes for all education levels. However, in the United Kingdom (Wales) learning outcomes and specific objectives are found only in ISCED 1, while in ISCED 2, 3 and IVET there are only specific objectives. Similarly, the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) has specific objectives for all ISCED levels, but learning outcomes only for ISCED 1 and 2.

The fact that as many as 20 education systems choose to issue both specific objectives and learning outcomes, in addition to general aims is certainly interesting. It shows that the education authorities want to combine the more traditional approach to curriculum structure with the newer approach which focuses more on learning outcomes. This in turn may indicate that education authorities are interested in both what citizenship education aims to achieve and what it should actually deliver.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that 12 education systems (German-speaking Community of Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom (England), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Liechtenstein and Serbia) deliver their curriculum guidelines in terms of general aims and/or specific objectives, but not in terms of learning outcomes.

1.5. The content of the curriculum

Fundamental to any study of citizenship education is its content. As pointed out in the conceptual framework in the Introduction, major socio-political developments have gone hand in hand with changes in the expectations of citizenship education. For example, the extension of the right to vote in the 19th and 20th centuries prompted national governments to adopt or adapt citizenship education in order to prepare people for their new role as national citizens and to instil an enhanced sense of nationhood (Hobsbawm, 1989; Heater, 2002). Citizenship education is not the only area of education to have been used by governments to achieve certain social or political objectives, but it is one of the obvious candidates for achieving objectives directly related to the well-functioning of the polity, such as encouraging citizens to exercise personal and social responsibility, to participate in politics or to obey the law. Consequently, the content of the citizenship education curriculum is a sensitive topic and needs to be analysed carefully.

1.5.1. On the methodology

The analysis of large amounts of qualitative data, especially when it is extracted from subject curricula, poses a number of challenges. Curricula do not lend themselves easily to a systematic analysis of their content therefore the excerpts quoted from curriculum documents, as conveyed in the Eurydice questionnaire responses, were subjected to some standardised treatment which involved the following steps and principles: (1) all useful data were identified, (2) data irrelevant to the study were filtered out, (3) relevant data was only counted once to avoid duplication and overestimation in the results, (4) the

⁽²⁾ This applies to the French Community of Belgium, Bulgaria, Spain, France, Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary, Austria, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Switzerland and Montenegro.

amount of data extracted was optimal (i.e. only as many pieces of information as absolutely necessary were extracted) and (5) the extracted data could yield a dataset with as much variability as possible.

Figure 1.7: Citizenship competence areas and specific citizenship competences

Interacting effectively and constructively with others	Thinking critically	Acting in a socially responsible manner	Acting democratically
Self-confidence	Multi-perspectivity	Respect for justice	Respect for democracy
Responsibility	Reasoning and analysis skills	Solidarity	Knowledge of political institutions
Autonomy (personal initiative)	Data interpretation	Respect for other human beings	Knowledge of political processes (e.g. elections)
Respect for different opinions or beliefs	Knowledge discovery and use of sources	Respect for human rights	Knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations
Cooperation	Media literacy	Sense of belonging	Interacting with political authorities
Conflict resolution	Creativity	Sustainable development	Knowledge of fundamental political and social concepts
Empathy	Exercising judgement	Environmental protection	Respect for rules
Self-awareness	Understanding the present world	Cultural heritage protection	Participating
Communicating and listening	Questioning	Knowing about or respecting other cultures	Knowledge of or participation in civil society
Emotional awareness		Knowing about or respecting religions	
Flexibility or adaptability		Non-discrimination	
Inter-cultural skills			

Source: Council of Europe (2016) and Eurydice.

Conducting a content analysis that respects the aforementioned principles for citizenship education curricula, stemming from 42 education systems even if they are excerpts or summaries of texts, is not easy in practice. Automated content analysis is helpful for managing large amounts of data, but it is prone to errors, since it cannot substitute for careful reading and comprehension of texts (Grimmer & Stewart, 2013). Close reading and good understanding are particularly important in the case of excerpts from curricula because there are differences in the level of detail and in the writing style, in addition to differences in the substantive content ⁽³⁾.

Thus, the relevant data were selected manually using a list of predefined criteria relating to the four areas of citizenship competence (interacting effectively and constructively with others, thinking critically, acting in a socially responsible manner, and acting democratically) that were identified in the conceptual framework of the Introduction (see Figure 2). The broad areas of citizenship competence and the specific competences grouped below (see Figure 1.7) reflect both decisions at the European level (European Parliament and Council, 2006 ⁽⁴⁾; Council of Europe, 2010; Council of Europe, 2016) and research findings (Ten Dam et al., 2010 and Ten Dam et al., 2011). In particular, most of the specific competences have been adapted from the Council of Europe's (2016) competences for a

⁽³⁾ The questionnaires were returned either in English or in French and were coded by analysts proficient in these languages.

⁽⁴⁾ Recommendation 2006/962/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December on key competences for lifelong learning, OJ L 394, 30.12.2006.

democratic culture ⁽⁵⁾. It is important to highlight that the lists presented in Figure 1.7 are not exhaustive. Consequently, European curricula of citizenship education may feature some, but not necessary all, or only, the citizenship competences mentioned in this report.

The next step taken to simplify the data analysis process and consequently the presentation of results was to treat all curriculum guidance documents equally, ignoring the precise nature of the guidance in terms of whether it provided general aims, specific objectives or learning outcomes. This was also essential for ensuring that no relevant citizenship competences would go unnoticed, regardless of the type of guidance issued by the national education authorities.

In sum, if the national curricula contained information conceptually related to the citizenship competences mentioned in Figure 1.7, then the respective competence was marked as present (i.e. given a value of '1', as opposed to '0' for absent). For example, a quote such as 'willingness to participate in the school's decision-making process', reported as one of the specific objectives of the Portuguese curriculum of citizenship education, would result in the specific competence 'participating' being marked as present. However, additional references to participation would be ignored. In other words, the coding process was confined to establishing whether a competence was present, not how many times it appeared in the curriculum.

In cases where citizenship education is not being taught at a particular education level/pathway, where the curriculum is not common for all students in a particular level/pathway or where a pathway is non-existent, the entry was marked as 'not applicable'. The categorisation 'data not available' was applied to cases where national units were unable to provide information for technical reasons or due to local/school autonomy for developing curriculum guidelines.

The results of the curriculum content analysis are presented in three parts. The first (section 1.5.2) presents the aggregated findings under the four broader citizenship areas of competence across ISCED levels. The second part (section 1.5.3) presents the results of each area of competence individually, starting with 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' which includes competences relating to students' personal development and inter-personal relations. The second area of competence is that of 'thinking critically' which combines practical skills in finding and interpreting information with more abstract abilities such as reasoning and exercising judgement. The third area 'acting in a socially responsible manner' includes the knowledge and attitudes that enable students to take into account the greater good and the interests of society as a whole and, finally, 'acting democratically' covers the area most directly related to the political sphere and addresses the knowledge and understanding required for citizens to participate in the democratic process. Section 1.5.4 takes a closer look at the distribution of the components of the four areas of citizenship competence across countries.

1.5.2. Curriculum content analysis results: general trends


In order to provide a wider picture on the content of citizenship education curricula in Europe, the values ('1') of all the reported citizenship competences marked as present at a particular ISCED level have been summated. This allows questions to be answered such as which citizenship competence areas are prioritised by the different education authorities and at which school education levels and

⁽⁵⁾ The Council of Europe (2016) identifies 55 possible citizenship competences. To facilitate the analysis, only 41 of these have been referred to here, some of which have been slightly adapted to match the four citizenship competence areas more closely. In addition, three other competences not linked to the four broader citizenship competence areas were identified: entrepreneurship, consumer rights and behaviour and (physical and mental) health protection. Since these competences relate only indirectly to citizenship and citizenship education, they are not examined in detail here.

pathways are they being taught. It also enables the reader to see how the prioritisation develops across levels and between citizenship competence areas.

Figure 1.8 depicts the aggregate number of citizenship competences, grouped in the four broader citizenship competence areas, per ISCED level. The first thing to be noticed is the fact that all four citizenship competence areas are covered in all school education levels and pathways. The second important observation is that the coverage of the citizenship competence areas varies across education levels. Thus, at ISCED 1 there is a relatively greater emphasis on 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' which includes competences related to students' personal development and inter-personal relations. This area of competence has a value of 282, which means that the competences grouped under this category feature 282 times in total in the national curricula across Europe. The higher the frequency, the more competences related to a particular competence area have been reported as present in a curriculum, or the more countries feature them in their citizenship education curriculum, or both.

Figure 1.8: Frequency with which citizenship education competences occur in national curricula for citizenship education by area of competence at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Explanatory note

The aggregate number of citizenship competences reflects how many times in total citizenship competences related to a particular competence area (see Figure 1.7) feature in the citizenship education curricula of the 42 European education systems participating in the Eurydice Network.

Nevertheless, it is not the absolute number as such that matters, but its relationship to the other citizenship competence areas. Thus, 282 is higher than 252, which is the frequency of all competences related to 'acting in a socially responsible manner', the second competence area most frequently referred to in citizenship education curricula for primary schools in Europe. Unsurprisingly, 'thinking critically' and 'acting democratically' do not feature as prominently in ISCED 1 citizenship education curricula. Education authorities seem to vary the content of citizenship education across education levels according to students' cognitive skills, which of course develop throughout their

school years. Acting democratically, which entails knowledge of the country's political institutions and the importance of participating, including at school level (see Chapter 2), is a competence more appropriate for older students. Equally, critical thinking presupposes the capacity for abstraction and analytical thinking, both skills that are more developed in older students. Alternative explanations why education authorities set different objectives for citizenship education at different ISCED levels are also plausible. For example, it makes more sense to equip students to behave democratically towards the end of secondary education, which normally marks the end of compulsory education, because this is when in most countries students become of age and acquire the right to vote in their country's general election. Similarly, national education authorities may wish to start the education of their younger students by teaching them early on how to behave towards others and how to act in a socially acceptable or responsible manner, in order to instil the respective values deeper in them.

In line with the different hypotheses mentioned above, Figure 1.8 demonstrates how 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' gradually loses ground in the national curricula of citizenship education in Europe, while 'thinking critically' and 'acting democratically' gain in prominence. The competence 'acting in a socially responsible manner' is relatively more stable across education levels, although it seems to appear less often in IVET.

Despite its merits for representing the general situation graphically, Figure 1.8 is not very helpful for tracing the development of each citizenship competence area while taking into account its relative position within each ISCED level. The relative shares depicted in the table of Figure 1.9 are more useful in this respect. Thus, Figure 1.9 shows that about 33 % of all citizenship competences in primary education relate to 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' which includes students' personal development and inter-personal relations. This competence area, together with that of 'acting in a socially responsible manner' accounts for roughly two thirds of all citizenship competences at ISCED 1. The remaining one third is divided between the 'thinking critically' and 'acting democratically' areas of competence. At ISCED 2 the content of national curricula is divided more equally between the four competence areas. As Figure 1.9 shows, 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' remains an important feature of citizenship education curricula but is no longer predominant.

Figure 1.9: The share of citizenship competence areas in the national curricula of citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17

(%)	ISCED 1	ISCED 2 general	ISCED 3 general	IVET (school-based)
Interacting effectively and constructively with others	33	27	24	25
Thinking critically	19	22	22	23
Acting in a socially responsible manner	29	28	29	29
Acting democratically	19	23	26	24
Total	100	100	100	100
Total of citizenship competences (absolute numbers)	855	950	902	792

Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory notes

The percentages are based on the aggregate number of citizenship competences presented in Figure 1.8, which reflects how many times in total the citizenship competences (see Figure 1.7) feature in the citizenship education curricula of the 42 European education systems participating in the Eurydice Network. The percentages do not always add up to 100, because they have been rounded to the nearest integer.

'Acting in a socially responsible manner' has a slight lead over the other competence areas, in relative and in absolute terms, in lower secondary education. The difference is even wider when compared to 'thinking critically' and 'acting democratically', which, as has already been mentioned, are dealt with mostly in secondary education. Interestingly enough, the social responsibility components also feature relatively more frequently at ISCED 3. According to the data represented in Figure 1.9, 29 % of citizenship competences in the national curricula of ISCED 3 are dedicated to enhancing social responsibility among students. This is followed by learning how to 'act democratically' (26 %), 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' (24 %) and 'thinking critically' (22 %).

Another very interesting aspect of the content of citizenship education curricula in Europe is the treatment of critical thinking. As Figure 1.9 shows, 'thinking critically' features more often in the curricula of secondary education and IVET. Its position is stable across ISCED 2 and 3 and it even rises slightly in IVET, even though Figure 1.8 gives the impression that the attention given to this skill declines. In fact, the frequency of 'thinking critically' does decline in absolute terms, justifying the drop in the 'slope' in Figure 1.8, but not in relative terms. Whilst a proportion ranging from 19 % (ISCED 1) to 23 % (IVET) is far from negligible, it is smaller than that of other citizenship competence areas in each education level. This implies that top level education authorities in Europe, on average, prioritise other citizenship competence areas. Although thinking critically is an indispensable skill for citizens of a democratic polity, it is in competition with the other competences that education authorities wish to promote.

The citizenship education curricula in IVET follow roughly the same pattern as ISCED 3 curricula. In particular, the social responsibility competences make up 29 % of all citizenship competences, 'acting democratically' and 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' make up 24 % and 23 % respectively, while 'thinking critically' accounts for 23 %. However, compared to the other education levels reported here, the total number of citizenship competences across all participating countries is smaller in IVET (see Figure 1.9). This is partly due to the fact that data for some countries is missing (see Figure 1.6) but may also be attributed to the lack of a common curriculum for all students (see also Figure 1.5).

1.5.3. Curriculum content analysis results: citizenship competences

Thus far, section 1.5 concentrated on the aggregated data from the analysis of citizenship education curricula. Section 1.5.3 disaggregates the broader competence areas, in order to give a more detailed picture of the curriculum content of the 42 European education systems participating in the study. Because of this, the data in Figures 1.10-1.13 have a different meaning to the data in Figures 1.8-1.9. Specifically, the four tables below, one for each of the broader citizenship competence areas, present the total number of occurrences of each individual citizenship component in all the national curricula under study. Thus, a higher number (frequency) signifies that there are more countries reporting the particular component in their general aims, specific objectives or learning outcomes for citizenship education.

Two more general remarks help in putting the data reported in Figures 1.10-1.13 into perspective. First, none of the national curricula feature all the citizenship competences as coded in this report. Similarly, no single citizenship component is found in all national curricula. This suggests that there is at least some diversity between national curricula. A closer look at the cross-country differences will be taken in section 1.5.4. The present section concentrates on the similarities between national curricula from a quantitative point of view, making it possible to demonstrate that citizenship curricula have a great deal in common. The second remark is technical. The coding was not confined to the individual citizenship competences, but it was also extended to the four broader competence areas.

One reason is that in some cases parts of the curricula made no explicit mention of a particular competence, but they referred generally to the competence area. The other reason is that occasionally competence areas would be mentioned by name. That was particularly the case of 'thinking critically'. To capture this kind of information, it was decided to code such statements in the same way as individual citizenship competences.

Once more, it is important to remember that national curricula are not always dedicated only to citizenship education and so may also include elements that are not directly (or not at all) related to citizenship education as defined in this report. For example, some countries have included health education as part of citizenship education (Belgium (French Community), France, Cyprus, the Netherlands, Portugal and the United Kingdom (England)). Others have integrated economics (Malta, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, the United Kingdom (England), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Liechtenstein), entrepreneurship (Estonia, Greece, Spain, Croatia, Malta, Poland, Portugal and Finland) or consumer rights and behaviour (Bulgaria, Estonia, Croatia, Cyprus, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway and Turkey). These topics are not analysed here, although it is very useful to know that citizenship education is defined broadly by some European countries ⁽⁶⁾. This confirms the point raised in the conceptual framework, namely, that citizenship and consequently citizenship education are fluid concepts and can be interpreted in more than one way. It is clear, therefore, that citizenship education does not only have a political dimension. This is also demonstrated in the analysis of the citizenship competence areas below.

It is tempting to summate the occurrence of the different citizenship components in each national curriculum, but this would prompt ill-founded country rankings. It is important to bear in mind that each citizenship component has its own non-quantifiable value that is not commensurate with the value of any of the other components. The presence of one component cannot compensate for the absence of another and vice versa. To put it differently, each citizenship component has its own intrinsic value and is unique, even if the concept it represents relates to other concepts. Hence, whilst it is possible to argue that some components relate to each other, allowing them to be grouped together, it is wrong to assume that they can be all measured on the same scale. Depending on the criteria applied, one component may be perceived as being more important than another. Therefore, the absence or presence of one does not necessarily carry the same normative weight as the absence or presence of another.

The second reason why the occurrence of individual citizenship components cannot be summated is that, as already noted, the list of the citizenship competences used here is not exhaustive. Consequently, stating, for example, that a country features few of the citizenship competences gives the misleading impression that the curriculum of that particular country is empty, which of course may not be true.

To avoid either complication, the ensuing analysis of curricula confines itself to making comparisons between ISCED levels. Section 1.5.4 compares countries directly, while taking into account the aforementioned limitations.

Interacting effectively and constructively with others

The competence area 'interacting effectively and constructively with other individuals' contains not only components relating to inter-personal relations, but also those relating to personal development (self-awareness, self-confidence, autonomy and responsibility). As such, it is a competence area which, whilst it is part of citizenship education curricula, it is not explicitly political. Of course, the

⁽⁶⁾ Entrepreneurship education is treated in another Eurydice report (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2016a).

distinction between the personal and the political is fine. As Figure 1.10 illustrates, as many as 36 education systems report the development of personal responsibility as one of the objectives (or learning outcomes) of citizenship education. Being responsible for one's actions and opinions is an important personality trait, which at the same time is socially useful. Personal responsibility implies, amongst other things, reflecting on one's own attitudes, self-restraint and a sense of ownership of one's own actions.

Figure 1.10: Frequencies of competences related to 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' in national curricula for citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17

	ISCED 1	ISCED 2 general	ISCED 3 general	IVET (school-based)
Interacting effectively and constructively with others	13	11	8	6
Self-confidence	21	17	16	13
Responsibility	36	35	30	30
Autonomy (personal initiative)	16	19	17	16
Respect for different opinions or beliefs	30	29	25	23
Cooperation	32	29	20	21
Conflict resolution	22	21	21	20
Empathy	20	19	18	18
Self-awareness	21	14	12	7
Communicating and listening	33	31	24	24
Emotional awareness	19	11	9	6
Flexibility or adaptability	2	3	3	2
Inter-cultural skills	17	20	18	14
Total	282	259	221	200

Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The rate refers to the number of national curricula in which a specific citizenship competence appears.

Another indication that education authorities treat personal responsibility as an important citizenship competence is the fact that it features in the curricula at all school education levels. Thus, at ISCED 2 there are 35 countries that mention responsibility in their curriculum, 30 at ISCED 3 and IVET. In other words, a large majority of European education systems include personal responsibility in their citizenship education curricula.

The second most common component in this competence area at primary level is 'communicating and listening' which implies the ability to communicate, to make one's views known and support them with the help of arguments, and to listen respectfully to the views of others. As Figure 1.10 shows, in primary education no fewer than 33 education systems include these competences in their curriculum. In lower secondary education 'communicating and listening' features in 31 national curricula. Acquiring communication and listening skills is the third most common competence in the 'interacting effectively' competence area in upper secondary. A similar pattern applies in IVET where 'communicating and listening' is mentioned in 24 curricula and is the second most common component.

Learning how to cooperate with others, in school and beyond, is clearly another priority that many curricula across Europe have in common. 'Cooperation' is the third most common competence in ISCED 1 and 2, but it ranks lower in ISCED 3 and IVET (see Figure 1.10).

Overall, the content analysis of the 'interacting effectively' competence area reveals a similar pattern across education levels – in general the same competences are mentioned in roughly the same number of European educational systems (but not necessarily in the same countries) across ISCED levels. However, there is a difference for the competences related to personal development, such as emotional awareness, self-confidence or self-awareness, which are more common in ISCED 1 curricula and progressively fewer education systems report them in higher level curricula. Nor does it apply to 'inter-cultural skills', which feature more often, albeit still not very frequently, in secondary rather than in primary education.

Thinking critically

Compared to the 'interacting effectively' competence area, there is slightly more variation in the distribution of the competences under the critical thinking heading. 'Exercising judgement' is by far the most common competence at ISCED 1 with 'thinking critically' and 'reasoning and analysis skills' 'media literacy' following some way behind (see Figure 1.11). At ISCED 2: 'thinking critically' is the frontrunner, with 'exercising judgement' and 'understanding the present world' coming joint second and 'knowledge discovery and use of sources' third. 'Thinking critically' continues to lead the field at ISCED 3, with 'exercising judgement' and 'understanding the present world' coming second and 'reasoning and analysis skills' third. Finally, in IVET the order is 'thinking critically', 'reasoning and analysis' followed by 'exercising judgement'.

Figure 1.11: Frequencies of competences related to 'thinking critically' in national curricula for citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17

	ISCED 1	ISCED 2 general	ISCED 3 general	IVET
Thinking critically	19	28	26	26
Multi-perspectivity	15	15	15	17
Reasoning and analysis skills	19	20	23	24
Data interpretation	8	15	14	14
Knowledge discovery and use of sources	15	24	21	20
Media literacy	18	23	19	14
Creativity	17	17	14	13
Exercising judgement	28	27	25	22
Understanding the present world	18	27	25	19
Questioning	11	15	16	12
Total	168	211	198	181

Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The frequencies refer to the number of national curricula a specific citizenship competence appears in.

Thus, it is possible to conclude that as far as critical thinking competences are concerned, there are some differences between education levels and systems, but not many. In other words, most education systems tend to favour similar components related to critical thinking and some seem to be important enough to be included at all or nearly all education levels. First and foremost, is the ability to reflect critically on matters and choose between different options, particularly when ethical considerations are involved ('thinking critically' and 'exercising judgement'). About half of the educational systems acknowledge 'media literacy', including social media literacy and dealing with cyber-bullying, as an important competence, incorporating it into the curriculum at ISCED 1, 2 and 3. Relatively fewer countries teach it in IVET. 'Understanding the present world' or current affairs is part of the curriculum in many countries, but mostly in secondary education. A similar pattern can be identified with 'knowledge discovery and use of sources'. In contrast, 'creativity' tends to be promoted

in primary and lower secondary schools, but only in a minority of countries. The majority do not include the promotion of students' creative capacities.

Acting in a socially responsible manner

Instilling a sense of social responsibility into students is also an important dimension of citizenship education. It is easy to see why education authorities would want students to graduate from school having a heightened sense of responsibility not only towards themselves or towards people in their immediate surroundings (e.g. family and peers), but also towards society as a whole. Hence, the competence area 'acting in a socially responsible manner' includes a broad array of competences ranging from respecting other people, cultures, religions and human rights, to protecting the environment and cultural heritage, and the feeling of belonging to a wider (local, regional, national and/or European) community.

Figure 1.12: Frequencies of citizenship competences related to 'acting in a socially responsible manner' in national curricula for citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17

	ISCED 1	ISCED 2 general	ISCED 3 general	IVET
Acting in a socially responsible manner	9	8	8	7
Respect for justice	18	21	19	22
Solidarity	22	25	19	20
Respect for other human beings	32	31	28	24
Respect for human rights	29	34	33	29
Sense of belonging	27	23	23	19
Sustainable development	12	19	19	17
Environmental protection	24	21	20	19
Cultural heritage protection	17	13	15	10
Knowing about or respecting other cultures	23	26	28	24
Knowing about or respecting religions	15	22	21	16
Non-discrimination	24	28	29	23
Total	252	271	262	230

Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The frequencies refer to the number of national curricula a specific citizenship competence appears in.

Like critical thinking and inter-personal interaction, social responsibility contains certain components that are taught throughout the school years. For example, more than half of the educational systems examined here teach 'respect for other human beings' and 'respect for human rights' in general at all education levels (see Figure 1.12). Similarly, 'knowing about or respecting other cultures' is something that is taught to students early on and is continued in later years. In particular, 23 countries mention respecting other cultures (or people from other cultures) in the curriculum for ISCED 1. The figure rises to 26 and 28 for ISCED 2 and 3, respectively. For school-based vocational education knowing about or respecting other cultures is mentioned in 24 curricula. 'Knowing about or respecting other religions' is a conceptually narrower category. Therefore, it is not too surprising that only a few curricula refer to it, especially at ISCED 1 or IVET. However, at ISCED 2 and 3 there are 22 and 21 national curricula respectively, that make an explicit reference to the need to understand or respect other religions. In contrast, 'non-discrimination' is a broader category which includes positive attitudes towards gender equality, diversity and pluralism in society, in addition to discouraging all forms of discrimination. As such, 'non-discrimination' is dealt with in the curricula of as many as 24 education systems at ISCED 1, increasing to 28 at ISCED 2, 29 at ISCED 3 and dropping to 23 at IVET.

Interestingly enough, topics related to 'sustainable development' tend to be covered at the higher levels of school education, whereas 'environmental protection' is more often dealt with in primary school. The same goes for the 'sense of belonging', which incorporates the references in curricula to fostering a sense of patriotism and national identity. As illustrated in Figure 1.12, in most education systems, promoting a sense of belonging takes place in the primary school. There are fewer secondary and school based vocational education curricula that make explicit references to such a competence. In this regard, there is another aspect worth highlighting.

Citizenship education, especially in previous eras, has been associated with the promotion of a national identity (Heater, 2002). The analysis of the most recent curricula on citizenship education reveals that although strengthening students' sense of patriotism and national identity is still present, it is not ubiquitous. At most, 27 out of 42 European education systems refer to the advancement of a sense of belonging (including belonging to a national community) in ISCED 1, while the number drops in ISCED 2, 3 and IVET. This finding, in combination with the fact that modern citizenship education curricula in many countries promote competences related to pluralism and respect for other cultures, probably reflects the fact that Europe has become more diverse and multi-cultural.

Acting democratically

'Acting democratically' is clearly the most political of the four areas of competence. It contains aspects that relate to the institutions of democracy as well as its practical application. Figure 1.13 shows that encouraging students to participate is present in the curricula of most European educational systems. Thus, modern citizenship education in Europe tends not simply to disseminate theoretical knowledge on democracy, but also to encourage students to become active citizens who participate in public and political affairs. In addition to 'participation' in general, a narrower category has been added ('knowledge of or participation in civil society') to determine if any countries are going a step further in encouraging students to take an active part in civil society. The results reveal that this is the exception rather than the norm. Only seven curricula make a reference to this at ISCED 1. The number increases at higher levels (13 for ISCED 2, 18 for ISCED 3 and 15 for IVET), but it still a minority of education systems.

Figure 1.13: Frequencies of citizenship competences related to 'acting democratically' in the national curricula for citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17

	ISCED 1	ISCED 2 general	ISCED 3 general	IVET
Acting democratically	7	8	14	9
Respect for democracy	23	28	31	29
Knowledge of political institutions	19	32	34	27
Knowledge of political processes (e.g. elections)	17	27	30	23
Knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations	11	22	23	16
Interacting with political authorities	6	6	8	8
Knowledge of fundamental political and social concepts	14	24	23	17
Respect for rules	28	31	23	22
Participating	32	33	33	27
Knowledge of or participation in civil society	7	13	18	15
Total	164	224	237	193

Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The frequencies refer to the number of national curricula a specific citizenship competence appears in.

Of course, imparting 'knowledge of political institutions' and 'knowledge of political processes', as well as the more abstract learning involved in 'knowledge of fundamental political and social concepts' is also included in national curricula. However, this tends to take place when students are a bit older, in secondary education. In primary school more than half of national curricula aim to instil in students the value of rules and the need to respect them ('respect for rules'). This is also the case in lower secondary education, but in upper secondary and IVET attention shifts away from this aspect. Promoting participation is something that takes place early on in the majority of the countries. In primary and secondary education more than 30 countries mention 'participating' in their curricula, but in IVET this number drops to 27 (see Figure 1.13). Finally, at the secondary education level a substantial number of national curricula also cover topics related to international organisations, especially the EU, and international treaties, particularly UN treaties, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ('knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations'). Somewhat surprisingly this is not shared by all the education systems examined. It would be easy to attribute this to the fact that not all countries examined here are members of the EU, but as the next section reveals this cannot be the sole reason.

1.5.4. Curriculum content analysis results: cross-country differences

This section goes a step further in disaggregating the curriculum content analysis results. Figures 1.14-1.17 allow the reader to see which specific components of each competence area are mentioned at each ISCED level of citizenship education curricula in the education systems involved in the study. This may still not do full justice to the wealth of information contained in national curricula, but it is the only way to present the data in an orderly fashion, while making cross-country comparisons possible.

Naturally, the diversity of the 42 education systems is reflected not only in the content of the citizenship education curriculum, but also in the availability of data. Apart from the education systems where citizenship education is not being taught and consequently no data exists, a high degree of school or regional autonomy in some countries impacts on the availability of data. In particular, the Netherlands reported the high degree of school autonomy as the reason why it was impossible to report any learning outcomes. Similarly, Italy highlighted that it was up to schools to define specific objectives or learning outcomes for citizenship education. The United Kingdom (Scotland) maintained that there is a 'Curriculum for Excellence', but it is up to local authorities and schools to determine how its content is managed and delivered. In the case of Spain, regional autonomy did not result in a lack of data but the opposite. The Spanish Eurydice Unit reported curriculum data both from the national and the regional level. However, to avoid complication in the visual representation, only the competences mentioned in Spain's national level curricula are shown graphically. Data from three autonomous regions (Cataluña, Castilla-La Mancha and Galicia) are referred to in the country-specific notes of the figures.

Interacting effectively and constructively with others

Figure 1.14 makes it possible to see not only that a large majority of education systems explicitly promote 'responsibility', 'communicating and listening' and 'cooperation' in their citizenship curricula, but also which ones do not. For example, at ISCED 1 the Flemish Community of Belgium, the Netherlands and Bosnia and Herzegovina do not refer explicitly to students learning how to be responsible individuals. At ISCED 2 the Netherlands again make no reference to 'responsibility' and they are joined in this respect by Estonia, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) and Iceland; the Flemish Community of Belgium and Bosnia and Herzegovina on the other hand do

include 'responsibility' at lower secondary level. In IVET and especially at ISCED 3 the majority is slightly thinner, as Figure 1.14 shows.

Figure 1.14: Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Figure 1.14 also makes it easy to discern which countries include the less common competences. For example, being flexible and able to adapt to changing circumstances features only in a few countries, namely, in the Czech Republic (ISCED 3), Croatia (ISCED 3 and IVET), Romania (ISCED 2), Finland (all levels), the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) (ISCED 2) and Serbia (ISCED 1).

'Emotional awareness' is another competence that is referred to less frequently in the national curricula. It appears mostly at ISCED 1 and in the following education systems: Belgium (French and Flemish Communities), Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Spain, France, Croatia, Cyprus, the Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, the United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland), Liechtenstein, Serbia and Turkey. Of these only Belgium (French and Flemish Communities), the Czech Republic, Spain, France, Croatia, Cyprus, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Finland and Liechtenstein continue promoting it at ISCED 2. Belgium (French and Flemish Communities), the Czech Republic, France, Croatia, Cyprus and Finland teach 'emotional awareness' also at ISCED 3, and are joined at this level by the German-speaking Community of Belgium and Ireland. Belgium (French Community), Ireland, France, Croatia and Finland are the only countries also promoting emotional development in IVET, while the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia deals with 'emotional awareness' exclusively in this pathway.

Figure 1.14 (continued): Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'interacting effectively and constructively with others' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Country-specific notes

Denmark and Romania: There is no common curriculum for all IVET students.

Germany: The data are drawn from resolutions of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs.

Spain: Additional competences are mentioned in the regional level curricula. The following are examples drawn from the curricula of the Autonomous Communities. **Cataluña:** responsibility (ISCED 1 and 3), cooperation (ISCED 2), conflict resolution (ISCED 1-3), empathy (ISCED 1 and 2), communicating and listening (ISCED 1 and 3), emotional awareness (ISCED 1 and 2).

Galicia: responsibility (ISCED 1-3), autonomy (ISCED 1 and 3), respect for different opinions (ISCED 1), cooperation (ISCED 1 and 2), conflict resolution (ISCED 1 and 3), empathy (ISCED 1), self-awareness (ISCED 2), communicating and listening (ISCED 1 and 3). **Castilla-La Mancha:** self-confidence (ISCED 3), responsibility (ISCED 1-3), autonomy (ISCED 1-3), respect for different opinions (ISCED 1 and 2), cooperation (ISCED 1-3 and IVET), conflict resolution (ISCED 1-3), emotional awareness (ISCED 1 and 2), flexibility (ISCED 3).

Austria: For IVET the curriculum of part-time vocational schools and apprenticeships is taken into account.

Being autonomous ('autonomy'), including the willingness to be pro-active and to take initiative, may be associated with personal development, but it also has social and political implications. As a result, it is interesting to note that relatively few countries include it in their citizenship education curriculum. At ISCED 1 these are Belgium (French Community), the Czech Republic, Ireland, Greece, France, Croatia, Hungary, the Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (England and Wales), Norway and Serbia. At ISCED 2 it is roughly the same countries, minus Greece and the United Kingdom (England and Wales), but in addition, Belgium (Flemish Community), Cyprus, Slovenia, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Montenegro. At ISCED 3 and IVET the list changes again slightly (see Figure 1.14). Finally, Spain and Switzerland promote personal autonomy only in ISCED 3 and IVET, Turkey only in ISCED 3 and Slovakia only in IVET.


'Respect for different opinions and beliefs' is a particularly important component of this competence area. It is essential that students are able to acknowledge that there may be opinions that contradict their own and that they need to respect them, even if they choose to challenge them. Such a competence helps maintaining, on the one hand, a peaceful climate within the classroom and the school and, on the other, harmonious co-existence with other individuals and between different types of communities outside school. Figure 1.10 revealed that whilst 'respect for different opinions or beliefs' does not feature in the curricula of all European countries, it does appear in the majority, especially in primary and lower secondary education. It is Figure 1.14 however, that demonstrates which countries endorse it in their curriculum. Furthermore, Figure 1.10 gives the general impression that the same education systems that teach respect for different views at ISCED 1 also do so at ISCED 2. This, however, is not necessarily the case. In particular, Estonia, Poland, the United Kingdom (England), Serbia and Turkey address this in primary, but not in lower secondary education. In contrast, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Romania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia address it in ISCED 2 but not in ISCED 1.

Thinking critically

Being able to think critically enables citizens to reflect on, question and criticise, if need be, the world around them. This may include thinking critically about one's own country and its institutions. As a result, thinking critically is potentially controversial, which implies that fewer countries may be willing to invest in it. Figure 1.9 indicated that competences related to critical thinking appeared comparatively less frequently in the national curricula of citizenship education, while Figure 1.11 showed that there is variation not only between ISCED levels, but also between the components comprising the 'thinking critically' competence area. Figure 1.15 summarises all the available information, making it possible to compare the various components of this competence area across countries and ISCED levels. The cross-country analysis that is described below focuses on the variation within ISCED levels and particularly on the exceptional cases. Before doing that, however, it is useful to identify the countries that mention 'thinking critically' explicitly in their citizenship education curriculum.

In section 1.5.2 (see Figure 1.8), it was underlined that the countries that choose to develop students' critical thinking faculties tend to do so after the primary level, but there are a number of exceptions (French and German-speaking Communities of Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, France, Cyprus, Hungary, Malta, Austria, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, Montenegro and Norway). The additional countries that explicitly mention critical thinking in their curricula for ISCED 2 and 3 can be found in Figure 1.15. Here, it is worth highlighting that cultivating critical thinking and being explicit about it is not confined to general education, but extends to school-based vocational education as well. In particular, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, France, Hungary, Malta, the Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Sweden, the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Montenegro and Norway, all mention 'thinking critically' as a competence relevant also to IVET students.

Figure 1.15: Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'thinking critically' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Country-specific notes

Denmark and Romania: There is no common curriculum for all IVET students.


Germany: The data are drawn from resolutions of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs.

Spain: Additional competences are mentioned in the regional level curricula. The following are examples drawn from the curricula of the Autonomous Communities. **Cataluña:** thinking critically (ISCED 1 and 3), multi-perspectivity (ISCED 2), reasoning and analysis (ISCED 1), exercising judgement (ISCED 2 and 3), understanding the present world (ISCED 3), questioning (ISCED 3). **Galicía:** thinking critically (ISCED 1 and 2), multi-perspectivity (ISCED 3), reasoning and analysis (IVET), exercising judgement (ISCED 1-3). **Castilla-La Mancha:** thinking critically (ISCED 1-3), multi-perspectivity (ISCED 3), reasoning and analysis (ISCED 3), knowledge discovery and use of sources (ISCED 2).

Austria: For IVET, the curriculum of part-time vocational schools and apprenticeships is taken into account.

'Questioning' is not necessarily the least common component of the critical thinking competence area, but it has connotations that ensure it stands apart. Being able to raise questions and also to question conventional wisdom or the established authorities and their decisions give 'questioning' a political edge. At ISCED 1 only 11 European education systems promote it, namely, Belgium (French and German-speaking Communities), France, Cyprus, Hungary, Malta, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales), Switzerland and Turkey. The list of countries grows at ISCED 2 (French and Flemish Communities of Belgium, Greece, France, Croatia, Cyprus, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, the Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Sweden and Switzerland) and again at ISCED 3 (Belgium, Ireland, Spain, France, Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary, Malta, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales) and Switzerland). In IVET only 12 countries feature 'questioning' in their curriculum: Belgium (French Community), Ireland, France, Croatia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Austria, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales) and Switzerland.

Figure 1.16 (continued): Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'acting in a socially responsible manner' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Country-specific notes (Figure 1.16)

Denmark and Romania: There is no common curriculum for all IVET students.
Germany: The data are drawn from resolutions of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs.
Spain: Additional competences are mentioned in the regional level curricula. The following are examples drawn from the curricula of the Autonomous Communities. **Cataluña:** acting in a socially responsible manner (ISCED 1 and 3), respect for justice (ISCED 1 and 2), solidarity (ISCED 1 and 3), respect for other human beings (ISCED 1 and 2), environmental protection (ISCED 1), knowing about or respecting other cultures (ISCED 2 and 3), non-discrimination (ISCED 1). **Galicia:** respect for justice (ISCED 2), solidarity (ISCED 2), respect for other human beings (ISCED 2), respect for human rights (ISCED 1-3), sense of belonging (ISCED 2), sustainable development (ISCED 3), knowing about or respecting other cultures (ISCED 1), non-discrimination (ISCED 2). **Castilla-La Mancha:** respect for justice (ISCED 3), solidarity (ISCED 2), respect for other human beings (ISCED 2), sustainable development (ISCED 3), knowing about or respecting other cultures (ISCED 1), non-discrimination (ISCED 2).
Austria: For IVET the curriculum of part-time vocational schools and apprenticeships is taken into account.

This gives the impression that a fixed group of education systems promote this particular component through all education levels, but this is not correct. Poland deals with this competence only in ISCED 1 (see Figure 1.16). Montenegro and Norway teach 'respect for justice' at all levels except ISCED 2, while Italy and Lithuania only in ISCED 2 and IVET, Romania only in ISCED 2 and 3, Bosnia and Herzegovina only in ISCED 2 and IVET and Turkey only at ISCED 1 and 3.

In section 1.5.3 it was emphasised that education systems tend to foster a 'sense of belonging', which means belonging to a wider (local, regional, national and/or European) community (see Figure 1.12). It was also highlighted that not all countries use citizenship education to foster national identity, at least not according to top level official guidance. Figure 1.16 reveals which education systems promote a 'sense of belonging' and at which education level. Thus, at ISCED 1, these are Belgium (French Community), Bulgaria, Germany, Ireland, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary,

Malta, Austria, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland), Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey. At ISCED 2 there are slightly fewer countries, namely, Belgium (French Community), the Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Hungary, Malta, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland), Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Montenegro. At ISCED 3 there are even fewer countries: Belgium (French Community), the Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, France, Croatia, Cyprus, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, and Serbia. Finally, in IVET it is only Belgium (French Community), the Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, France, Croatia, Italy, Latvia, Hungary, Malta, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Switzerland, Montenegro and Serbia. This means that there are eight countries where a collective identity is not mentioned in the citizenship education curriculum for any school education level. These are Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Spain (except at regional level), the Netherlands, Poland, the United Kingdom (England) and Norway.

The curriculum analysis has shown that citizenship education is perceived as instrumental in most European countries in teaching students the need for respecting others. While the 'interacting effectively' competence area includes the 'respect for other opinions and beliefs' (see Figure 1.10), the area on social responsibility goes further in teaching respect not only for other human beings in general but also for their different cultures and to some extent their religions (see Figure 1.12). Many countries go a step further and try to teach students about human rights, often imparting knowledge of the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Only the German-speaking Community of Belgium does not mention human rights explicitly in the curriculum. All the other education systems cover 'respect for human rights' in at least one education level. Most deal with human rights in all ISCED levels, although it is more common in secondary education.

Another interesting aspect about citizenship education is that it often contains an ecological dimension. In other words, 29 countries cover either 'environmental protection' or 'sustainable development' in the curriculum. The latter, being a relatively more specialised topic, is found in relatively fewer education systems. Namely, in Belgium (French and Flemish Communities), the Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Spain (at regional level), France, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Malta, the Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales), Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Liechtenstein.

Similarly, 'knowing about or respecting religions' is narrower a topic, compared to 'knowing about or respecting other cultures'. As a result, fewer education systems include this in their curriculum, and several of those that do, do not teach it at all education levels. Thus, the Flemish Community of Belgium refers to religious tolerance and/or awareness in ISCED 2, while the German-speaking Community does so in ISCED 1 and 3. Bulgaria includes it in the curriculum for ISCED 2 and 3, Greece for ISCED 3, Croatia for ISCED 1 and 2, Cyprus for ISCED 1, 2 and 3, Lithuania for ISCED 2 and IVET, Austria for ISCED 2 and 3 and IVET, Portugal for ISCED 3, Romania for ISCED 2, the United Kingdom (England and Northern Ireland) for ISCED 3 and IVET, Switzerland for ISCED 1, 2, and 3, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for ISCED 2, 3 and IVET, Iceland for ISCED 1 and 2, Montenegro and, last but not least, Turkey for ISCED 2. The education systems covering 'knowing about or respecting religions' at all education levels and pathways are only the French Community of Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, France, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Wales) and Norway.

Acting democratically

Given that democracy is not simply a political constitution but also an ideal, it is not surprising that the majority of countries covered here include in the citizenship education curriculum the goal of teaching students to appreciate and show 'respect for democracy'. What is surprising, though, is that not all education systems mention this goal in the curriculum. This is the case in the German-speaking Community of Belgium, Cyprus, Luxembourg and the United Kingdom (England and Wales). In all other education systems appreciating and respecting democracy is taught at least in one education level (see Figure 1.17).

Figure 1.17: Cross-country distribution of the competences related to 'acting democratically' in national citizenship education curricula at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Country-specific notes

Denmark and Romania: There is no common curriculum for all students in IVET.
Germany: The data are drawn from resolutions of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs.
Spain: Additional competences are mentioned in the regional level curricula. The following are examples drawn from the curricula of the Autonomous Communities. **Cataluña:** respect for democracy (ISCED 1), knowledge of political institutions (ISCED 3), knowledge of political processes (ISCED 3), knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations (ISCED 1), respect for rules (ISCED 1 and 2), participating (ISCED 1), participating in civil society (ISCED 3). **Galicía:** acting democratically (ISCED 3), knowledge of political institutions (ISCED 2), knowledge of political processes (ISCED 2), knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations (ISCED 3), knowledge of fundamental political and social concepts (ISCED 2 and 3), participating (ISCED 1 and 2). **Castilla-La Mancha:** acting democratically (ISCED 3), knowledge of political institutions (ISCED 3), knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations (ISCED 3), respect for rules (ISCED 1 and 2), participating (ISCED 1-3), knowledge of or participation in civil society (ISCED 3).
Austria: For IVET the curriculum of part-time vocational schools and apprenticeships is taken into account.

In the following countries the teaching starts in primary schools: Belgium (French Community), Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Greece, Spain (at the regional level), France, Croatia, Italy, Hungary, Malta, the Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, Norway and Turkey.

Living in a democracy implies not only rights and freedom, but also duties and restrictions. Hence, being aware of the importance of social and legal rules and of the need to respect them is something that most European education systems try to instil in students early on. Nevertheless, citizenship education curricula do not always mention the 'respect for rules'. In particular, the national curricula of Belgium (German-speaking Community), Denmark, Estonia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Liechtenstein do not refer to the rule of law or to students learning to obey rules in general.

At the core of citizenship education resides a responsibility to impart knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes and concepts, usually adapted to the particularities of each individual country and/or region. Thus, there is hardly an education system in Europe whose curriculum does not cover 'knowledge of political institutions' or 'knowledge of political processes'. Only a few exceptions can be found. These are the German-speaking Community of Belgium, Lithuania and Iceland.

Whilst it is understandable that most education systems teach students about more abstract social and political concepts, such as defining society or democracy, in secondary rather than primary education, it is worth noting that such topics tend to be more neglected in IVET. Only Belgium (French and Flemish Communities), Germany, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro raise 'knowledge of fundamental political and social concepts' in the IVET curricula (see Figure 1.17).

Similarly, there are only few education systems that have introduced an international dimension into the IVET curriculum ('knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations'). In other words, the IVET citizenship education curriculum of most education systems does not mention the EU at all; nor does it mention other international organisations or international treaties. Belgium (French and Flemish Communities), the Czech Republic, Germany, France, Croatia, Hungary, Malta, Austria, Poland, Slovenia, Finland, the United Kingdom (England and Wales), Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro are the exceptions.

Figure 1.13 reveals that about half of the education systems discussed here have introduced an international dimension into citizenship education in secondary education. Several of the countries participating in this study are not EU member states, which might be considered a reason why the EU or European unification is not mentioned in their curricula. However, the findings presented in Figure 1.17, contradict this hypothesis. As many as eight EU member states do not have an international dimension in the curriculum of secondary education, whereas six (Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro and Norway) of the non-EU countries examined here do. On a more positive note, the French Community of Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Spain, Italy, Cyprus, Malta, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Finland and Norway start teaching about international organisations and treaties in ISCED 1.

Although all the citizenship competences mentioned thus far are valuable in themselves, encouraging students to participate in social and political life is particularly important. In an age of mass democracy, when it may seem as though the individual citizen has little power to change things, it may not be immediately obvious to young people why it is important to take part in politics, in collective decision-making or in community bodies and projects. Hence, citizenship education can play a significant role

in this regard. The findings presented in Figure 1.13 suggest that the vast majority of European countries are aware of citizenship education's potential and they promote student participation in various ways. The only education systems that do not mention 'participating' in the curriculum at any education level are Belgium (German-speaking Community), Hungary, the Netherlands and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. It should be noted, however, that this offers no proof that student participation is not taking place at school level or even beyond.

Summary (B. Content)

Overall, it is difficult to discern any particular pattern in the distribution of citizenship competences or competence areas between education systems. Even though different countries have different priorities and approaches, the content analysis of citizenship education curricula did not reveal any clear-cut differences, between, for example, northern and southern Europe, East and West, new and old EU member states or EU countries and non-EU countries. Therefore, if there are any systematic differences between countries they do not relate to the aforementioned classifications. Nonetheless, the curriculum content analysis revealed that European countries share many similarities with regard to the content of the citizenship education curriculum. For example, it was demonstrated that the competences related to students' personal development and inter-personal interaction are promoted mostly in primary schools. Critical thinking, on the other, is usually cultivated in secondary education, while learning how to act democratically is dealt with at upper secondary level. Within citizenship competence areas there is inevitably variation between countries, but there is also some convergence. The majority of countries cover personal responsibility, cooperation and communication in their curricula across all education levels. As far as the components of the critical thinking competence area are concerned, the majority of the countries studied here promote 'exercising judgement' by students, again at all levels. Other competences, like 'creativity' are more likely to be taught earlier, while studying current affairs and 'understanding the present world' tends to take place later in school. Interestingly enough, a large majority of countries deal with respect – whether it is general respect for different opinions and beliefs or for other cultures and religions or for human rights in particular. While human rights is a topic dealt with across all education levels, most citizenship education curricula seek to foster a sense of belonging to the wider community largely during primary education. Last but not least, it is worth highlighting that the components which are predominant across European education systems in the most explicitly political of the four areas of citizenship competences ('acting democratically') are those relating to participation, respecting democracy and rules and knowledge of political institutions.

CASE STUDY 1: CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION CURRICULUM REFORM IN AUSTRIA

In Austria modern citizenship education was founded in 1978 with the General Ordinance 'Citizenship education as a cross-curricular educational principle' (*Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kunst*, 1978). Following the lowering of the voting age for general elections in 2007, citizenship education was offered as part of a new integrated school subject 'history, social studies and citizenship education' as of 2008. The latest in a series of reforms took place in 2016 and is presented here. The information and the arguments developed in the following analysis draw on official documents and on the insights of seven interviewees, most of whom were directly involved in the design, testing or implementation of the curriculum reform ⁽¹⁾.

Rationale and main objectives

The objective of the 2016 curriculum reform in Austria was to strengthen citizenship education. Although citizenship education was already a compulsory subject before the curriculum reform, a consensus among stakeholders had emerged that citizenship education deserved more attention. Given that citizenship education was taught together with history as an integrated subject and that it was taught mostly by history teachers, it was easy for teachers and students to treat it as a second-order subject. Furthermore, prior to the reform, citizenship education was taught only from grade 8 onwards.

Whilst it was clear that citizenship education had to be strengthened, it was necessary to maintain a pragmatic approach. Consequently, even though some of the stakeholders had wished for citizenship education to become a separate subject taught independently of history, this was extremely difficult because of the effect this would have on other subjects. Teaching citizenship education separately would have necessitated shifting teaching hours away from other subjects.

The solution chosen was to re-formulate the curriculum in terms of compulsory modules, two of which deal exclusively with citizenship education. Two more refer to both citizenship education and history, and the remaining five relate only to history. Thus, citizenship education has remained integrated with history, but now teachers are obliged to cover all nine models, resulting in the de facto upgrade of citizenship education.

The status of citizenship education has also been upgraded in another way. Instead of starting at grade 8 (last class of ISCED 2), citizenship education now starts as early as grade 6 (second class of ISCED 2). This ensures that students receive citizenship education not only over a longer period of time, but also before the age of 16, which is the voting age in Austria.

This wide-ranging reform also touched on the content of the curriculum, but since citizenship education is taught with history, many of the content-related reforms had to do with history, which are not being covered here. Still, it is important to mention that the new curriculum introduced the notion of learning on the basis of fundamental concepts (*Basiskonzepte*) ⁽²⁾. The curriculum does not

⁽¹⁾ The interviewees (in alphabetical order) are: Mr. J. Brzobohaty (Secondary level school teacher of German and history/citizenship, lecturer at Vienna University and instructor at the Private University College of Teacher Education, Vienna/Krems); Ms. P. Hladschik (Director of *polis* – the Austrian Centre for Citizenship Education in Schools); Mr. P. Mitnik (Head of the Citizenship Education Centre at the University College of Teacher Education, Vienna); Mr. S. Polzer (Austrian Ministry of Education, Eurydice Unit); Ms. S. Steininger (Austrian Ministry of Education, deputy head of department for citizenship education); Ms. J. Tradinik (President of the Austrian National Youth Council); Mr. B. Vogel (Head teacher of secondary level school and teacher of history and citizenship education).

⁽²⁾ The full text (in German) of the new citizenship education curriculum can be found here: https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/Dokumente/BgblAuth/BGBLA_2016_II_113/BGBLA_2016_II_113.pdf (last accessed 26 May 2017).

distinguish between historical and citizenship education concepts, since most of them relate to both. These fundamental concepts are grouped in three categories: (i) the foundation of historical and political knowledge (covering the concepts of verifiability, causality, constructiveness, perspective and selection), (ii) time (covering concepts, such as time flow, time points and division between periods), and (iii) the framework of living together in a human community (covering the concepts of structure, power, communication, scope for negotiation, vital space (*Lebensraum*) and natural space, norms, labour, diversity and division).

Another novelty of the new curriculum is that the citizenship education modules cover topics in a way that combines cross-time and cross-sectional approaches, in contrast to the chronological order of the past. In addition, the curriculum now distinguishes between three interrelated yet distinct dimensions of the political ontology. First, the formal dimension ('polity'), which deals with the constitution and political institutions. Second, the content ('policy'), which covers the goals and tasks of the polity and the associated competing political interests and ideologies. Third, the process ('politics'), dealing with how political ideas translate into praxis, how the 'political will' is formed and how political consensus is built and conflict is resolved.

As far as the selection of citizenship education topics is concerned, the interviewees highlighted that the new curriculum does not differ that much from the old. Most of the topics outlined in the curriculum were already mentioned in the old. However, the revision of the curriculum gave the opportunity to improve the visibility of some topics and make explicit references to them. For example, human rights and a strengthened European and global outlook are more visible in the new curriculum.

Process and outcomes

The curriculum reform process started officially with the announcement of the intention to reform citizenship education in the work programme of the new government, which was formed after the general election of 2013 ⁽³⁾. The work programme was rather laconic regarding the intended reform. It simply stated that the measure is about 'Establish[ing] political [i.e. citizenship] education as a compulsory model from the 6th school grade upwards as part of the subject history and social studies/political [citizenship] education. Schools will also be free to teach a subject of their own choosing (Austrian Federal Chancellery 2013, p. 42). The latter point meant that schools were free to offer citizenship education as a separate subject if they wanted to. This was a reaffirmation of an existing right which had been in place since the 1970s. However, according to the interviewees, few schools chose to offer citizenship education as a separate subject because of the impact on the teaching time of other subjects.

The very short reference in the government work programme meant that all the important details, including the exact scope and timeframe of the reform, had to be filled in. This started with the formation of an expert working group, an initiative that originated in the cabinet of the minister of education at the time. Austrian law requires the deliberation with social partners and stakeholders after a law or general ordinance (and the curriculum has the legal status of general ordinance) has been drafted, but not before. However, the ministry, in close cooperation with the minister's cabinet, decided it was sensible to bring together all the major stakeholders to contribute to the design of the reform, although the final say and responsibility remained with the minister.

The expert working group comprised various stakeholders, such as representatives of the ministry, regional education authorities, teachers and headteachers, *polis* – the Austrian Centre for Citizenship

⁽³⁾ The work programme of the Austrian Federal Government can be found in full (in English) here: <https://www.bka.gv.at/DocView.axd?CobId=53588>

Education in Schools, the National Youth Council of Austria, and representatives of other (quasi-) non-governmental organisations totalling about 20 members. The working group also included three university professors who were the authors of the new curriculum ⁽⁴⁾.

The design phase of the reform lasted approximately one and a half years to be followed by a testing phase which lasted one academic year (2015/16). The new curriculum was piloted in approximately 40 lower secondary education schools in all nine regions (*Länder*) of Austria. Throughout the piloting phase the participating schools and teachers were supported by the ministry, *polis* – the Austrian Centre for Citizenship Education in Schools, the authors of the curriculum and the teaching colleges. Three meetings between October 2015 and May 2016 were held in the city of Salzburg where teachers were given the opportunity to air their views, to ask questions and provide feedback. In addition to these meetings, the ministry had opened another channel of communication with the participating schools. The latter were expected to send regular reports to the ministry, which added to complaints that the teachers piloting the new curriculum were burdened with too many tasks. Despite the existence of communication channels between the ministry and the teachers, some of them had the impression that their views did not really matter. Eventually, the draft curriculum was amended after the testing period, although admittedly the changes were small.

Another source of complaint was the fact that the new textbooks were not ready to be used during the pilot phase or during the first year of full implementation (2016/17). However, both the teaching colleges and *polis* – the Austrian Centre for Citizenship Education in Schools – provided the teachers with some material to facilitate their work. In any case, this was not an insurmountable obstacle since, even before the launch of the reform, citizenship teachers were used to finding appropriate material themselves. The problem of unavailability of the new textbooks and teacher handbooks, which has been reported by all interviewees as the only complication in the reform process, should be resolved by the start of the 2017/18 school year.

One unresolved challenge concerns student assessment. According to one interviewee, there is empirical evidence suggesting that compared to history, citizenship education topics are under-represented in the final exams. Students anticipate this and they can adjust their revision process accordingly.

Overall, the curriculum reform did not prove to be controversial. Naturally, as with all processes of change, some issues were raised. These included concerns about the delay in the availability of the new textbooks, which has already been mentioned. Other concerns came from the citizenship education teachers who had to familiarise themselves with the new curriculum and adapt their teaching to the new elements found in it. However, by the time of the second Salzburg meeting most teachers participating in the pilot appear to have become accustomed to the new curriculum. Some issues surrounding the topics selected for the curriculum did arise, but they concerned primarily history rather than citizenship education. Perhaps the main reason why the reform of citizenship education in Austria was relatively non-controversial was that the necessary conditions were in place. This leads to the final part of the present case-study examining the reasons behind the curriculum reform in Austria.

⁽⁴⁾ The authors were Prof. T. Hellmuth, Prof. C. Kühberger and Prof. A. Ecker.

The reasons for the reform

The reform of citizenship education did not occur as the result of any single cause but from a combination of many factors, some of which occurred at the same time making it difficult to isolate the relative weight of each. Whereas it is clear that the mention of citizenship education in the work programme of the Austrian government made reform imminent, it is not immediately obvious why it was included in the work programme or why the reform took the shape it eventually did.

In relation to the first question, the lobbying of the National Youth Council of Austria (*Bundes Jugend Vertretung*), an umbrella organisation representing 53 Austrian youth organisations, played a significant role. Being one of the social partners recognised by the Austrian government and representing young people up to the age of 30, nearly three million people in Austria according to its president, the National Youth Council (NYC) campaigned and lobbied intensively, in order to have a reference to citizenship education included in the work programme. The campaign ran between the general election of 2013 and the European election of 2014 and it involved the production of a position paper and other campaign material on what citizenship education is, why it is important and what should be done. The NYC contacted all political parties and members of the parliament to make its voice heard. These efforts bore fruit, and they managed to convince representatives of the two parties (*Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreichs* and *Österreichische Volkspartei*) in the coalition government to include a reference in the work programme that citizenship education should start as early as grade 6.


The NYC continued being pro-active after their initial success with the government's work programme. As soon as they found out that the ministry of education had set up an expert working group they asked to be included. Once in, they promoted a holistic approach to citizenship education and they secured, amongst other things, that the new curriculum would make an explicit reference to this – an important achievement, because it meant that the new textbooks would also make direct references to it, thus consolidating their status as a significant actor on youth-related matters.

The NYC pushed a maximalist agenda on citizenship education, which included starting to teach it as a separate subject from grade 5 onwards. However, it soon became clear that a compromise had to be found, even though the Minister of Education (G. Heinisch-Hosek) was, in principle, positive towards this idea. The Minister's personal interest in citizenship education was also instrumental in creating a reform that substantially strengthened citizenship education in Austria, something confirmed by more than one interviewee. It was the first time that a minister had a person dedicated to citizenship education matters in their cabinet.

While the contribution of all stakeholders, ranging from the ministry's higher echelons down to individual teachers, contributed in their own way to the launch and execution of an important yet fairly smooth reform process, the role of broader societal forces should also be acknowledged. As mentioned in the beginning, citizenship education had already been reformed in 2008 following the lowering of the voting age to 16. Nevertheless, there was a broad consensus that the reform of citizenship education should carry on. This was at least partly the result of two developments. First, the lowering of the voting age made it plain that citizenship education had to be offered earlier and for longer, to ensure that all young people, still at school age, are knowledgeable, active and responsible citizens. Second, the rise or re-emergence internationally of problems, such as violent extremism, populism and xenophobia triggered a debate in society and consequently the search for appropriate responses. As one interviewee explained, citizenship education is sometimes seen as the answer to urgent questions, which is not necessarily the best approach, given that citizenship education benefits more from a steady approach rather than fluctuating interest and resources.

Main findings

- Citizenship education in Austria has been strengthened. It is now being taught earlier (from grade 6 onwards), and the new curriculum identifies nine compulsory modules, two of which are exclusive to citizenship education (the other two to history and citizenship education and five only to history).
- The curriculum content has been modernised: it distinguishes, between polity, policy and politics, there is a stronger European and global dimension, and the notion 'fundamental concepts' has been introduced.
- The new curriculum was piloted for one year in about 40 schools.
- In 2016/17 it was fully implemented for grade 6. In 2017/18 and in 2018/19 it will be fully implemented also for grades 7 and 8, accordingly.
- The main difficulty was the one year time lag between the implementation of the new curriculum and the availability of the new textbooks and teacher handbooks. However, teachers could count on the support of *polis* – the Austrian Centre for Citizenship Education in Schools as well as the teaching colleges for providing alternative material in the meanwhile.
- Cross-party political approval, ministerial support, civil society lobbying and the lowering of the voting age made the reform possible.



CHAPTER 2: TEACHING, LEARNING AND ACTIVE PARTICIPATION

Having explored the guidance provided by top level authorities on the organisation and content of the citizenship education curriculum, this chapter looks more closely at the process of teaching and learning in schools. It explores the assistance given to schools by top level authorities in the form of guidance and support materials, and takes into consideration the formal curriculum, extra-curricular activities and stakeholder participation. The chapter explores:

- The role and function of guidance provided by top level education authorities, with an annex outlining the provision of online guidance and support for citizenship education (see [Annex 3](#) available on line only);
- Teaching and learning in the classroom, mapped against six characteristics of effective pedagogical practice in citizenship education;
- Support for the whole school approach, given for a more holistic whole-school culture of embedded citizenship education;
- Learning beyond the curriculum, presenting the types of teaching and learning practices recommended alongside national programmes that have been forged at national level to support and accelerate implementation;
- Participation of students and parents in school organisation and governance, which is proven to have an impact on citizenship education outcomes.

2.1. Review of the research literature

Role and function of guidance

Policy and strategy development in citizenship education is already well-developed across Europe. However, the challenge often lies in the translation of these policies and reforms into successful practice on the ground (Halász & Michel, 2011). Effective guidance is a recognised tool to help schools and teachers adapt to change (Roca and Sánchez, 2008). Guidelines and support materials are partly how citizenship is articulated at national or regional level, and is often influenced by discourse at European level, and they offer evidence of how citizenship is understood within these contexts (Keating et al., 2009). The provision of support materials is part of a wider process to build implementation capacity. These standards are often issued in the context of curriculum reform, curriculum goal setting and standards, teacher training and professional development, models of new school practices or feedback through assessment and evaluation (Halász & Michel, 2011).

Importantly, guidance and support materials can help schools to embed new curriculum reforms within their own institutional contexts. They can be seen as both pressure from top level authorities and as support for schools to evolve their practice (Altrichter, 2005). Teachers involved in different subjects may require additional support to integrate key competences (such as citizenship education) in their teaching and to design learning outcomes linking these competences with the relevant curriculum area (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b).

Teaching and Learning in the classroom

Modern citizenship education should create engaging and interactive learning environments. The development of transversal skills and attitudes rooted in citizenship education should be prioritised, such as expressing opinions, negotiating, resolving conflicts, thinking critically, analyzing information, having the courage to defend a point of view, showing respect and tolerance, and a willingness to both listen to and stand up for others (Citizenship Foundation, 2006). This learning process demands innovative pedagogies that allow the student to build knowledge and understanding of citizenship education topics as well as develop the skills and attitudes associated with this area of learning.

Teaching should be delivered in a supportive, open-minded and non-judgemental learning environment.

The Citizenship Foundation⁽¹⁾ sets out six characteristics of effective learning for citizenship education: active, interactive, relevant, critical, collaborative and participative (for more detailed information, see Section 2.2.2). As highlighted in the conceptual framework within the introduction to this report, a number of academics (McLaughlin, 1992, Kerr, 1999 and Akar, 2012, cited in UNESCO – IBE, 2017) have drawn a continuum between the minimalist and maximalist approaches to citizenship education (see Figure 1 in the Introduction). These six characteristics complement and link to pedagogies associated with the maximalist end of this continuum⁽²⁾. Active learning emphasises learning by doing, and is strongly aligned to experiential learning. While learning by doing was advocated as far back as Aristotle, the most well-established model of experiential learning was developed by David A. Kolb, who defined it as 'an active, self-directed process... whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience' (Kolb, 1984, cited in Sliwka 2006). Cooperative learning is a pedagogy widely associated with citizenship education, and it closely correlates to the collaborative characteristic. Van Driel et al. (2016) define this as involving 'the instructional use of small heterogeneous groups... where students work together [towards shared goals] to maximise their own and each other's learning'. The relevant characteristic links to the need for citizenship education through authentic learning or learning connected to real-life, with critical thinking as a vital area of development to support media literacy. Participative, the final characteristic identified, brings together the ethos of maximal citizenship education to embrace the student as the creator and director of their own experiential learning through being able to have a say in their own education experience, as described by the Citizenship Foundation in a formal submission to the UK government, which states that 'the focus on pupil voice and participative learning is at the core of what schools aspire to'⁽³⁾, also reflected in an early publication from the Council of Europe (Dürr et al., 2000). These six characteristics may be seen both singly and together in different learning activities, and form a guide to identifying excellence in the learning experience for citizenship education.

Support for a whole-school approach

If citizenship education is to be interdisciplinary, holistic and participatory, the whole school approach is necessary to achieve this vision. Maximalist citizenship education implies that the process involves systemic change at school level to embed both ethos and actions of democracy and active citizenship into school governance, culture, planning and monitoring, teaching, learning and the wider community (Hargreaves, 2008). This is about organisational development with learning processes at different levels – at individual level within an organisation and learning by the organisation itself to change the way it works (Altrichter, 2005).

To illustrate what is meant by a whole school approach, it is useful to consider a progression continuum adapted from a 2005 typology presented in the UK-based Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study Annual Report (Kerr et al., 2004). It identified characteristics for four stages of school development. At the starter level, is the 'minimalist' school which is at an early stage of development, it is not seen as a democratic school, it does not have much stakeholder engagement, and has little variety in delivery methods or extracurricular activities. 'Focused' schools are more advanced in these areas, while 'progressing' schools are the most developed, and are seen as

⁽¹⁾ The Citizenship Foundation is a registered charity in the United Kingdom that supports teachers, schools and policy makers to include high quality citizenship education into UK education systems.

⁽²⁾ A number of international reports emphasise teaching and learning that embraces the characteristics of maximalist Citizenship Education, such as European Commission (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a, 2012b), UNESCO (1998), UNESCO-IBE (2017), IDEA (1999) and the Council of Europe (Dürr et al., 2000).

⁽³⁾ For more information, see <http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/page.php?281>

democratic through the involvement of a range of people in planning citizenship education, using a variety of curriculum methods, engaging the school community and wider community and having mechanisms to recognize achievement. This typology lastly includes 'implicit' schools, which are those that have some of these characteristics, but do not yet focus explicitly on citizenship education in the curriculum although they have the potential to become 'progressing' schools. The principles of interdisciplinary, holistic and participatory education are embedded into the advanced 'progressing school', while there is a clear sense of progression to the different types of school identified in this evolution of the whole school approach.

At its core, the whole school approach can be defined as 'a holistic approach in a school that has been strategically constructed to improve student learning, behaviour and well-being, and provide conditions that support these' (Lavis, 2015, cited in Van Driel et al., 2016). This model is applied to citizenship education specifically, but also to specific themes from sustainable development (Hargreaves, 2008) to well-being (Elfrink et al., 2017).

The benefits are widely accepted. The UK-based Citizenship Foundation has produced an illustration, referencing a whole-school model, of the benefits of citizenship education drawn from their wider research led by David Kerr (⁴):

School:

- Strengthens student voice and participation
- Impacts on student leadership
- Strengthens the school as a community
- Improves behaviour and attitudes
- Raises achievement and motivation

Students:

- Develops key skills of student voice, leadership and teamwork
- Gives them opportunities to take part in decision-making with responsibilities
- Helps them to express views and opinions
- Improves self-confidence and self-esteem
- Enables them to make a positive contribution in and beyond school
- Enhances student achievement
- Better prepares for life as adults.

Wider community:

- Brings civil society into school
- Aids transition between primary and secondary
- Takes the school out into the local community
- Connects with wider communities and civil society beyond school
- Develops young people informed about and willing to participate in community life
- Develops young people with an interest in and opinions about 'big, controversial issues' in society.

Academics widely agree that implementation at school level is likely to be more successful if a whole school approach is embraced, while there is a need for additional research to fully evidence the positive outcomes (Van Driel et al., 2016).

(⁴) From the 2017 resource *Why citizenship education in schools?* developed by David Kerr for The Citizenship Foundation. [Online] <http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/page.php?456> [Accessed 10 May 2017].

Learning beyond the curriculum

The provision of extracurricular learning activities is a core part of the whole-school approach (Kerr et al., 2004). This is the wider opportunity available to students to develop citizenship skills and values in mainly voluntary activities chosen by themselves. These activities may be separately provided by community-based organisations such as NGOs and youth clubs or it may be in collaboration with schools; but they are clearly separate from the formal curriculum.

Learning in the extra-curricular space is often the channel to connecting to the local and international community, through activities that are closely associated with citizenship education like volunteering, sporting or arts activities, projects with local community groups, political activism or international networking. With digital technology, these activities can be based locally and work with the immediate community, while collaborating with partners around the globe.

Extra-curricular learning activities can equally embrace the six characteristics of the formal curriculum outlined earlier in this chapter. Indeed, the non-formal sector is often said to have pioneered effective learning for citizenship education, through the common and long-held ethos to promote citizenship values and social inclusion. As Isaac and colleagues emphasized in 2014 (cited in Van Driel et al., 2016), 'in general student involvement in extracurricular activities organised by the school, in cooperation with the community, is positively related to social movement-related citizenship'. Others have stated that it may be easier to develop citizenship skills such as participation and critical thinking within the less traditional and more flexible extra-curricular environment (Sherrod et al., 2002; Saha, 2001, cited in Keser et al., 2011), and a 1999 European research report found that 'citizenship skills appear to be developed more through extracurricular activities than through the formal curriculum' (European Commission, 2006 – ETGACE Project, 1999). Following this, a number of studies have shown that involvement in extra-curricular citizenship education can be an indicator of increased active citizenship in later years (Smith, 1999; Youniss et al., 1999 and Zaff et al., 2003, cited in Keser et al., 2011), though more research is needed (Keser et al., 2011).

The efficacy of extra-curricular learning is thus not in doubt. However, while formal education has a captive audience, extra-curricular activities do not engage all students, are voluntary and – while efforts are made to widen participation – predictably there is a self-selection bias towards those with an interest in this area (Sliwka, 2006). Therefore, the impact, though perceived to be higher for the individual, may not be as widespread across the whole student population. However, a 2015 European Commission report highlights the increasing overlap and connections between extra-curricular and curricular learning, as more non-formal learning providers enter the formal space and increased recognition is given to learning models delivered outside the curriculum (European Commission, 2015a).

The role and impact of participation in school governance

Participation in the planning and delivery of citizenship education has been identified as a means of embedding a democratic ethos and experience that is integral to developing citizenship among learners. David Kerr and colleagues revealed this in their published results of the Citizenship Longitudinal Study (Kerr et al., 2004), and in later work with the Citizenship Foundation ⁽⁵⁾, Kerr further illustrated the benefits for schools, students and the wider community as seen in Figure 2.1.

⁽⁵⁾ From the resource *Why citizenship education in schools?* developed by David Kerr for The Citizenship Foundation. [Online] <http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/page.php?456> [Accessed 10 May 2017].

Student voice in school governance

This is experiential learning for democracy, and academics have long since acknowledged that democracy is best learned through this type of practical experience (Dewey, 1916; Gutmann, 1987 cited in Thornberg, 2009). Examples of how it is commonly practiced in schools includes class or school level councils usually involving elected student representatives. There may also be student representatives included on the school governing board or a community-wide schools forum. Additional or alternative means of engagement can be through involvement in the extensive network of child and youth parliaments across European countries, offering links to the formal democratic structures at local, regional, national and European level.

These types of forum offer authentic opportunities for student participation and for student voices to be heard, in contrast to the average classroom environment which is teacher-led (Thornberg, 2009). However, there is some difference of opinion regarding how deep this experience can be, with some academics arguing that student participation through class councils can be illusionary in how much impact they can have at school level, and maybe a student forum 'geared primarily to securing a certain commitment on the part of the students to the existing social order' in the school (Denscombe, 1985, quoted in Thornberg, 2009). This may be compounded by a cultural view among teachers that the students are not mature or experienced enough to have a valid viewpoint, or the fixed nature of school decisions and policies which are seen as impervious to change (Thornberg, 2009). As Thornberg (2009) highlights, both students and teachers are influenced by the current and historical contexts of where they live, learn and work. To challenge this is vital, as otherwise student participation cannot be authentic and thus the democratic experience cannot be fully realised in the school environment.

Involving parents

Engaging with the parents and carers of students brings a sense of shared responsibility for the education of the student between educators and parents/carers. There is opportunity for mutual learning; the learning process can be two-directional, and while the school can learn from the perspective of the parent, the parents can also learn about how they can best support their child and be involved in the educational experience. The forums for engaging parents are wide-ranging, from fundraising to supporting homework clubs, from volunteering in the classroom to being involved in school governance. School leadership, as well as policy guidance, plays a large role in embedding the parent's voice at school level, supporting a positive school culture and sense of belonging for all stakeholders (Habbeger, 2008). Engagement in school governance offers a route which can directly influence the decisions being taken with respect to the curriculum, teaching staff or school management. This is about engaging parents in school level decision-making, recognising their influence on the development and performance of the student.

Participation may be influenced by the culture, socio-economic status or ethnicity of the family (Thomas et al., 2009, cited in Keser et al., 2011; Berba et al., cited in Hoskins et al., 2012). Academics have identified broad groups of factors relating to barriers; Van Driel et al. (2016) identified a series of factors within four broad groups of parent/family factors, child-related factors, parent-teacher factors and societal factors. Yet schools and policy-makers strive to overcome these barriers, driven by the strong evidence available of the benefits of engaging parents in the democratic life of the school. Schools, principals and teachers should work in collaboration with parents and recognise them as 'experts about their children and the social environment in which the children are growing up' (Van Driel et al., 2016), thus ensuring their voice is heard through the decision-making processes of school governance.

2.2. Learning citizenship in the classroom


Citizenship education has evolved in recent years, and it now has a higher profile in education and life-long learning policy. A greater importance has also been placed on ensuring that teaching and learning in the classroom is effective. As a result, increased emphasis has been placed on the provision of appropriate guidance on pedagogies as well as on the provision of appropriate materials to support learning on a wide range of topics, including emerging priorities such as anti-radicalisation. As the world changes, so must the learning experiences that students are exposed to inside and outside school. This sub-section seeks to explore whether education authorities provide guidance on teaching and learning citizenship education, and where this is the case, to illustrate how this guidance translates into the pedagogies and practices used in the classroom.

2.2.1. Guidance and support materials for classroom learning

Guidance can play an important role in helping schools and teachers provide high quality learning experiences for their students. It can help educators assess good quality materials through the provision of indicators, or it can direct them to ready-made high quality resources. Guidance can also help educators determine the core content to include in their teaching and indicate which learning activities to use.

There are 33 education systems in Europe which provide guidance for at least one level of education, to support the implementation of citizenship education. Of these, 18 education systems evidenced national guidance at all levels from primary to upper secondary as well as school-based IVET.

Figure 2.1: Guidance materials on citizenship education from top level authorities for primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE fr): Each school has pedagogical freedom, with information and resources available via a government website.

Germany: Nationally, the Standing Conference has made a number of resolutions linked to citizenship education which are binding for all *Länder*. A range of guidance is available from individual *Länder*, as illustrated in the main text for ISCED 1-3.

Spain: More guidance is available at the level of Autonomous Communities.

Bosnia and Herzegovina: While no guidance materials have been produced by national authorities, there are recommended citizenship education manuals from other sources.

National guidance and support materials in the area of citizenship education are most frequently seen at lower secondary level (33 education systems), while 29 education systems provide them at primary level and 30 at upper secondary level. In comparison, only 20 education systems feature such support for school-based IVET level. Where countries provide guidance and support materials at one or more levels of education, they usually apply to general education rather than school-based IVET. Greece is an exception to this, where guidance exists for all levels except upper secondary.

Most of the education systems which provide guidance and support materials on citizenship education do so as part of their national curriculum guidance or as manuals which often give both pedagogical guidance as well as insight into appropriate learning practices or resources ⁽⁶⁾. For example, France has a range of guidance provided at national level, a result of ongoing developments as well as a surge of reforms from 2013 onwards.

In **France**, the *Loi 2013 pour la refondation de l'école de la République* outlines a new programme of civic education, demonstrating a renewed emphasis on citizenship education within the new academic pathway of all students through a 'Citizenship Journey' (*Parcours Citoyen*). Addressing regions, schools, teachers and curriculum, this is supported by a broad selection of guidance and resources hosted on the national Eduscol website.

From 2010-2016 **Cyprus** redeveloped the entire curriculum to include a new subject of 'health education' which has separate thematic units and associated guidance that covers economic, social as well as cultural rights. The country has also introduced new Ministry of Education recommendations to encourage children to participate in workshops or activities with human rights and anti-racism organisations.

Malta links the guidance to specific subjects, and has developed handbooks and educators' guides for pedagogy and assessment for two courses linked to citizenship education, 'personal, social and career development' (PSCD) and 'social studies', relevant for primary, lower secondary and school-based IVET.

Countries also cite ministerial decrees, circulars or acts as the source of the guidance, which tends to be less detailed than that produced by educationalists. In Italy, developments in both 2012 and 2015 have contributed to a more comprehensive range of guidance for schools.

In **Italy**, national guidelines were developed in 2012 to emphasise competence-based citizenship education while in 2015 a more whole-school approach was advocated through a major reform of the national education and training system. The Law no.107 in 2015 provides principles, objectives and guidelines to schools, assigning objectives to schools and underlining their role in citizenship education and the acquisition of social, civic and intercultural competences (knowledge and skills) for all education levels from primary to school-based IVET. Schools have the autonomy to choose how to implement these to reach the goals and learning outcomes expected (e.g. citizenship and social/civic competences, knowledge of the Italian Constitution and other laws and understanding of the European Union Charter of Fundamental Rights.)

In some countries, responsibility for education is not held at national level. While some general guidelines may be provided at national level, more extensive guidance is developed by the top level authorities to support the implementation of citizenship education at school level in their respective education systems.

In **Germany**, there is guidance at national level from the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs, which have issued a number of resolutions related to citizenship education, for example *Strengthening Democracy, Building Intercultural Education, Recommendations for a Culture of Remembrance to form an Object of Historical and Political Education in Schools* and the *Recommendation on the Promotion of Human Rights in Schools*. Guidance is also provided by individual *Länder* such as Saxony-Anhalt, Baden-Württemberg, Hamburg, Berlin and Brandenburg have a joint Education Server and a joint institute for school pedagogy.

In **Spain**, while there is evidence of guidance on specific topics at national level (e.g. resources on love and relationships, there is a wider range of resources evident in Autonomous Communities such as the Cataluña competence framework for social and civic competence as well as pedagogical resources and activities on specific themes such as critical thinking for citizens, education for democracy and understanding ethics. In the Autonomous Community of Galicia, the *Proxecta* programme was launched in 2012/13 to provide financial support for educational innovation to enhance key competence development, particularly interdisciplinary projects, which can include guidance and support for citizenship education.

Countries have developed competence frameworks to support citizenship education, breaking down the social and civic competence into its separate components and either providing associated learning outcomes or providing pedagogical examples of how to develop specific competence areas.

⁽⁶⁾ Examples seen in Ireland, France, Croatia, Italy, Latvia, Hungary, Malta, Austria, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Liechtenstein and Serbia

Cataluña, an Autonomous Community of **Spain**, has produced a guidance document for the education of social and civic values from primary to upper secondary levels. This provides an overview of the suggested methodologies for each of eight competence areas related to citizenship education, with an overview for the skills developed through each competence. It is intended to support schools in developing and implementing an appropriate curriculum for citizenship education.

Austria have developed a *Political Education Competence Model* within citizenship education, outlining concept, method, modelling and decision-making competences, including an overview of each of these competence areas alongside ideas on teaching methods.

In **Switzerland**, the *Guide Education Citoyenneté Mondiale* provides a pedagogical guide for schools and teachers on citizenship and global citizenship relevant to all subjects. This includes an analysis and limited breakdown of the different competence areas important for citizenship education, alongside pedagogical examples to illustrate practical implementation.

National recommendations may include references to guidance produced at European or global level, with UNICEF and the Council of Europe cited by a number of countries including Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Austria and Finland.

Denmark, Germany, Estonia and Austria all provide national recommendations for resources from the Council of Europe, particularly referencing the *Compass: Manual for Human Rights Education with Young People* ⁽⁷⁾.

Finland provides general guidelines with the national core curriculum but indicates a number of national and international resources organisations where support materials are available, including UNICEF and Council of Europe. UNICEF runs a well-established programme of global citizenship education linked to the Sustainable Development Goals, with a focus on the areas of global advocacy and policy dialogue, global measurements of progress, peace and human rights education, preventing violent extremism through education and education about the Holocaust ⁽⁸⁾.

While there are primarily standard approaches to guidance, some education systems have utilised a more tailored approach to address specific issues within a school or to engage specialist knowledge through wider consultation. For example, Belgium (Flemish community) has involved an external network of experts to support citizenship education.

In the **Flemish Community of Belgium**, the education authorities have the support of a range of partners, such as the Educational Network of Islam Experts. This network is made up of volunteer experts who are developing a counter argument against radical Islam. At the request of schools it provides guidance and resources to prevent radicalisation by, for example, steering class conversations on personal beliefs or explaining the norms and values of Islam to both students and teachers.

From 2017 in **Denmark**, the Ministry for Children, Education and Gender Equality has provided tailored guidance to schools by hiring learning consultants, who support schools and municipalities in promoting democracy and citizenship and in preventing radicalisation and extremism at school.

Much guidance is provided online, and 33 education systems identify web-based sources of guidance and support materials (see [Annex 3](#) for a full list) addressing a broad spectrum of themes for citizenship education. The countries that do not indicate any sources of general online guidance recommended by education authorities are Bulgaria, Greece, Luxembourg, Hungary, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland and Serbia. The United Kingdom (England) provides a topic-specific website called 'Educate Against Hate'. Where online guidance is provided, it is of two main types, firstly a dedicated website relating to general citizenship education, and secondly a sub-site or a selection of pages dedicated to citizenship education within a larger website (such as the Ministry of Education or the teacher resources hub).

In the **Netherlands**, there is a dedicated website supporting citizenship education in schools, including special needs schools. This is complemented by a specific and separate web area focused on guidance materials for school-based IVET.

In **Portugal**, there is an area of the Ministry for Education website providing reference documents, guidance and information on thematic areas linked to citizenship education.

⁽⁷⁾ For more information see <http://www.coe.int/en/web/compass>
⁽⁸⁾ For more information see <http://en.unesco.org/qced>

Of the countries that do not provide either published or online support materials on learning in the classroom, the most commonly cited reason is school and teacher autonomy⁽⁹⁾. However, it is interesting to note that some of the countries which are well known for allowing teacher autonomy, such as Finland and Norway, evidence significant guidance on citizenship education at national level, whilst leaving the final choice of pedagogical tools to the individual teachers. Luxembourg is in the process of developing a range of support.

No national guidance is currently provided in **Luxembourg**, though the Ministry of Education has recently created the *Centre for Citizenship Education* whose mission includes to 'develop the concepts associated with citizenship education at national level' and once fully-functional (end of 2017) this centre will provide guidance materials and resources.

In Iceland, there is specific guidance at two levels, and beyond this the national curriculum includes themes and attributes closely associated with citizenship education for all levels.

In **Iceland**, the six fundamental pillars of education within the national curriculum include literacy, sustainability, democracy and human rights, equality, health and welfare and creativity. This includes, among other things, emphasis on ethics, social and civil consciousness and social competence which align to the aims of citizenship education.

Of the nine countries not providing broad guidance for citizenship education, some do provide support on specific topics or sub-themes within citizenship education (this more specific information is not illustrated in Figure 2.1). For example, Belgium (German-speaking Community) references a specific guide for media literacy as well as highlighting curriculum frameworks that include elements of citizenship education. The United Kingdom (England) supports a website addressing the specific theme of 'Educate against Hate'.

Many countries provide support materials or make non-binding recommendations to include particular events at school level such the commemoration of specific days with national, European or global significance. Twenty-three⁽¹⁰⁾ provide information for schools to support events marking national days, while 21 education systems⁽¹¹⁾ state that there are recommendations on specific international days such as International Human Rights Day or International Women's Day. Commemorating such days may be linked to specific curriculum areas or may form part of a wider whole-school approach to citizenship education. It can provide a simple starting point to engage the whole school in a citizenship education related activity.

In **Austria**, *polis* – the national centre for citizenship education provides a list of different international days alongside web resources on how to address the topic in the classroom e.g. 'World Refugee Day' on 20 June. There are also monthly information sheets on citizenship education published by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education on the Politik Lernen website that regularly address national and international days with relevance to citizenship education.

Portugal promotes a wide selection of national and international days at all levels of primary, secondary and school-based IVET. Information is provided on the Ministry of Education website, and includes a diverse mix of days such as *National Children's Day*, *European Day of Languages*, *European Day for Child Protection Against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse* and the *International Day in Memory of the Victims of the Holocaust*.

In **Norway**, the National Curriculum for 'social studies' at primary school (years 1-4) provides guidance on the learning objectives to be achieved, these include learning about why and how Norway celebrates specific national days including the Norwegian Constitution day (17 May) and the national holiday for Sami people (6 February), as well as national holidays in some other countries. Teaching methodology or how learning should take place is not prescribed through the National Curriculum, in line with Norway's emphasis on teacher autonomy.

⁽⁹⁾ Belgium (the three Communities), Denmark, Luxembourg, United Kingdom (England and Scotland), Bosnia and Herzegovina and former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

⁽¹⁰⁾ Belgium (French Community), Bulgaria, Germany, Ireland, Greece, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Montenegro, Norway and Turkey

⁽¹¹⁾ Belgium (French Community), Bulgaria, Ireland, Greece, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey

2.2.2. Effective learning practices

Citizenship education is about engaging and inspiring students to explore an inclusive understanding of citizenship within an increasingly globalised world. At its very basic level, it is a process through which students can develop knowledge of democratic structures within their society. At its best, citizenship education is a transformative learning process, empowering young people to become active and responsible citizens contributing to a tolerant, just and democratic society.

As indicated in section 2.1, modern citizenship education should create engaging and interactive learning environments and use innovative pedagogies to develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes young people need to become active citizens. Teaching should be delivered in a supportive, open-minded and non-judgemental learning environment. This is education for modern life.

The most successful examples of citizenship education feature all or many of the six characteristics of effective practice. Developed by the Citizenship Foundation and as highlighted in the literature review (see Section 2.1), these characteristics guide pedagogy and inspire quality.

- Active: emphasises learning by doing;
- Interactive: uses discussion and debate;
- Relevant: focuses on real-life issues facing young people and society;
- Critical: encourages young people to think for themselves;
- Collaborative: employs group work and cooperative learning;
- Participative: gives young people a say in their own learning.

These characteristics can be seen in a range of practices evidenced across European countries and regions. The following analysis is based on country examples provided for this report that demonstrate a link to these characteristics. It is not intended to be an exhaustive study of practices in all countries. The links to the national websites are available on line in the [Annex 3](#).

Active learning

Active learning is an overarching pedagogy that more directly involves students, asking them to engage, participate and collaborate with others to think, act and reflect. Simpler examples of active learning can be small group discussion, role play, problem solving tasks or project-based. More developed approaches may evidence opportunities for the student to learn by doing through practical experiences linked to citizenship education objectives.

Project based learning is illustrated across a number of education systems.

In the **German-speaking Community of Belgium**, project based learning linked to citizenship education has been offered since 2010, while an *Action Plan on Intercultural and Religious Dialogue* was launched for the 2016/17 school year. This action plan focuses on active learning, asking schools to develop a programme of visits, projects and initiatives, and all students can participate in a competition. An Opportunities Marketplace will be held to present the students' ideas, activities and results.

In **Ireland**, the main learning activity linked to citizenship education is a student-led action research project. Students are expected to engage directly with themes or issues and contact individuals or organisations that are involved with politics, human rights, cultural diversity or sustainable development. They gather information about the organisation itself and ideas about what actions they themselves could take and then plan and initiate a citizenship action at local, national or international level. This might be a form of action agreed with the organisation or a new initiative. They are expected to justify the action they have chosen as compared to available alternatives.

In France, this is part of a clearly defined learning pathway, offering student different types of active learning at all levels from primary school right up to school-based IVET.

In **France**, the *Parcours Citoyen* is the citizenship education learning pathway that spans from primary through to school-based IVET. Active learning is evidenced through the option to develop multidisciplinary projects as part of the *Parcours Citoyen* at IVET level, where professional projects may be linked to citizenship education and include learning outcomes such as autonomy, sense of responsibility and commitment. This will be expanded as specific interdisciplinary practical lessons are gradually introduced at all levels from 2016/17.

Innovative experiential learning in Finland offers learners the chance to role-play in a simulated physical environment.

In **Finland**, the *Me & My City* learning environment is a physical place set up as a micro-city with all the associated functions, and is used by approximately 80% of all sixth graders in lower secondary. It allows young people to experience being a consumer, citizen and worker within this micro-society environment. This active learning concept includes teacher training, learning materials for ten lessons and a day-long visit to a *Me & MyCity* learning environment. The themes of the lessons help the students to discover and understand their own role in *Me & MyCity* as workers, consumers and members of the community.

Role-play can also take place in a classroom environment, such as simulations in a safe environment or asking students to imagine the perspectives of different people within society.

In the **German-speaking Community of Belgium**, the Parliament promotes a role play workshop (also used by organisations across Europe) called *Democracy*. This happens in primary school, where 10-12 year old students have to create and organise a virtual city and realise the responsibilities, opportunities and difficulties of politics.

Interactive learning

Interactive learning through discussion and debate offers students an opportunity to develop their understanding of others, their ability to express their views and experience in negotiating conflicting opinions through discussion and debate.

At primary level in **France**, children at grade 5 follow a theme called 'Heros', in which they discover a series of heros and heroines and critically explore the qualities and values that characterise them.

In **Cyprus**, an innovative learning guide called 'Discovering the Elephant' has been developed by the Ministry of Education and Culture, providing guidance and activities to support discussion and debate around themes such as diversity (including intercultural diversity), acceptance of others. Difficult issues such as euthanasia for animals, non-typical families, drugs or smoking may also be addressed.

In **Austria**, the Political Education Competence Model highlights debating as a learning activity and has a network of debating clubs within schools.

In **Romania**, a suggested learning activity within the lower secondary 'civic culture' course is debating about highly publicised cases of human rights infringement and other controversial subjects. Guidance emphasises that this is relevant from primary level through to older age-groups.

Debating as a learning activity lends itself to being developed and profiled as a valuable learning experience at national level.

In the **Netherlands**, the National School Debate Foundation organises debates between school teams on topical issues related to economics, politics, philosophy and society. The debates can also be an integral part of curriculum, developing students' skills in arguing a case, public speaking, leadership and citizenship.

Relevant learning

Many education systems emphasise the central role of citizenship education in providing a focus on current affairs and societal issues. This is about learning about real issues relevant to students' personal and social lives, including controversial issues which may be difficult to discuss. Peer to peer

learning or pedagogies that focus on breaking down barriers between social groups may feature here, addressing, for example, issues that are of particular importance to certain regions such as the division between religious communities in Northern Ireland.

In **Cyprus**, for 2015-16, the Ministry of Education and Culture set the development of an anti-racist policy as a goal for all schools under the title 'Raising students' awareness of racism and intolerance, and promoting equality and respect in the context of the 'No Hate Speech Movement of the Council of Europe'.

In **Finland**, KiVa is a national anti-bullying programme for Finnish schools. Through peer mediation – a solution oriented and voluntary method – student mediators help the different parties of the conflict to find their own solution to the conflict and thus change their behaviour.

In the **United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)**, 'Shared Education' has been developed in the context of an education system which has mirrored the historical divisions in the Northern Ireland society. The shared education policy offers a range of opportunities for children and young people from different community backgrounds to learn together so creating a more inclusive society, encouraging community cohesion and making effective use of resources and expertise.

The principle of relevance is also applied to European and global citizenship issues, ensuring that both knowledge and skills are developed to enable young people to take their place as citizens of the world beyond their country's borders.

In **Ireland**, the *Blue Star Programme* has been in place since 2011/12, with approximately 16 350 children participating in 2015/16. Students carry out projects in relation to four key elements: the foundation and development of the European Union; the cultural and linguistic diversity of Europe; what the European Union does and how its work affects the lives of citizens.

Supporting teachers to make learning relevant is vital, and in France, they have established a pool of volunteers to work alongside teachers and add their real life experiences.

In **France**, the *Loi 2013 pour la refondation de l'école de la République* outlines a new programme of civic education and new education actions for a 'Citizenship Journey' (*Parcours Citoyen*). This includes an initiative to recruit a *Citizen Reserve of National Education* of over 4 000 motivated civil society volunteers, including parents, to work alongside teachers to share and develop French Republican values and citizenship education with students in curricular and extra-curricular activities.

Critical learning

Critical thinking and analysis is prevalent in citizenship learning across countries and is communicated through topics such as media literacy, which is increasing in importance in the face of an increasing number of news and information providers and an increasingly complex media environment. This is about encouraging young people to think for themselves, not taking information at face-value and encouraging them to review what they find with a critical ear, eye and mind.

Denmark introduced a new curriculum to the *Folkeskole* in 2015/16 which simplifies the Common Objectives issued in 2009 and increases the focus on citizenship, human rights and activities. Critical thinking is now an explicit learning objective following this reform.

In **Latvia**, *7 Stories About Us* is a series of short films addressing age, sex, race, sexual orientation, ethnicity and religious affiliation. Available in Latvian, English and Russian, the films are based on real cases of discrimination and designed to both provoke critical thinking and encourage students to think about their own attitudes to themselves and others.

Collaborative learning

Collaborative activities ensure that students learn to interact with both peers and external partners, encouraging an openness to listen to, work with and learn from others through employs group work and co-operative learning. Examples can include working together on developing school media projects such as radio or newspapers, or interaction developed through team-based entrepreneurship education activities where groups are working together to implement a common idea or vision.

In the **German-speaking Community of Belgium**, the *Kultur macht Schule* project promotes collaboration between schools and the cultural sector. Each year, schools can put forward proposals for collaborative projects between the school and previously selected actors within the arts of cultural sectors. There are seven categories featuring 39 different arts or cultural organisations for schools to apply for: performing arts, media literacy, fine arts, museum pedagogy, interdisciplinary projects, music, and, since 2016, literature.

In **Greece**, students and teachers can access the online 'School Press' service. Implemented using open source via WordPress, this service enriches the normal teaching process through the use of group collaborative tools or publishing the outcomes of group activities. Students are encouraged to express themselves and, since the 2014 launch, about 1 045 electronic magazines and 15 564 articles have been published.

In **Austria**, 'Sparkling Science' is a programme aiming to promote students being actively involved in the scientific research process. Scientists are supported by students in their scientific work and in making their joint research results accessible to the public. Cooperation can take the form of jointly conceived subject-specific project work qualification projects, or be within the framework of cross-curricular school projects. The aim is to improve the interface between school and university, and is open to the social sciences and natural sciences.

Participative learning

Finally, participative activity is often seen as the most challenging to introduce and implement because it is both learner-directed and experiential, and may be intrinsically linked to a whole-school approach to participation. This is also about learners as active participants in the design and delivery of their own learning experience, such as project based learning that is learner centred offering the opportunity to address a topic linked to their own interests, choose their own channels of research and discovery, present findings in innovative ways and is not teacher-directed towards a specific type or theme of outcome.

In **Finland**, the whole school approach means that the schools whole culture and practices are being developed on the basis of democratic governance. There are three principles of the approach: a learning community at the heart of the school culture encouraging all of its members to learn; interaction and versatile working approach recognizing the diversity of learning; and participation and democratic action constructing its operating and learning methods together. Both classroom and school-based participative learning opportunities are integral to this approach.

In the **United Kingdom**, Wales introduced changes in 2015 to the national Welsh Baccalaureate qualification to ensure a more learner-led ethos to this skills-based qualification delivered for 14 to 19 year olds across lower secondary, upper secondary and school-based IVET. This qualification asks the learner to complete four skills challenge certificates – an Enterprise Challenge, a Community Challenge, a Global Citizenship Challenge and an individual project. While this is essentially a project-based learning methodology, the learner can self-direct the specific theme (either individually or working within a team), make choices about researching and producing the work required and decide on the final product or evidence to be assessed, within an established challenge brief structure agreed by examination boards.

Beyond project based learning, there are only a few examples showing evidence of students being able to direct their own learning within the curriculum. At macro level, students can influence the content of learning through acting as advisors to those designing curriculum content.

In **Lithuania**, the general secondary education organisation plans stipulate that student representatives must be present when preparing the school education and development plans (the main document which regulates the process of education and development in schools), offering students some opportunity to influence this process though this may not allow the learners to direct their own learning.

Other examples include community volunteering which can be accredited as part of the curriculum in the Netherlands, a choice that is made at school-level. Participatory approaches are highlighted within the Paris Declaration as a dimension of learning which should be student centred and promoted from the earliest age, and the relative lack of evidence in this report indicates that more work is needed in this area to deliver meaningful student-led learning experiences which demonstrate student participation in the design of learning approaches as part of curriculum.

2.2.3. The whole-school approach

Alongside these effective learning practices, research shows the need for a supportive school environment for the implementation and/or promotion of citizenship education (UNESCO, 1998). The whole-school culture and approach to citizenship education can be an important factor in successfully implementing the subject at class level and thereby have a positive impact on individual learners. Research shows that there is also a myriad of benefits at school level from a stronger community feeling and sense of belonging within the school to improved behaviour and attitudes leading to increased student engagement and motivation. The whole-school approach can also take the school into the wider community, to break down barriers and connect young people to community life; the school head plays an important role in developing and defining this approach (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a). The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study carried out by the National Foundation for Education Research between 2001-2010 in the United Kingdom evidences that effective citizenship education requires a whole-school ethos, where school leaders support and promote the subject, with a clear and coherent understanding of what this means for the classroom and for the school. The whole-school approach is an opportunity for students to see and experience the democratic voice and active citizenship in action, but it can only have an impact if it has committed support at school level (see also European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice 2012a, section 3.1).

The whole-school approach may be promoted by education authorities in different ways. In Italy, this approach is recommended in national legislation, while the education authority in Hamburg (Germany) has led the development of quality criteria to guide development centred on education for democracy.

In the Hamburg region of **Germany**, the quality criteria for the development of democratic education schools are presented in a catalogue on the *Characteristics of Schools who promote Democratic Education*. Building on four guiding concepts of Learning, Participation, Conduct and Support, the quality criteria aim to improve the quality of democratic education in schools through guidance on school culture, leadership and management, teacher professional development, learning culture and results. It draws on the results of the now completed Learning and Living Democracy programme (*Demokratie lernen & leben programm*) developed by the Federal Government, the *Länder* and NGOs, in collaboration with teacher training institutions in the federal states of Berlin, Brandenburg, Hamburg, Saxony, Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia.

In **Italy**, whole-school approaches are encouraged through Law No. 107 of 13 July 2015, to promote a cohesive, collective and collaborative school model. Each school is free to establish cooperation with families, local communities and different stakeholders, including public authorities, businesses, NGOs and communities. The intention is to better target educational provision and services to local needs and circumstances, and to foster the active participation of students in society.

It is important to recognise the value of such approaches. Estonia and Lithuania are actively seeking ways to show the value of schools that strive for more than just academic achievement, linking strongly to the whole-school approach to citizenship education.

Established by **Estonia** in 2012, with **Lithuania** adopting the concept in 2015, the *The Good School Model* aims to reflect the wider outcomes of school education beyond league tables based on academic achievement, in line with the priority placed by the Estonian national curriculum on character building. This is about developing whole-school evaluation approaches. It seeks to allow schools to demonstrate their whole-school efforts to place importance on values and skills, and to bring together the different actors involved in supporting students' personal and social development. Eighty-seven Estonian experts are involved in the design process for the model, including educational researchers, school principals, teachers, union representatives as well as local councils and the Ministry for Education and Research.


The lived experience tends to be one of the most powerful influences on young people's attitudes towards citizenship, and learning to be an active citizen within the school environment is an important factor in the equation, alongside the influences of family, peers and neighbourhood.

2.3. Learning citizenship beyond the curriculum

A broader perspective of citizenship education sees the integration of extra-curricular learning as part of a comprehensive approach embracing both curricular and extra-curricular approaches. Extra-curricular activity can allow a more student-led learning process not directly linked to national curriculum learning objectives, and may provide additional student-led choice in countries with more rigid curriculum frameworks. These activities can also provide the means to engage flexibly with community and national organisations linked to citizenship education, as national programmes for extra-curricular learning may be linked to NGOs or community organisations.


This section will present firstly an overview of the national recommendations for extra-curricular activities, particularly the types of activity which are recommended through these routes.

Figure 2.2a: Top level recommendations for extra-curricular activities in primary and lower secondary education (ISCED 1-2), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Figure 2.2b: Top level recommendations for extra-curricular activities in upper secondary education (ISCED 3) and school-based IVET, 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note for Figures 2.2a and 2.2b

Only activities which have a citizenship-related dimension are included

Environmental activities: e.g. education for sustainable development.

Sports activities: e.g. promoting peace and/or social inclusion.

Arts activities: e.g. promoting intercultural dialogue and/or media literacy.

International networking: e.g. via foreign exchanges or online networks.

Political life: e.g. visits to political institutions, youth parliaments or participation in elections.

Voluntary work: e.g. with community-based organisations.

Other: e.g. other types of extra-curricular activities.

Country-specific notes for Figures 2.2a and 2.2b

Czech Republic: Schools at all levels have the autonomy to create their educational programme.

Denmark: Lesson plans and themes are chosen by teachers, however citizenship education resources and inspiration are provided through the EMU.dk education website.

Germany: Recommendations have been made by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs.

Spain: Numerous examples also exist at the Autonomous Community level, such as those in Castilla-La Mancha, Cataluña, Cantabria, Galicia and Extremadura. There are national recommendations for arts activities.

Slovenia: Schools are required to provide extra-curricular activities but have the autonomy to determine the content of extra-curricular activities according to national guidelines.

This is followed by an insight into the types of national programmes that have been set up to encourage extra-curricular activities. A national programme for extra-curricular activities is deemed to be a programme either initiated or recommended by and at least partially funded by top level education authorities, and accessible to a large proportion of the relevant geographic area.

Thirteen education systems do not provide recommendations on extra-curricular activities at any level, although this may not mean that such activities do not take place. Belgium (French Community) confirms school autonomy as the specific reason for no national recommendations, and Ireland also cites the same reason for a lack addressing upper secondary and IVET. Luxembourg confirms that while no guidance exists there are examples of activities happening across the country. Similarly, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia highlights a small number of activities linked to education for democracy (meeting politicians or visits to government bodies) but there are no recommendations supporting these. However, most countries state that it is for schools to decide i.e. school autonomy, including Hungary, Sweden, Switzerland and Norway. Interestingly, Iceland does provide national guidance in the form of one extra-curricular programme on environmental awareness but otherwise it encourages school autonomy in the matter.

The **Czech Republic** does not provide any national recommendations for extra-curricular activities, but it does signpost to relevant documents. In 2007, the government developed a document titled *Methodology to support the creation of school curriculum in school facilities for extra-curricular [leisure] education*, and while this has no direct reference to citizenship education it does emphasise the role of the school in providing leisure activities i.e. extra-curricular learning for students. In the State Programme of Environmental Education and Awareness Raising 2016-2025, the government addresses the need for both curricular and extra-curricular activities to be developed linked to environmental themes such as the support and development of environment centres linked to schools and as school facilities (measure 1.1.4).

Denmark states that engagement with the community and extra-curricular activity is part of the daily lives of young people, through the responsibility of the primary and lower secondary schools to cooperate with the local community as an integral part of school life. Therefore, the government does not see the need to provide regulations or guidance in this area.

In the **United Kingdom**, Scotland does not provide national guidance, but indicates that most schools will offer upper secondary students the opportunity of volunteering or work experience.

Twenty-eight of the education systems surveyed do provide recommendations on extra-curricular activities. However, these are more likely to apply from lower secondary education up to IVET, rather than to primary level. Of the various types of activity identified in the survey, environmental awareness was the one most commonly referred to – by 23 education systems at at least one level (from 19 at IVET level up to 22 at lower secondary). Closely behind this were activities related to political life, with 23 education systems highlighting this at upper secondary level, though only 13 did so at primary level.

There are numerous examples of activities provided by countries, illustrating interesting and inspiring practice. Extra-curricular activities tend to be more student-led rather than directed, with an emphasis on learning by doing. Environmental activities include a range of projects with different partners at both global and national level, from COP21 projects linked to United Nations priorities to Erasmus+ projects with diverse partners.

In **Greece**, Sameworld is a global environmental citizenship project aiming to provide learning activities around the topics of Environmental Justice, Climate Change and Environmental Migrants. It is funded by Erasmus+ and involves partners from ten EU countries and associates from a number of African countries.

Across **Europe**, Ecoschools is an international environmental education programme dedicated to building networks of schools that engage students in environmental projects. Malta, all the UK countries and Iceland have cited this initiative.

Let's do it! is an environmental protection initiative in **Lithuania** designed to bring together students and the community to preserve the environment, by clearing rubbish from outdoor areas and re-foresting areas which have been degraded. Most schools are part of the network.

At **global level**, International Earth Day is a celebration event encouraging practical learning through educational projects focusing on the environment and ecology (highlighted by **Poland**).

Sporting activities across Europe can provide valuable channels to bring diverse groups together to collaborate in teams or through a common interest in sports.

In **Malta**, SportMalta provides extra-curricular sporting activities as an important tool for health and wellbeing, social integration and gender equity.

In **Austria**, Peace run/Friedenslauf is a 'kidsrunforkids' project where funds are raised for aid projects. It is organised by different institutions and supported by the Federal Ministry of Education.

Arts and cultural activities can be used for intercultural dialogue and media literacy.

Greece highlights the global UNESCO AspNet, which is a global network of schools involved in citizenship education with over 2 500 participating schools across Europe. The network provides study themes and resources linked to citizenship education priorities such as Education for sustainable development, peace and human rights and intercultural learning.

In **Spain**, there are opportunities for extra-curricular arts activities linked to awareness of and work with the Roma Community through the Gitanos Association.

France holds a *Press and Media Week* to support work on media literacy, with over 200 000 students participating each year in schools, with the aim of developing their understanding of the media and how it works, building critical thinking and analysis skills, and shaping their own opinions as citizens.

In **France**, the *Chemins de Mémoire* project offers intergenerational learning through a cultural project linked to remembrance and building a common understanding.

In **Portugal**, there is the *Tic Toc na Escola do Futuro* project which offers integrated learning involving digital and artistic languages using the interactive CD-Rom educational resource '31 Images for Discovery' about works of art and the stories behind them.

International networking across Europe fosters intercultural understanding through building bridges between individuals, teachers and schools from diverse countries and backgrounds:

Erasmus+ offers international networking through mobility opportunities for schools and partnership projects (Key Actions 1 and 2, available to all countries in Europe and particularly highlighted by the Czech Republic, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia and Lithuania.

E-twinning is available to schools offering an online community to connect teachers and schools, particularly highlighted by the Czech Republic, Greece and Slovenia as a resource for citizenship education.

Political life is about making young people aware of and engaging them into political issues, processes and structures. This can be through debating and dialogue activities, as well as via the many student councils and parliament structures across Europe.

Lithuania highlighted international youth debates between young people from central and eastern European countries. These can offer a valuable route to building critical thinking and analysis, through interactive learning opportunities.

Austria provided a few examples such as of Structured Dialogue for Youth, a European wide initiative to systematically involve the views of young people into political discussions at national level. The *Democracy Workshop* is an activity offered by the Austrian Parliament, offering workshops and guided tours for students. Emphasis is also placed on the Youth Parliament as an extra-curricular activity for young people to experience politics first-hand, talking to politicians and expressing their opinions on political topics. From 2015, this also included a parliament for apprentices.

In **Switzerland**, *Easyvote* is a simple voting tool which can be used in any environment to foster political participation among young people.

Campus Demokratie is an initiative in **Switzerland** which is a platform for bringing together representatives of citizenship education organisations and political organisations, to build effective extra-curricular activities for young people so they can develop their skills through active participation.

Volunteering in the community can offer rewarding experiences, building knowledge (such as of environmental issues), intergenerational connections or simply an awareness of the challenges facing different parts of the community.

In the **Netherlands**, the Society Internship is the chance for students to volunteer in the community. This can also form part of their school learning, although it is no longer compulsory at national level but considered a best practice.

Cutting across curricular and extra-curricular learning, **Hungary** has introduced a compulsory School Community Service programme in the 2011 Act on National Education. From 1 January 2016, proof of performance in this programme (i.e. 50 hours of community service) is a condition of obtaining the school leaving certificate. The aim is to raise social awareness, improve the self-confidence and competences of students, with an opportunity for career guidance. The Eszterházy Károly University Hungarian Institute for Educational Research and Development coordinates the programme, sharing guidelines, practice examples and a partner search facility via a dedicated website, and organises accredited training courses for teachers. The student can propose their own choice of volunteering organisation, from eight domains including healthcare, social services and charity, education, culture, accident presentation and crime, environment, disaster recovery or organisations supporting individuals with specific needs.

In the **United Kingdom (Scotland)**, the Duke of Edinburgh's award programme is a widely available youth achievement award for 14- to 24-year-olds, aimed at fostering social and employability skills. It involves sport (outdoor activities such as hiking), volunteering, team-work and skills development. While the programme is active across the UK, in Scotland it is directly supported by the national education authority.

A number of countries highlight entrepreneurship education as an active form of learning which builds skills and attitudes linked to citizenship education ⁽¹²⁾. Organisations such as Young Social Innovators in Ireland or Policy Experimentation and Evaluation Platform in Portugal offer diverse entrepreneurial learning opportunities, allowing young people to engage in creating value for others through themes such as social innovation or environmental focused challenges. These can be directly correlated to both citizenship education knowledge and skills, linking directly to social and civic competences and offering an active learning-by-doing opportunity that is both collaborative and directed by learners. Three countries (German-speaking Community of Belgium, Estonia and Cyprus) emphasise their work with Junior Achievement as a useful methodology for the development of skills associated with citizenship education such as critical thinking, ethical thinking and working with others, and there is often the opportunity to run a business with a social aim within this activity.

⁽¹²⁾ See EntreComp: European Reference Framework for the Entrepreneurship Competence <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/publication/eur-scientific-and-technical-research-reports/entrecomp-entrepreneurship-competence-framework>

2.3.1. National programmes supporting extra-curricular activities

Governments also establish national programmes to drive forward citizenship education. A national programme is deemed to be either initiated or recommended by and at least partially funded by top level education authorities, to provide learning activities accessible to the majority of students in their respective education systems. The main drivers behind these programmes are the development of the skills and attitudes associated with the social and civic competences that are central to citizenship education. They may be based around different themes, aligning to country priorities or around existing partnerships at national level.

Of the 42 education systems surveyed, 27 provide national programmes of extra-curricular activities. It can be clearly seen from Figure 2.4 that these programmes mainly occur in western, central and southern Europe, with the Nordic countries and the south-eastern European region notably absent. In south-east Europe, this may be because structures that could help develop the partnerships needed to implement programmes at national level are relatively undeveloped in some countries. Nordic countries cite school autonomy as the reason for the absence of national level partnerships, which is in line with the tradition of a flexible curriculum and devolved educational decision-making.

Other education systems do provide a support structure through the development of national programmes to help and guide citizenship education in schools. A full list of national programmes evidenced can be seen in [Annex 4](#) available on line.

A new programme has been introduced in the United Kingdom (England) in 2011 and the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) in 2012, to support active citizenship and skills development:

In the **United Kingdom (England and Northern Ireland)**, the National Citizen Service is aimed at bringing together young people aged 15 to 17 from different backgrounds to help them develop greater confidence, self-awareness and responsibility. This is with a view to creating a more cohesive, responsible and engaged society. The programme takes place outside term time for approximately three weeks and has three phases. The first phase consists of a residential course of outdoor adventure activities, the second of a residential self-discovery programme using team activity to build leadership and communication skills and the third phase consists of group work to plan and deliver a social action project. There is a small charge to the young person, with the government supporting the additional cost of the programme. The National Citizen Service Act 2017 put the programme on a statutory footing in England and strengthened accountability arrangements.

Elsewhere, programmes and partnerships are linked to different themes and address more diverse audiences:

In **Germany**, the Federal Government runs a Youth Debates competition which aims to encourage young people to actively participate in discussions and contribute to shaping the democratic process. Competitions begin at local level through school networks and culminates in a national final hosted by the Federal President of Germany who is patron of the competition. Debates address current political or social issues, and the evaluation criteria are: expertise, verbal communication abilities, discussion skills, persuasive power.


In **Estonia**, the youth programme *Tugila* provides activities that are targeted at empowering young people who are not currently in education, employment or training (NEETs). This is part of the wider *Estonian Youth Guarantee National Action Plan*, supporting young people in need, who may have been made redundant or have not completed their education and are not currently studying. The programme assists them in realising their potential and becoming a productive member of society as quickly as possible, raising their confidence and self-esteem.

In **Malta**, the government supports environmental awareness through the national *EkoSkola Malta* programme and partnership providing children with the opportunity to get involved in education for sustainable development as an extra-curricular activity. This fosters an understanding of the environment necessary for a small tourism driven economy, alongside building the skills and attitudes associated with active and responsible citizens.

Romania has a National Strategy of Community Action which is an extra-curricular educational programme to promote social cohesion by connecting high schools with link organisations that work with children who have specific needs. Link organisations

include special schools, supported housing programmes, day centres or hospitals. The programme aims to build young people's understanding of diverse social groups and their specific needs, broadening the life experiences of young people whose life experience is significantly different.

Figure 2.3: National programmes supporting extra-curricular activities, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

A national programme is deemed to be one that is either delivered by or at least partially funded by top level authorities to provide learning activities accessible to a large proportion of students in the relevant geographic area.

Country-specific notes

Spain: Programmes exist at Autonomous Community level.

Switzerland: At national level, the law on fostering extra-curricular activities for children and young people allows national funding of projects such as those run by the Cantons, communities or non-governmental organisations at national level.

Serbia: There are no official national programmes to support extra-curricular activities; however, schools are free to implement projects with NGOs that encourage learning and the application of human rights activism in and out of school.

2.4. Participation in school governance to support citizenship education


Schools are a central part of their communities, and citizenship education is an educational priority that spans the local, regional, national and global context. When students and their parents/carers are part of the democratic process at school level, it sends a strong message about democracy and inclusion in the school as a whole.

2.4.1. Student participation in school governance

Student participation is an essential component in ensuring the 'student voice' is heard within decision making at school level as well as providing all students with practical experience of the democratic process. A school-level student council is a structure that can support this, bringing together student representatives as advisors or exponents of school level issues and decisions. While schools may not always have to or choose to abide by their student council proposals and decisions, it can offer an important amplifier for an authentic student voice to be heard within school governance.

There is a general trend of more countries evidencing recommendations for student engagement since the 2012 study ⁽¹³⁾. In the 2016/17 study, 39 of the 42 countries surveyed confirm that student councils are used at one or more levels of education. Of the five education systems newly included in the 2016/17 survey ⁽¹⁴⁾, all evidence student councils for at least two levels of education. These results emphasise the normalisation of this structure, supporting democratic participation of students in schools across Europe. However, recommendations on this area of school-level activity are not equal across the different levels of education. Sweden and Austria are the only countries to emphasise school autonomy at all levels and not have any national recommendations. In both Austria and Sweden student councils are common forms of student involvement and students' right to be part of a student council or similar is protected by national education acts. In Slovenia, primary and lower secondary levels have school autonomy in how they organise student participation (traditionally they form student councils through parliaments), while there are national regulations for upper secondary and IVET.

Figure 2.4: Student engagement in student councils according to top level regulations and recommendations at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

Student councils are student led bodies that provide a forum for discussion on topics related to school life, and may provide advice or recommendations to the school governing bodies who are responsible for taking decisions at school-level.

Country-specific notes for Figures 2.4a and 2.4b

Belgium (BE de): Schools have the autonomy with respect to the role of their student council.

Belgium (BE nl): Primary school students also have the right to establish a student council if at least 10 % of students request this.

Czech Republic: Students are entitled to establish self-governing bodies within the school. However, the establishment of student councils is not regulated centrally and falls within the scope of school autonomy.

Germany: Student participation in student councils is governed by the Education Acts of each Land, recognising the basic right of each student to participate.

Greece: For general secondary and IVET, it is compulsory for every school to have a student community (i.e. general assembly and councils) to support student participation,

Spain: Numerous examples exist at Autonomous Community level e.g. Castilla-La Mancha, Cataluña and Cantabria, although there is no specific national level requirement for student participation in school governance.

Austria: It is up to individual schools on whether student councils are established, however the School Education Act allows for class representatives and student representatives in school governing bodies applicable to ISCED 2 and 3.

Sweden: Student councils are common forms of student involvement in Sweden and the student right to be part of a student council or similar is protected by the Swedish Education Act.

⁽¹³⁾ See Citizenship Education in Europe (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a), Figure 2.2 on page 41.

⁽¹⁴⁾ New countries included in this 2017 study, since the previous version of the study in 2012, are Bosnia and Herzegovina, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia.

Twenty-three countries now evidence recommendations across all levels of education. When looking across the different levels of education it is easy to see that lower and upper secondary feature slightly more prominently with more recommendations for student councils. Interestingly however, a marked change has taken place at primary level since 2012. While in 2012 only 16 education systems indicated student councils at primary level, this has now increased to 28. This additional activity is taking place in diverse countries across Europe, and includes countries that traditionally place significant emphasis on the autonomy of the school to make decisions locally. The overall increase reflects a positive and important step to include even younger children in the democratic process and to embed this experience into their school life from a very young age, though many countries still do not have recommendations and primary level has the fewest countries overall making recommendations on student participation.

Student participation is less pronounced in school-based IVET (30 education systems) than in lower and upper secondary education (37 and 38 education systems respectively), and attention should be paid to this. Student councils are important channels through which democracy is experienced and the student voice should be expressed in all levels of education and all pathways.

Some countries have implemented significant reforms in this area since 2012.

In **Bulgaria**, the 2015 Law on Pre-School and School Education extended the recommendations on student councils to cover primary schools and introduced the right for student representatives to participate, although without voting rights, in the school board which leads decision-making on key pedagogical decisions within the school.

In **Denmark**, a 2014 reform for the Danish Folkeskole allowed students to have greater influence on their school day, extending student involvement to additional areas of school life such as the selection of optional subjects.

Ireland now includes recommendations on student councils for primary level as well as all other levels of education. This is linked to the 2016 Parent and Student Charter Bill, which, among other provisions, includes requirements for every school to consult with and gain feedback from parents and students.

In **France**, as a result of the *Loi 2013 pour la refondation de l'école de la République*, and since the beginning of 2016 there has been a requirement for each college to have a Council of College Life (*Conseils de la vie collégienne*) as places of learning for democracy. These are elected student councils at lower secondary level with a range of responsibilities, for example they may be involved in the school media that each college is required to develop, such as radio, newspaper, blog or online collaborative platform.

In **Latvia**, Guidelines on Value Education and Evaluation Procedure of Information, Teaching Aids, and Teaching and Education Methods were introduced in 2016. These regulations are focused on strengthening value education in response to the Paris Declaration in 2015, to request schools to provide representation and participation of students in decision making, including through the work of students' self-governing bodies. Students are now entitled to organize their own activities (events) on issues of value education such as family, freedom, dignity or related themes.

In **Finland**, student council activities have become a compulsory part of primary and lower secondary (basic education), as well as upper secondary and school-based IVET, through amendments to the Basic Education Act in 2013. Activities are decided locally and organised according to students' ages and situation and take into account the local context.

Youth policy or strategy may drive the development of student participation.

One of the four main objectives set in the Strategy for Education Policy in the **Czech Republic** is the pursuit of active citizenship. The strategy sees this as a prerequisite for the development of a society based on solidarity, sustainable development and democratic governance. Supporting this, in 2016 the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports announced a new project to strengthen the position of the 'pupils' parliaments' within civic education. This project has identified pilot schools and through these the project will (1) verify the implementation of student councils ('pupils' parliaments'), (2) create advisory centres to support other schools in the future, (3) identify how best to support teachers who coordinate the student councils at schools; and (4) develop a system to effectively assess the student councils.

Estonia, through the Youth Field Development Plan, supports a network of school boards and youth councils, providing training and resources – a guidance handbook for teachers is currently in the piloting phase prior to publication to support this.

In some countries, there may be extensions to the student council which address specific issues.

In **Norway**, there is a School Environment Committee, in addition to a School Committee, in each school at primary and lower secondary levels, involving students, parents, employees, management and the municipality. The committee is specifically composed in such a way that the student and parent representatives together comprise a majority.

If the student voice is included in school quality assurance processes or inspection questions (see also Chapter 3), then this can encourage school leaders to enhance the role and value placed upon the student council. The nature and quality of student involvement in decision making and school governance is often dependant on the individual school, and can be reflective of a wider school culture where students are integrated into decision-making processes and the student voice is a valued contribution.

In the **United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland)**, the education inspectorates in both countries provide an online questionnaire for students and learners to give their views ahead of a school inspection.

In the **United Kingdom (Wales)**, the Welsh Government developed a toolkit for students and staff to use for their student council accompanied by a best practice guide. The Welsh Government has also developed a 'Pupil Voice' website to support students.

A number of education systems also support wider networks of student-based student councils, providing for interaction between student councils at regional and national level and offering feedback into democratic structures beyond the school. These can be directly related to school activities and governance.

In the **Flemish Community of Belgium**, there is an umbrella organisation of Flemish student councils (*Vlaamse Scholierenkoepel* or VSK). This acts as the voice of students on education matters, and the governance of the organisation is completely in the hands of students. The VSK represents over 680 student councils across Flanders. It is officially recognised by the minister and is accepted as an advocate by all other stakeholders in education. Their main aim is to support student councils and promote student interests at different levels of policy-making

In **Ireland**, there is a national student union to support student participation in lower and upper secondary, offering training, newsletters and resources to students and schools across Ireland.

In **Slovenia**, individual upper secondary schools appoint student representatives, who then become members of the parliament of the School Student Organisation of Slovenia (SSOS). The SSOS aims to: improve the material position of students; enforce and protect student rights; ensure the cooperation of students in extra-curricular activities; strengthen and spread student influence over the curriculum, learning processes and the ways of assessing of knowledge in schools; improve the quality of relationships in schools; improve the provision of information and the impact of students on civil society; ensure school democracy, sovereignty and equality in schools; defend equal opportunities for all, defend and strengthen the impact of students on issues related to their material and spiritual growth; and ensure commitment to the secular and neutral school.

Many countries highlight links to organisations at European and international level, such as the European Parliament's Model *European Parliament* ⁽¹⁵⁾, which involves delegations of young people from all Member States, or the European Youth Parliament involving 39 countries, which is run by young people and for young people ⁽¹⁶⁾. Other countries offer significant support for the development of student or youth parliaments at school level (such as Poland, Portugal, Liechtenstein, Switzerland and Montenegro).

⁽¹⁵⁾ In the Model European Parliament, two EU 28+ sessions take place each year in a different European capital. Five students are chosen to represent each EU member state, and each delegate represents their country in one of ten committees to discuss international issues which appear on the agenda of the European Parliament. www.mepeurope.eu

⁽¹⁶⁾ European Youth Parliament (<http://evp.org/>) involves: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium (all), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom (all).

In **Poland**, the Children and Youth Parliament comprises 460 members. Each of Poland's 16 provinces obtains a number of tickets proportional to the number of students in its lower and upper secondary schools. Debates are held in the national council chamber, and structured in the same way as the parliament with parliamentary commission debates followed by the preparation of draft resolutions, bill consultations and thematic workshops organised by non-governmental organisations. The speakers of the Polish Parliament help with conducting the debates of the Children and Youth Parliament.

In **Slovenia**, the Children's Parliament is based on Article 12 of the UN Children's Rights Convention, which says that 'every child has the right to freely express an opinion in all matters affecting her/him and to have that opinion taken into account'. Elected school representatives from primary and lower secondary (basic school) usually participate in the regional and national Children's Parliament (*otroški parlament*). These are seen as a means to engage in citizenship education, and participation is promoted and supported by the Slovenian Association of Friends of Youth. Each year one topic is chosen as the focus of the annual debate, in the 2016/17 school year this is 'Children and planning of the future'.

Student or youth parliaments may not be directly connected to schools and therefore not influence activities at school level, but they provide a valuable citizenship experience for those who take part in the process. However, by their nature, this type of activity only engages the very few students. Care should be taken that all students experience the democratic process and understand the value of participation through valuable and valued student council activities at school level. All students need to understand that they too can influence the democratic process and should experience the impact of having voice being listened to. Participation in student councils is an important example of participative learning practice, highlighted as a characteristic of effective learning in section 2.2.2.

Many countries emphasise engaging students as representatives on school or municipal boards that involve the school heads, teachers, parents and/or community representatives (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a). These are necessarily more connected to strategic decisions being made about the school, and usually a small number of student representatives are chosen to sit alongside other members of the board as equal decision-makers.

In **Austria**, there are clear regulations on student representation on school community boards (*Schulgemeinschaftsausschuss*) which comprise teachers, the school head and students.

In **Norway**, at upper secondary level the county authority either appoints a board for the school or identifies the school committee as the responsible body; it should have at least two representatives from the student council on this board, although neither students or staff groups are allowed to hold the majority of seats on the board.

Of the many education systems with student councils supporting student participation and the democratic experience, very few set targets or monitor progress on student participation.

In **Spain**, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports has established that the individual education authorities of the Autonomous Communities have the right to decide the number of students on the School Board. In Cataluña, a minimum of one sixth of the members of the School Board must be students, while in the Comunidad Valenciana, at least one third of members should be students.

Luxembourg has a target for student representation on the *Education Council* of each school, where at least two students from the *Student Council* which is required in lower and upper secondary education.


While **Norway** has a statutory requirement for a student council at primary, lower and upper secondary levels, it also has a target for participation in the council at upper secondary level where there should be one member for every 20 students in the school.

2.4.2. Parental engagement in school life

School governing bodies are a common means of engaging parents in school life. They are school focused committees of parents, educators, non-teaching staff and learners, usually chaired by the school head. The governing body seeks to bring stakeholders together to support the school in its teaching and learning. It may have responsibilities ranging from involvement in discipline to teacher recruitment, as well as providing guidance on the future direction of the school. Parent representatives are usually elected through a parent vote.

Overall, results have not changed significantly since 2012. In the 2012 Eurydice study⁽¹⁷⁾, of the 37 countries surveyed, all except Sweden and Turkey stated that parents formally participated in school governing bodies. In 2016/17, this number has increased to 40 education systems out of 42 surveyed. Sweden and Finland have cited school autonomy as the reason why they have no national guidance or recommendations on parental engagement; however, Finland does emphasise the importance of parent associations and cooperation between school and parents in the 2014 National Core Curriculum for Basic Education. Turkey instigated a reform in 2012 via *The Ministry of National Education Parent-Family Association Regulations*, and now supports parents participating officially in a wide range of school management activities.

Figure 2.5: Parent engagement in school Governing boards at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

School governing boards are decision-making bodies at school level, and generally involve the school head alongside representatives of stakeholders such as teachers, parents, students and the community.

Country-specific notes

Germany: Each *Land* has developed its own approach to parent participation, however all *Länder* support parent participation in school governing boards.

Spain: While extensive examples exist at the level of Autonomous Communities e.g. Castilla-La Mancha, Cataluña and Cantabria, there is no specific national level requirement.

A stark contrast can be seen when considering parental engagement in school governing bodies at each level of education. While there is no significant difference in the number of education systems involving parents at primary (40), lower (40) and upper secondary (38) levels, this reduces to just 30 education systems involving parents in the governing bodies of school-based IVET. This also reflects results seen for student engagement through student councils in IVET. Countries which do have parent involvement in general education but not in IVET include Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Cyprus, Romania, the United Kingdom (Scotland), the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

⁽¹⁷⁾ Citizenship Education at School (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice 2012a) – see data on participation of parents in school governing bodies within Figure 2.12 on p. 53.

Iceland, Liechtenstein and Montenegro. Parental involvement is an important driver for student engagement and achievement and this should be fostered at every level of education, with consideration given to adding parent involvement within school governance in IVET.

Different actors can be engaged in school governing bodies, and best practice sees involvement from community partners as well as learners and parents.

In the **French Community of Belgium**, the Participation Council is the school governing body which brings together all the actors in the local area including community representatives, the school head, teachers and students, parents and associations connected to the school. Its purpose is to be a forum for discussion, consultation and reflection, and a means by which school life is improved. Discussions may cover a wide range of issues including school-family connections, pedagogical scope, homework, healthy eating, prevention of violence in school and the integration of students with special needs.

Countries embracing parent engagement in school governance include those that are traditionally considered to have high levels of school autonomy in this area.

Iceland has parent representation on its school councils at primary and lower secondary level (basic education). The councils serve as a forum for consultation between the school head and the school community.

Norway, a country with high levels of teacher and school autonomy, includes regulations within the Education Act on the composition of the School Board, which must include two representatives of the parent council at every level of education.

In some education systems, parents are also encouraged to network within parent-led and parent focused associations or councils, and parent representatives for school governing bodies are elected from these parent networks.

In the **Flemish Community of Belgium**, there is financial support from the Ministry of Education and Training for umbrella organisations of parent associations which exist for each educational network. These umbrella organisations receive financial support from the Ministry of Education and Training, and their main task is to promote the involvement and engagement of parents at school level.

In **Slovenia**, parent councils make proposals, form opinions and elect representatives to the school governing bodies. They have the right to approve the proposed extracurricular programme and provide school governing bodies with recommendations and views. The Parent Councils form local or regional networks of councils which make up a national association of networks which is a member of European Parents' Association.

Parent councils may, like student councils, be networked at national level; for example, in Germany, Cyprus and Malta, they provide an exchange of good practice and the opportunity to have a stronger voice at regional or national level.

In **Germany**, each *Land* has developed its own approach to supporting parent participation in school governance. However, there are different levels of representative bodies, such as regional parents' councils at the level of the local authority or district and at a representative forums at the Land level (*Landeselternbeirat*), sometimes organised according to the different school types. At national level, the representative bodies combine to form a single federal parents' council at national level (*Bundeselternrat*), providing a forum to discuss developments in the field of education policy and to advise parents on school-related issues.

In **Cyprus**, the Pancyprian Parents Association of Primary and Secondary Schools links closely with the Ministry of Education regarding the running of schools, new curricula, discipline, uniform and in general everything related to the functioning of schools.

In **Malta**, the Maltese Association of Parents of State School Students (MAPSSS) is a voluntary organisation officially representing parents of students attending state schools. It aims to act as a reference point and to strengthen the partnership between parents, educators and the Maltese educational authorities and policy-makers.

Part of valuing the role of parents is to include their views in any feedback on the functioning or direction of the school.

In **Poland**, the parent council provides a basis for parents to be partners in education. In consultation with the school teaching staff, they are involved in approving the school educational programme and any activities for students. They could also be involved in activities such as developing a risk-prevention programme adapted to the needs of students and the local community, giving an opinion on a programme or schedule of activities designed to improve school/institution educational performance or reviewing a draft financial plan submitted by the school head.

In the **United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland)** the national education inspectorates provide parents with the opportunity to respond to an online survey prior to school inspection. Inspectors take the results of those surveys into account when judging how well the school engages with parents. In England, an online toolkit (*Parent View Toolkit for Schools*) has been developed to use in raising parents' awareness of this approach, while in Wales a physical meeting is also held with parents during the course of the inspection. These are examples of how parents may contribute in a meaningful way to the quality assurance process for schools.

In the **United Kingdom (Scotland)**, specific provision is made for a formal role for parent councils to participate in the appointment of a new school head teacher through the *Scottish Schools (Parental Involvement) Act 2006*.

Some countries have dedicated online resources providing guidance on how to get involved in school activities and school governing bodies.

In **France**, the *La Mallette des Parents* web site provides resources, information and tips on how parents can get involved with their child's education, including a very useful grid outlining the different channels through which parents can engage and what objectives each channel might achieve. The site also emphasises that all parents are part of the education community, and that the school welcomes cooperation and engagement.

Summary

National and regional authorities have stepped up efforts to ensure citizenship education plays a more central role within the education experience inside and beyond the classroom, reflected through existing activity as well as a number of new actions introduced through recent reforms. However, it is not yet universal and the focus is not equal across all educational levels.

Guidance and support materials issued by education authorities can be found in 33 education systems across Europe. The impact of recent political reforms can be clearly seen, with new initiatives and directives both established and ongoing in countries such as France, Italy, Cyprus and Luxembourg. Guidance and support materials is evidenced in different formats, usually subject guidance, national curriculum manuals, ministerial laws or decrees or competence frameworks outlining the competences to be achieved. Rarely, more innovative methods such as whole-school training are used to build capacity among teachers. Online sources have been widely developed, with both dedicated websites and specific webpages within wider websites highlighted, with many featuring links to internationally available resources such as those from UNESCO and the Council of Europe.

Interesting examples have been provided regarding a whole-school approach to citizenship education, building on the practices gathered in the 2012 study, but new developments see emphasis placed on the evaluation and recognition of such extra effort. Work in Estonia and Lithuania on the *Good School Model* aims to demonstrate the value of and support for citizenship education as a tool for school improvement and learner engagement, creating clarity about the potential evaluation measures that schools can use to demonstrate excellent work in this area and providing a wider picture of teaching and learning impact beyond the measure of academic achievement.

Across the chapter, an analysis of the results for the different levels and pathways of education reveals less emphasis on support for school-based IVET. Fewer support materials are directed towards the school-based IVET level, although it is recognised that generic guidance for upper secondary may be applicable to the IVET pathway. Within the subsequent results for student and parent participation, the differences in recommendations on student and parent participation between IVET and general education is more marked. Where there is less structural support for parental participation in a country or region, this may impair parent engagement mechanisms at the local level. Implementation of citizenship education is equally relevant from primary through to school-based IVET, and a persistent lack of attention to IVET is an important finding within this study.

Less student participation is seen at the primary school level. While an increase in the level of engagement can be seen since 2012, there remains a statistically significant difference between the number of education systems engaging students at primary and at other levels of education (lower, upper secondary and school-based IVET). It is vital to provide the youngest children across Europe with the opportunity to experience democracy, allowing them to understand how their voice can impact on the world around them.

While these are significant areas of concern, the overall trend has been towards more support from national and regional authorities. Where this is comparable to 2012 results, it is clear to see that education authorities have increased their focus on citizenship education. Support for student council participation has increased in 14 countries since 2012, while both student and parent participation is now recommended for at least one level of education in 39 of the countries surveyed. Areas for improvement remain; however, there is clear recognition of the importance of enhancing the curricular and extra-curricular opportunities for learning and active participation in citizenship education.

CASE STUDY 2: THE CITIZENSHIP BOOSTER FOR SCHOOLS IN THE FLEMISH COMMUNITY OF BELGIUM

Introduction

The Citizenship Booster is an online survey used by schools with students aged from 10 to 20 years old. It is a data-based questionnaire comprising a series of simple statements to elicit insight into the citizenship-based values, attitudes and behaviours of students, with the end-aim of using this information to increase the effectiveness of school-level citizenship education approaches.

Developed by the GO! education network in Flanders as a tool for their schools and vocational education institutions, the Booster is used for 10- to 20-year-olds in a variety of approaches. It provides school-based information to implement the cross curricular objectives for citizenship education set by the education authority ⁽¹⁾ (see Chapter 3) and supports teachers and schools in ascertaining how to achieve these objectives at their school. It also offers complimentary data to the Flanders-wide national assessment of progress in citizenship education objectives carried out in 2016 ⁽²⁾. The GO! education network is one of the three main educational networks in the Belgian Flemish Community, responsible for around 1 000 education institutions with nearly 300 000 students and vocational trainees ⁽³⁾. The case study is based on interviews with the GO! project lead schools who have used the Booster, and policy representatives from the Flanders government ⁽⁴⁾.

Rationale

The GO! education network has a pedagogical project that, at its centre, aims to foster active citizenship through the core values of respect, sincerity, equality, commitment and involvement. The idea for the GO! Citizenship Booster stemmed from a need to support schools in embedding these core values into their work. This ambition was inspired by the 2012 Eurydice report on *Citizenship Education in Europe* and the 2009 *International Civic and Citizenship Education Study* led by the IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement), which provided models of how the key values and attitudes associated with citizenship education has been evaluated at macro-level. This gave the network the idea to explore the potential of surveys or assessment tools to provide a data-based tool which would give insights and evidence at school level.

Process

While the rationale for school-level support was sparked by Raymonda Verdyck, Managing Director of GO!, the concept development and design was the responsibility of a Working Group on Citizenship. The process took three years, from the first idea in September 2013 until the tool was available online in September 2016.

⁽¹⁾ For more information, see: <https://www.vlaanderen.be/nl/publicaties/detail/voet-2010-nieuwe-vakoverschrijdende-eindtermen-voor-het-secundair-onderwijs>

⁽²⁾ National Assessment Programme tests are developed under the supervision of the Agency for Quality Assurance in Education and Training (AKOV) (part of the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training). The first aim of the NAP is to collect information on student performance outcomes concerning the attainment targets at the Flemish level. However, schools participating in the NAP receive a school feedback report, which is a valuable instrument to evaluate its students' performance and which illustrates a comparison with other schools.

⁽³⁾ See: http://www.gemeenschapsonderwijs.be/sites/portaal_nieuw/english/educationinlanders/Pages/default.aspx

⁽⁴⁾ Interviewees included Dilys Vyncke (Chair of the GO! Network Working Group on Citizenship and Go! Pedagogical Counsellor, Go! Education Network), Eline de Ridder (National Contact for the Eurydice Network in Flanders, Department of Education and Training, Flemish Government), Ann de Jaegere (Policy Officer, Department of Education and Training, Flemish Government), Marleen Timmermans (Lead teacher for citizenship at the KTA Brasschaat technical and vocational school), Marijke Eeckhout (Head teacher of De Reynaertschool, a special needs school in Oostakker).

Design phase (Sep. 2013 – Aug. 2014): The *Working Group on Citizenship* brought together educational and pedagogical advisors working with schools at all levels of education. Led by Dilys Vyncke, a GO! pedagogical advisor with a specialism in citizenship education, each member of the group was allocated working time of one day every two weeks. This allocated working time demonstrated an important level of management commitment to the development process. The group had previously developed teacher and school guidance tools for the curriculum, and used this experience alongside the latest international studies, examples of other questionnaire approaches and their own experience from life and work to identify essential themes. They aimed to create a tool that would help schools to improve citizenship education, by gathering information on the current values, attitudes and understanding of their students across the different themes of citizenship.

Piloting phase (Sep. 2014 – Aug. 2015): The review and pilot phase involved extensive one to one interviews with key educational stakeholders, teachers and head teachers to review statements, followed by piloting the questionnaire with groups of students across the relevant age ranges. This reviewing process did not change the content themes, but it fundamentally changed the way the statements in the questionnaire were worded to ensure user-friendliness, avoid leading questions and ensure clarity of understanding. A focus on simplicity of language and structure was important.

Technical Development (Sep. 2015 – Aug. 2016): This phase covered the translation of the tool into an online instrument with data-capture and analysis capacity. Assuring the right technical specifications for online development took more time than expected, but brought benefits through better and more user-focused design and development. Making it useful for the user, i.e. the school, was a key consideration; the tool has ensured a sense of school level ownership of the data by including the ability for schools to use the online tool themselves to see the school report, manipulate their own data and develop their own conclusions.

Launch (Sep. 2016): The survey was launched in September 2016, and the target uptake in the first twelve months was 100 schools including primary, secondary, vocational and special needs schools.

This first version of the Citizenship Booster student survey takes a maximum of 50 minutes (usually much less) to ensure that it fits into one lesson within the school day, and all respondents must have parental consent to complete it. It targets students at two levels, firstly 12- to 20-year-olds, and secondly 10- to 12-year-olds who answer almost identical statements ⁽⁵⁾. The survey focuses not on knowledge, but on the 'harder to assess' values, attitudes and behaviours linked to citizenship education. Statements cover ten key themes:

Questionnaire sections	Primary: 10-12 years	Secondary: 12-20 years
Democracy at school	14 statements	17 statements
Wellbeing	8	8
Diversity	12	12
Engagement	10	11
World citizenship	6	6
Sustainability and fair trade	8	5
Democracy	9	10
Cultural education	1	3
My educational path and choices	9	10
Other	6	6

⁽⁵⁾ Five statements have been eliminated from the primary school survey. All others are identical in content to the survey targeting older students. The number of questions is restricted, however where a deeper insight is required on a specific theme, schools are directed to specialist tools e.g. cultural education, gender, sexual identity, media literacy and sustainability.

During the piloting process, it was found that '*I can / I feel that...*' statements were more easily understood by students than less personalised statements. It was also found to be important to include answer options for those who do not understand the question, and those who would prefer not to answer, as these answers provided different and important insights. Parental consent was obtained for all young people completing the survey.

Sample question	Use scale from 1 (not at all) ... to 10 (completely)	I don't know	I'd rather not answer	I do not understand
I feel happy at school				

The Booster is promoted widely to all schools and VET institutions that are affiliated to the GO! network, with the ambition of all GO! schools becoming regular users of the tool in the future. It is promoted through the network of GO! pedagogical counsellors connected to each school and through workshops on citizenship education with groups of head teachers. These workshops are intended to illustrate the value of the Booster in gaining insights into students' views and values, and to profile the importance of generating conversations between staff around often challenging topics. There has been an active process to raise awareness of the aims and objectives of the Booster with key stakeholder groups such as the national network of Flemish Pupils' Councils (*Vlaamse Scholierenkoepel*), and a case study of work in the first year has been shared in professional networks such as the 'Education and Society' group of the Flemish Education Council (VLOR) ⁽⁶⁾.

Developing a citizenship day

Koninklijk Technisch Atheneum Brasschaat is a secondary level vocational school with 770 diverse students drawn from mainly urban areas. Led by a group of teachers of religious and non-religious beliefs, the school decided to use the booster to support planning for a school citizenship day. A few months before the planned citizenship day, the Booster was completed by all students during history or Dutch lessons, with both teachers and students finding it easy to complete. Results have highlighted topics to be addressed through the curriculum and future citizenship days, as well as showing the need for some additional staff training, and the school plans to use the survey again in the future.

Most of the schools using the tool for the first time do so to provide a starting point for analysis, to act as a baseline and understand the state of play within the school. While each school chooses how to implement it, there must be an agreement on a school-wide approach with the GO! Working Group, which coordinates the tool. Approaches used in the first year include the survey completion as:

- A pre-cursor to a citizenship day or event
- A follow up activity after having completed a large school project
- Class activity within a relevant curriculum area e.g. history, language or religion
- As part of vocational education compulsory project courses

Feedback is available at school level. Prior to using the tool, each school is encouraged to identify a school lead for the Booster. At school level, a detailed report is automatically produced by the system. The school can go online to view the report and manipulate the data to see results by age or gender. The report provides scoring (from 1-10) per theme (see list above) and presents this in spider diagram displaying all topics, and the school can also see the scoring per individual statement. This report is

⁽⁶⁾ VLOR – *Vlaamse Onderwijsraad* – is the Flemish Education Council, which has a wide membership involving all education stakeholders such as teacher organisations, teacher unions, parents, and students. See www.vlor.be

shared with the school head teacher, lead teacher/s for citizenship and the GO! pedagogical advisor supporting the school; and the pedagogical advisor can support the school to enhance provision based on the results. The school can also ask for advice from a member of the Working Group. The student does not get individual feedback, but each school is asked to provide follow-up discussions with students to share the results of the survey.

Changing the content of citizenship education

De Reynaertschool is a special needs school working with children with autism, located in Oostakker, Belgium. The school has an existing curriculum that includes a range of citizenship projects, such as 'Being a Democratic Citizen in Belgium' or 'Me and my Community', and has been involved in children's parliaments at the Flemish Government. A joint decision of all teachers was taken to use the Booster with 14- to 16-year-olds and gave very interesting results. The teachers were not aware that the children had concerns around certain topics, and had underestimated their understanding. It prompted the start of discussion lessons around the topics raised, and has also illustrated the need for additional staff training to support these topics which were not previously addressed. The Booster will now become a regular feature in the school and new citizenship education topics will be introduced.

The monitoring of the numbers of schools using the Citizenship Booster is ongoing, and the target was to achieve 100 schools by the end of the first year (August 2017). By the end of April 2017, a total of 11 000 students in 85 schools had used it. However, there is no intention to use the data to benchmark schools, and all data within the Booster is anonymised so no individual student results can be identified. GO! schools access the tool to use the data as the starting point to understand the next steps needed to support their students, and it is seen as a learning tool for schools rather than a monitoring tool. A structured evaluation process is being developed with research universities in Flanders, and from the 2017/18 school year more impact research will be undertaken.

Next steps

In June 2017, the Working Group members will review data and gather feedback on the use of the Booster, and this will be used firstly to revise the tool while maintaining comparability with the first version and secondly to design guidance materials to support schools in using the Booster more effectively. This will include practice ideas and workshops to support the follow-up conversations with students to discuss the results of the Booster, as well as a feedback channel for schools to share the impact of the Booster on teaching and learning at school level, including how each school follows up with students after they have completed the survey. The ambition is that all GO! schools will use the Booster, and where this is done over a number of years, each school will gain a picture of progress across the survey themes such as democracy at school or diversity. At the level of the GO! network, once the majority of schools have used the tool, GO! intends to explore the anonymized data to inform future development of their overall strategy supporting citizenship education.

GO! is interested to expand the use of the tool to other regions and countries, and is also developing complementary tools to work at organisational level. The team Citizenship Booster has recently been completed by the Working Group and will be launched in 2017; it is suitable for any type of organisation, and is intended to promote conversations about citizenship themes among staff, to recognise staff skills and engagement in citizenship activities outside work and to emphasise the importance of role models for active citizenship within organisations.

Main findings

- The Citizenship Booster is an online survey designed to gain insight into student values, attitudes and behaviours on key themes of citizenship education. Inspired by international citizenship education surveys, successful implementation at school-level shows that it is possible to create a data-based tool on citizenship education to assess student values and attitudes.
- It is made up of a student questionnaire with a series of simple statements that students either rank in order of importance or choose not to answer, and the anonymised data produced can be used by schools as a first step in an internal dialogue on the content and effectiveness of school-level citizenship education.
- Data collected within the school report is being used in some schools to reflect on and change how the school implements teaching and supports learning for citizenship education. However, more research is needed to develop more structured measures to assess the diversity and scale of impacts at school-level, and this is currently being explored.
- Feedback from schools shows that the use of the Booster can result in deeper conversations around citizenship topics both with and between students, offering the opportunity to use authentic and relevant student-focused evidence to address challenging topics.
- The survey results can empower teachers to expand their teaching horizon and include new topics, but may also be challenging because it highlights topics that they themselves are not comfortable with. The use of the Booster provides the opportunity to start sometimes difficult conversations within teams of teachers on the themes addressed within the Booster, or act as a prompt for professional development. The team version of the Booster is intended to support this further.

CHAPTER 3: STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND SCHOOL EVALUATION

European countries use a variety of means to evaluate educational provision and measure outcomes, and hence constantly improve the quality of education. Both student assessment and evaluation of the system – either in whole or in part – contribute to this process. System evaluation generally focuses on schools, teachers or authorities with responsibility for education, particularly at local level. Student assessment is usually either formative or summative, but a variety of methods can be used. As citizenship education is an integral part of the curriculum in all countries, it is essential that appropriate evaluation tools and instruments are devised to ensure that this subject area, like others, is properly assessed and a reliable body of evidence built up.

However, designing measures for evaluating citizenship education is a complex task, due to the range of curricular objectives assigned to this area as well as the range of contexts in which it is delivered. The objectives and learning outcomes assigned to the citizenship curriculum by European countries include the acquisition by students of a wide body of theoretical knowledge, the development of skills such as analytical skills and critical thinking, the adoption of certain values and attitudes such as sense of tolerance and, last but not least, the active participation and engagement of students in school and community life. An important issue for this area of learning is the need for assessment methods that can cover both the range of learning outcomes associated with citizenship education and all the contexts in which it is taught. In particular, assessment methods must be able to accommodate the cross-curricular nature of the subject, as well take into account the reality that citizenship education is not only delivered through the formal curriculum but also through non-formal and informal learning, and through student involvement in school life and project work. This calls for assessment methods that can capture the outcomes of the diverse learning experiences that form part of citizenship education.

This chapter considers two main aspects of evaluation in relation to citizenship education: student assessment and the external evaluation of schools, also called school inspection in many countries.

The first three sections are concerned with student assessment. Section 3.1 presents a brief overview of the scientific literature on the main issues surrounding student assessment in the area of citizenship education. Section 3.2 provides a comparative analysis of the official guidelines provided for teachers assessing their students, and the recommended methods and components for classroom assessment are described. Section 3.3 investigates which countries organise national testing in citizenship education and whether these tests are related to subjects or cross-curricular themes relevant to this area of learning. It examines the main purpose of the tests and describes their arrangements in terms of timing, frequency and target population. The scope of national tests and the types of questions or tasks involved are also examined. Finally, section 3.4 investigates whether citizenship education is part of external school evaluation, and where this is the case, it examines the areas of school activity covered.

3.1. Review of the research literature

'Assessment' is a term used to refer to judgements of students' work. It describes a process of collecting and interpreting evidence about what students can do, know or how they behave, for the purpose of producing a judgment about students' achievements (Harlen, 2007).

Assessment is a vital part of the teaching and learning process. Making use of appropriate assessment methods at school is crucial, since assessment is one of the main tools for promoting effective learning (Black & William, 1999). The nature and content of the assessments could determine the nature of teaching and learning (Halasz and Michel, 2011). Therefore, it is important that assessment properly reflects the various objectives or dimensions targeted by the teaching and learning process.

This review of academic literature aims to highlight the key challenges for student assessment in citizenship education. It also outlines a range of assessment tools and methods that have the potential to effectively address these challenges. This review explores literature dealing with student assessment in general, student assessment in the area of citizenship education, as well as the assessment of key competences including social and civic competences. This is why both 'citizenship education' and 'social and civic competences' will be used alternately in this section.

Beyond the scope of this literature review, it should also be remembered that there is a strong rationale in the research literature in favour of establishing learning outcomes for the assessment of competences to be acquired by students, including social and civic competences (CEDEFOP, 2011, Pepper, 2011; European Commission, 2012). Learning outcomes are concerned with student achievement rather than the objectives of the teacher; they are usually expressed in terms of what the learner is expected to know, understand and be able to do on completion of a level or module (Adam, 2004). Specifying learning outcomes does not only help teachers to structure and organise their teaching and inform learners about the expectations, but it also provides a basis for establishing the assessment criteria reflecting the learning expectations. Because citizenship education often has a cross-curricular status (see Chapter 1), all teachers share the responsibility for delivering it. In this respect, developing clear guidelines on the learning outcomes to be achieved within the boundaries of given subjects, might be particularly necessary in order to ensure that social and civic competences are effectively implemented (Roca and Sánchez, 2008).

3.1.1. Methods of assessment for citizenship competences

Given the above-mentioned importance of a close relationship between on one hand the teaching and learning process and on the other hand assessment, all the various core dimensions of citizenship should be reflected adequately in student assessment. However, the need to develop assessment methods that go beyond measuring the acquisition of theoretical knowledge has already been identified in the first Eurydice report on citizenship education as one of the major challenges in this field (Eurydice, 2005).

Furthermore, the more recent research results detailed below indicate that, whereas the knowledge dimension is always assessed, the assessment of students' attitudes, and skills occurs to a lesser extent, and is more complex and less systematically applied. A cross-national project reviewed the forms of pupil assessment in citizenship education in eight European countries in 2009 (Ireland, Italy, Hungary, the Netherlands and the four parts of the United Kingdom). It revealed recurrent discrepancies between official guidelines and practice in many of the participating countries regarding the dimensions of citizenship education actually assessed. 'While the policy guidance states that all three citizenship dimensions should be developed and assessed, in practice the reality is that in terms of assessment, most countries assess the cognitive (knowledge and understanding) dimension more frequently than the active and affective dimensions (participation, skills, attitudes and behaviours)' (Kerr et al. 2009, p. 45).

A comprehensive review of the implementation of the EU Recommendation on Key Competences ⁽¹⁾ in the 27 Members of the EU in 2009 commissioned by the European Commission also presented findings related to assessment. It highlighted that pupil assessment was lagging behind recent developments towards the competence-based approach in national curricula, based on a dynamic combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes closer to real life contexts. However, according to Gordon et al. (2009), assessment tends to put too much emphasis on subject knowledge and skills, and less on attitudes.

⁽¹⁾ European Commission, 2009.

Converging the results of the two above-mentioned comparative studies carried out across Europe seem to imply that the assessment of some components of citizenship education and especially students' attitudes and the values underpinning these attitudes is a particularly complex task. Nevertheless, literature reviewed in this section also suggests that, as compared to traditional assessment methods which require students selecting an answer from a ready-made list, assessment methods involving students performing a task in a real-life or close to real-life context allow evidence to be captured on a wider range of learning outcomes. These innovative forms of assessment, often referred to as performance-based assessment, include projects, individual investigation, role plays or group work, interviews, reflective diaries and portfolios (European Commission, 2012).

The main supporting idea for the use of assessment methods which involve authentic tasks, is that a demonstration of competency in citizenship cannot be made in isolation to real-life, but only in specific contexts. Indeed, given that competences are a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes, they cannot be exercised in an abstract manner and their acquisition has to be demonstrated within given contexts (Scallon, 2007). The demonstration of competences within real-life contexts allows for their components to be assessed (knowledge, skills, supporting attitudes and underlying values) in interaction rather than in isolation (Pepper, 2011).

Across Europe, student assessment takes a variety of forms and uses different instruments and tools. Assessment can be external or internal (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2009). External assessment, also referred to as 'national tests' in this chapter, are designed externally to schools and are administered and scored according to homogenous procedures, in order to ensure that the performances of individual pupils are readily comparable. Internal assessment, also referred to as 'classroom assessment' in this chapter, is carried out under the responsibility of individual teachers as part of the teaching-learning activities in the classroom. The literature described below provides arguments in favour of different types of performance-based assessment, whether external or internal, to assess students in the area of citizenship education or key competences more generally.

A recurrent criticism regarding national tests is their tendency to assess only a part of the knowledge and skills targeted by the curriculum, which may result in the undesirable effect of the narrowing of the curriculum taught to students (Mons, 2009). Nevertheless, in a review of the literature on the assessment of key competences, Pepper (2013, p. 11) advanced that national tests have the potential to contribute to the assessment of knowledge, skills and attitudes 'if they include items with structure and content that reproduce real-life context authentically; multiple steps requiring a chain of reasoning and a range of competences; a range of formats allowing responses that require different competences'. The same reasoning could be applied to written examinations designed by individual teachers.

Methods of assessment involving students performing 'authentic tasks' include for instance project-based assessment. Project-based assessment can range from very short activities, though short projects to address a single specific issue, to lengthy projects that result in the creation of reports and/or presentations that are made to one or more audiences (Barrett, 2016⁽²⁾). Lengthy projects might be particularly suitable to enable the demonstration and assessment of a wide set of skills relevant to citizenship education, such as decision-making, problem-solving, reflective skills, etc. (Barrett, *ibid*).

A portfolio serves as a demonstration of students' skills as well as being seen as a platform for self-expression. A portfolio is a type of learning record that provides actual evidence of achievement

⁽²⁾ http://www.academia.edu/28260557/Competences_for_democratic_culture_and_global_citizenship_components_and_assessment

(Wikipedia, 2010). Portfolio assessment enables the collection of information about students' performance across time. Because the portfolio increases the number of assessment 'events', it is likely to provide a broader picture of the products of learning and is therefore particularly adapted to holistic areas such as that of social and civic competences (European Commission, 2012).

3.1.2. Summative versus formative assessment

Over recent years, academic literature on student assessment in citizenship education has discussed the types of assessment most suitable to this area of teaching and learning. Two main types of assessment are usually distinguished: summative and formative assessment.

Summative assessment refers to the systematic and periodic collection of information resulting in a judgement at a particular point in time about the extent and quality of pupil learning. It usually occurs at the end of each term, grade and educational level, and is used by teachers to report on the achievements of pupils both to their parents and the pupils themselves, or to take decisions that can affect their school career (Harlen, 2007).

Formative assessment is usually performed by teachers on an on-going basis as an integral part of their activity throughout the school year. It is aimed at monitoring and improving the processes of teaching and learning, by providing direct feedback to teachers and pupils alike (OECD, 2005).

As pointed out by Jerome (2008) and Mark (2007), it can be argued that summative assessment is less compatible with the major principles governing citizenship education, which imply that all citizens are of equal worth. By contrast, summative assessment is traditionally competitive and hierarchical in the sense that it aims to make judgments about students with regard to absolute standard of attainment, which may end with some student labelled as 'failed citizens'. Furthermore, the scope of summative assessment might be too restrictive with regard to the breadth of aims pursued by citizenship education, in the case where it focuses predominantly on knowledge to the detriment of skills and attitudes. Taking the theoretical example of students performing poorly on written tests in citizenship but making good progress in their behaviour, commitment, involvement and participation in community, Mark (2007) concludes that 'there seems to be an inherent tension between what our tests and our teaching tell children about their value as citizens'.

The literature mentioned above argues that, as compared to summative assessment, formative assessment is more compatible with the principles of citizenship education. The two following features acknowledged as intrinsic to formative assessment can be pointed to in this respect (Black and William, 1998). Firstly, formative assessment relies on a shared understanding of the learning outcomes targeted by citizenship as well as what might count as evidence of the development of the citizenship competence in different contexts. Secondly, formative assessment includes the provision of feedback to pupils about the gap between what they have achieved and the reference level, which allows reflection on how to alter this gap and places the emphasis on the learning process itself rather than its outcomes.

Different assessment methods can be used in the context of formative assessment. Self and peer assessment entail students collecting information about their own or others' performance respectively, and comparing it to explicitly stated criteria, goals, or standards (Andrade and Valtcheva, 2009). As they involve and may increase students' awareness and understanding of the learning outcomes to be achieved (Looney, J., 2011), self and peer assessment may be pointed to as being particularly interesting formative assessment methods in the context of citizenship education.

3.1.3. Assessing student achievement across various learning contexts

Additional challenges applying to student assessment in the area of citizenship education are linked to the multiple learning contexts within which it can take place: subject-based or cross-curricular delivery in the curriculum (see Chapter 1), participation in school life, as well as in activities in the wider community (see Chapter 2).

Regarding assessment in the curriculum, research findings dealing with the implementation of the EU key competences in the curricula of European countries (which include social and civic competences), indicate that the biggest challenge occurs in situations where a competence is delivered across the curriculum rather than through subject-based provision (European Commission, 2009). According to the above-mentioned cross-national project on pupil assessment in citizenship, where citizenship is a cross-curricular theme and thus implemented through a range of subjects, a variety of assessment methods dealing with different components of citizenship are used. Such variety may result in a lack of coordination and consistency in assessment methods which may hamper the efficacy of cross-curricular approaches to citizenship education (Kerr et al., *ibid*). Nevertheless, a review of different approaches to the assessment of key competences in primary and secondary education in Europe emphasises that some assessment methods, such as tests involving authentic tasks or portfolio assessment, may enable the gathering of evidence of learning acquired across a variety of subjects, (Pepper, 2011) ⁽³⁾.

As stated above, citizenship education is also provided through student participation in activities in school and wider society. Despite the fact that assessment in citizenship tends to concentrate on activities within the curriculum, some forms of assessment that focus on pupil participation in school and or wider society exist across Europe (Kerr et al., *ibid*). The use of action projects where pupils prepare a report on an activity they have participated in within their school or the wider community (local, national or global) is one example of an assessment tool going beyond the curriculum (Kerr et al., *ibid*) ⁽⁴⁾.

3.2. Official guidelines on student assessment

3.2.1. Guidelines for teachers

In a majority of European countries, student assessment in the classroom is framed by official guidelines which usually set out the basic principles of assessment, including general aims and often a range of recommended approaches and/or methods (see Figure 3.1). Other aspects of assessment, such as possible grading for students, criteria for their progression through school, etc., may also be included. Although, in these countries, official guidelines set the general conditions for classroom assessment, the same guidelines also often emphasise teacher autonomy with regard to the precise methods or criteria that will be used and/or the need for common assessment practices across the school.

Beyond the scope of this section, it is worth mentioning that, independently of official guidelines on assessment, European countries provide a range of support to help teachers assess students in the classroom. Moreover, national tests in citizenship education may also represent an important source of influence on assessment in the classroom (see Section 3.3), since it is likely that teachers will align with the content and methods of these tests ⁽⁵⁾.

⁽³⁾ See also Sections 3.2.1 and 3.3.1 for more recent information on this topic in specific the field of citizenship education.


⁽⁴⁾ See also Section 3.2.1 for more information on this topic.

⁽⁵⁾ For more information on the effects of national testing on teachers and schools, see National Testing of Pupils in Europe: Objectives, Organisation and Use of Results. European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2009.

The official guidelines on assessment whether general or specific to given subjects, are usually to be found in national curricula and/or special legislation. However, in a few countries, there are other types of sources which provide official guidelines on classroom assessment. These include, for example, documents issued by the Czech School Inspectorate which deal with criteria for external school evaluation; model curricula developed by the Ministry of Education and Science in Latvia; and guidelines on assessment available on the Eduscol website created under the umbrella of the French Ministry for National Education.

Official guidelines on student assessment in the classroom may take the form of a general framework for the whole assessment process, irrespective of the subject concerned, or they may be specific to each subject (or subject area) or cross-curricular theme within the curriculum. Twenty-two of the 26 education systems with guidelines on classroom assessment have a general framework which applies to all curriculum content (see Figure 3.1). Guidelines on assessment specific to citizenship education are less widespread. They can be found in ten education systems.

Figure 3.1: Guidelines on classroom assessment in citizenship education at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

Specific guidelines on assessment may apply to a separate subject on citizenship education, a subject area in which citizenship education is integrated, or a cross-curricular theme relevant to citizenship education.

Country-specific notes

Lithuania: The general guidelines only apply to ISCED 1 and 2, as well as school-based IVET.

Malta: The general guidelines only apply to ISCED 1 and 2 and the compulsory part of ISCED 3.

Finland: The general guidelines only apply to ISCED 1, 2 and 3 of general education. For school-based IVET, the assessment is based on qualitative criteria and achieved learning outcomes specified for each unit of the qualification requirement.

United Kingdom (WLS): There are general guidelines only for the first two grades of ISCED 1.

United Kingdom (NIR): There are specific guidelines only for key stages 1 and 2 of ISCED 1, ISCED 2, as well as the compulsory part of ISCED 3.

Iceland: The general and specific guidelines only apply to ISCED 1 and 2.

In France, Ireland, Latvia, the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), Serbia and Turkey, education authorities have issued specific guidelines for assessment in the separate subject on citizenship education or the subject areas integrating citizenship education.

In **France**, the above-mentioned Eduscol website provides teachers with general principles for assessment in each subject taught at primary and lower secondary education levels, including moral and civic education ⁽⁶⁾. National Curricula ⁽⁷⁾ for moral and civic education at upper secondary level also include some guidelines on assessment.

In **Ireland**, the Primary School Curriculum ⁽⁸⁾ offers teacher guidelines specifying the main purposes and principles of assessment for each subject and subject area, including 'social, personal and health education' which integrates components of citizenship education. Guidelines ⁽⁹⁾ on classroom assessment in the subject area which integrates citizenship education at ISCED 2 as of 2017/18 ('wellbeing') are available. The National Council for Curriculum and Assessment establishes the principles, components and criteria for the assessment of all leaving certificate subjects, including the 'politics and society' subject ⁽¹⁰⁾.

In the **United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)**, Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment guidance documents for 'personal development and mutual understanding' ⁽¹¹⁾ at ISCED 1 and the 'local and global citizenship' strand of 'learning for life and work' at grades 11 and 12 of ISCED 3 both include sections on assessment ⁽¹²⁾.

In **Serbia**, teachers' manuals establish the principle of descriptive assessment for both core curriculum options 'citizenship education' and 'religious education' and specify the criteria for assessment.

In Estonia, Spain, Slovenia and Iceland, general requirements for student assessment exist alongside the specific guidelines by subject.

In **Estonia**, national curricula for compulsory and upper secondary education ⁽¹³⁾ contain general assessment guidelines as well as assessment principles that cover the specific nature of each subject. Hence, the syllabi for the subject area 'social studies' sets down the basis for assessment in 'history, personal, social, and health education', and 'civics and citizenship education'.

In **Spain**, legislation ⁽¹⁴⁾ establishes assessment principles and methods for assessing students in key competences. The curricula for primary education ⁽¹⁵⁾, general secondary education ⁽¹⁶⁾, and basic vocational training ⁽¹⁷⁾, address assessment in each subject or module, including those integrating components of citizenship education, e.g. 'social and civic values', 'ethical values', and 'communication and society'.

In **Slovenia**, legislation determines the general assessment rules that apply to all subjects taught at primary, lower and upper secondary education levels. Moreover, specific recommendations that apply to the subjects dedicated to or integrating citizenship education are included in the supplements to the respective subject curricula.

In **Iceland**, the Icelandic national curriculum guide for compulsory schools ⁽¹⁸⁾ (ISCED 1 and 2) presents a general section on assessment as well as specific recommendations on the main principles, methods, and criteria of assessment in each subject or subject area, including social studies which has components of citizenship education.

Finally, two education systems have developed guidelines for assessing the development of student achievements in citizenship education acquired across the curriculum, meaning across the various subjects addressing citizenship education.

In **France**, the new Common Core of Knowledge, Competences, and Culture to be acquired by the end of compulsory education introduced in 2016/17 provides more expanded guidelines on the assessment common to its seven areas of competences as well as

⁽⁶⁾ http://cache.media.eduscol.education.fr/file/EMC/63/9/Ress_emc_evaluation_ecole_college_521639.pdf

⁽⁷⁾ [Bulletin officiel spécial n°6 du 25 juin 2015](#)

⁽⁸⁾ http://www.ncca.ie/en/Curriculum_and_Assessment/Early_Childhood_and_Primary_Education/Primary-Education/Primary_School_Curriculum

⁽⁹⁾ <http://www.juniorcycle.ie/Curriculum/Wellbeing>

⁽¹⁰⁾ <http://curriculumonline.ie/Senior-cycle/Senior-Cycle-Subjects/Politics-and-Society/Assessment>

⁽¹¹⁾ http://ccea.org.uk/sites/default/files/docs/curriculum/area_of_learning/pdmu/ks1_2_pdmu_guidance.pdf

⁽¹²⁾ http://ccea.org.uk/sites/default/files/docs/curriculum/area_of_learning/learning_life_work/ks4_citizenship_guidance.pdf

⁽¹³⁾ <https://www.hm.ee/en/national-curricula-2014>

⁽¹⁴⁾ <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2015/01/29/pdfs/BOE-A-2015-738.pdf>

⁽¹⁵⁾ Real Decreto 126/2014 (BOE 01-03-2014)

⁽¹⁶⁾ Real Decreto 1105/2014 (BOE 03-01-2015)

⁽¹⁷⁾ Real Decreto 127/2014 (BOE 05-03-2014)

⁽¹⁸⁾ http://brunnur.stjr.is/mrn/utgafuskra/utgafa.nsf/xsp_ibmmodes/domino/OpenAttachment/mrn/utgafuskra/utgafa.nsf/E7DE015E63AA2F2C00257CA2005296F7/Attachment/adalnrsk_greinas_ens_2014.pdf

specific guidelines for each of these areas, including the 'personal and citizenship education' area. Furthermore, the development across subjects of the seven areas of competences is assessed by means of a booklet in which teachers and students compile information at given stages in primary and lower secondary education.

In the **United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)**, Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment guidance documents for the cross-curricular 'thinking skills and personal capabilities' at ISCED 1 and 2 include a section on assessment ⁽¹⁹⁾.

In addition to the guidelines on classroom assessment linked to subjects or cross-curricular themes shown in Figure 3.1, some countries provide teachers with assessment tools which will inform them on student participation in activities in school or in the wider society, which may support the development of their citizenship competence.

For instance, in **Bulgaria**, at the end of each year of primary and secondary education, the class teacher prepares a personal profile which presents an assessment of students' participation in out-of-school activities in the field of civic education, such as information campaigns or voluntary activities. Upon completion of primary and secondary education, a more comprehensive personal profile is an integral part of school leaving certificates.

In **Cyprus**, in their yearly report, students in upper secondary education are provided with a statement of attainment which is actually a description of their personal skills, attitudes and involvement in school activities linked to citizenship; this falls under the umbrella 'action, creativity, innovation'.

In **Lithuania**, a social-civic activity portfolio in which students describe their activities and how they became involved with practical civic activity is recommended for primary and lower secondary schools. The portfolio should gather documents which provide formal evidence of students' social activity (duration and location of completed social hours, other documents which prove students' social activity, texts). Students can evaluate the practical civic participation skills that they have acquired.

In **Poland**, the behaviour mark awarded to students at lower secondary level includes the assessment of their competences in terms of cooperation, teamwork and involvement demonstrated during compulsory project work at this stage of education.

3.2.2. Recommended assessment methods

With the exception of Malta, Poland and Sweden, all the other European countries with guidelines on classroom assessment recommend using specific assessment methods (see Figure 3.2). The different methods listed here have been chosen as examples of either more traditional approaches (e.g. multiple choice questionnaire) or alternative methods which can be used to assess a wider range of learning outcomes (e.g. portfolios). In a majority of cases, guidelines on assessment refer to a variety of assessment methods (between four and seven). There are no major differences in this respect between general guidelines meant for all subjects and specific guidelines related to subjects or cross-curricular themes addressing citizenship education.


Besides mentioning assessment methods, several countries emphasise the importance of formative assessment in supporting the learning process. This is explicitly stated in the guidelines for classroom assessment issued by public authorities in Estonia, Ireland, Greece (primary education), France, Malta, the United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland), Iceland and Montenegro.

Overall, there are few differences between the levels of education regarding the assessment methods recommended. The most striking difference relates to teacher observation of students' behaviour in order to identify evidence of attainment, which appears to be a method of assessment particularly suitable for the first stages of schooling, whether in the specific field of citizenship education or in other subjects as well. Of the eleven countries which recommend teacher observation for primary education, ten continue recommending it at lower secondary level, against six for the subsequent stages of

⁽¹⁹⁾ http://www.nicurriculum.org.uk/docs/skills_and_capabilities/training/TSPC-Guidance-KS12.pdf
http://www.nicurriculum.org.uk/docs/skills_and_capabilities/training/TSPC-Guidance-KS3.pdf

education. In the United Kingdom (Wales) ⁽²⁰⁾, teacher observation is the main method recommended for assessing pupils in the first two years of ISCED level 1 in their acquisition of skills relevant to citizenship in the subject area 'personal and social development, well-being and cultural diversity'. In France too, at the end of cycle 2 (3rd year of primary school), teacher observation in a range of situations is the main recommended assessment method for validating competences in the 'personal and citizenship education area' from the Common Core of Knowledge, Competences, and Culture. For the later stages of education, additional assessment methods are recommended to teachers: written assignments at the end of cycle 3 (end of first and fourth years of lower secondary education), and oral presentation at the end of cycle 4 (last year of lower secondary education).

Figure 3.2: Recommended methods and components of classroom assessment in citizenship education, according to official guidelines for primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

For more information on the official guidelines on assessment, see Figure 3.1.

⁽²⁰⁾ <http://gov.wales/docs/dcells/publications/160812-foundation-phase-profile-en-v3.pdf>

Country-specific notes (Figure 3.2)

Ireland: For more information on school-based IVET, see Figure 1.5.

Greece: Recommendations on oral assignments and self-assessment do not apply to ISCED 1.

Spain: Recommendations on teacher observation only apply to ISCED 1, 2 and 3 of general education.

Latvia: Recommendations on written composition or essays do not apply to ISCED 1. Recommendations on project-based assessment do not apply to school-based IVET.

Lithuania, Malta, Finland and United Kingdom (WLS/NIR): The country notes under Figure 3.1 also apply to Figure 3.2.

Romania: The recommendations only apply to ISCED 2 and 3 of general education.

Former Republic Yugoslav of Macedonia: Recommendations on teacher observation only apply to ISCED 1. None of the other assessment methods recommended apply to ISCED 1.

The assessment methods and approaches most often recommended in official guidelines are multiple choice questionnaires (16), written compositions or essays (18), oral assignments (19), self-assessment or peer assessment (17), as well as project-based assessment (17). In addition to project-based assessment, a few countries recommend other types of performance-based assessment. Role play (Estonia⁽²¹⁾, Greece⁽²²⁾ and France⁽²³⁾), case studies (Estonia, Greece, France and Ireland⁽²⁴⁾), group work (Estonia and France) or investigations (Ireland and France) are also recommended assessment methods either for the specific subjects or cross-curricular competences in citizenship or for the whole assessment process. Finally, only seven countries recommend using portfolio-based assessment at primary and/or lower secondary levels while four do so at upper secondary level.

Regarding the components of citizenship education being assessed, a majority of countries with official guidelines report that all three components (knowledge, skills and attitudes) should be assessed (see Figure 3.2). In contrast, official guidelines in Austria, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland) limit the scope of assessment to knowledge and skills. The official guidelines in Estonia include examples showing different assessment methods being used according to the type of learning outcome being assessed. The national curriculum for civic and citizenship education at primary and lower secondary levels establishes that 'knowledge and skills are assessed on the basis of oral response, including presentations, and written projects. Assessment of values and attitudes (e.g., showing interest, understanding importance, valuing, following rules) is facilitated by role plays, case studies and group work'⁽²⁵⁾.

3.3. National tests

The national testing of students, which in this analysis is defined as the top level administration of standardised tests and centrally set examinations, is a widespread practice in European education systems (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2009). This section analyses the existing national tests in citizenship education, which includes tests focusing specifically on this topic as well as tests addressing broader subjects or areas of subjects integrating aspects of citizenship education.

⁽²¹⁾ National curricula for civic and citizenship education at compulsory and upper secondary levels

⁽²²⁾ Cross-thematic curriculum for primary education

⁽²³⁾ Assessment of 'personal and citizenship education' area after the first year of lower secondary education (Common Core of Knowledge, Competences, and Culture)

⁽²⁴⁾ Guidelines for classroom-based assessment at lower secondary level

⁽²⁵⁾ <https://www.hm.ee/en/national-curricula-2014>


3.3.1. Main characteristics of national tests

Almost half of the education systems covered by this report organise national testing in citizenship education (see Figure 3.3).

Fourteen education systems organise such tests for certification purposes, which are intended to summarise students' achievements at the end of a school year or an educational stage. The results are used to award certificates or take formal decisions with regard to student progression to the next stage of education. All the certification tests in citizenship education take place at the secondary level of general education. In Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (England), it is also possible for some students in school-based IVET to take certification tests in citizenship education.

Moreover, eight education systems administer standardised tests in citizenship education with the purpose of evaluating and monitoring the education system as a whole and/or individual schools. In Estonia, these tests take place at primary level, in the Czech Republic and Slovenia, at lower secondary level, in Spain, at upper secondary level, and in France and Lithuania at both primary and lower secondary levels. In Belgium (Flemish Community), monitoring tests are administered at primary and general secondary levels and in school-based IVET. In Finland, the level of education monitored through standardised tests is determined by the Ministry of Education and Culture and is set down in its evaluation plan.

Figure 3.3: National tests in citizenship education: main purpose and levels of education involved, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Explanatory note

National tests in citizenship education can focus on the separate subjects devoted to citizenship education, the subject or subject areas in which citizenship education is integrated, or any cross-curricular themes relevant to citizenship education. Certification tests are used to award certificates or take formal decisions with regard to student progression to the next stage of education. The main purpose of monitoring/evaluation tests is the evaluation and monitoring of the education system as a whole and/or of individual schools. The monitoring/evaluation tests indicated did not necessarily take place in 2016/17. National tests administered to IVET students exist only in Belgium (Flemish Community), Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (England). The certification tests administered in secondary education may take place at either lower or upper secondary level, or both, depending on the country.

National tests administered for monitoring purposes

The precise content, frequency and targeted population of national tests in citizenship education administered for monitoring purposes vary from country to country.

Estonia, France, Slovenia and Finland administer monitoring tests in the separate subjects of citizenship education taught in these two countries. In Belgium (Flemish Community), the Czech Republic, each Autonomous Community in Spain and Lithuania, students take national tests for evaluating the education system and/or individual schools in the subjects or subject areas that have components of citizenship education. Moreover, in Belgium (Flemish Community), other national tests carried out to evaluate the education system also focused on student performance in the cross-curricular attainment targets relevant to citizenship education.

Belgium (Flemish Community), the Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Slovenia and Finland rotate the subjects set in the national tests designed to measure the health of their respective education systems. In Belgium (Flemish Community), the Czech Republic, Slovenia and Finland, the subjects covered by monitoring tests is chosen according to national priorities and consequently not administered at regular intervals.

In **Belgium (Flemish Community)**, students were tested in 'World orientation' in the third grade of primary education in 2010⁽²⁶⁾, and 'Citizenship education' in the last grade of upper secondary general education as well as school-based IVET in 2016.

In the **Czech Republic**, the survey on 4th grade lower secondary education students in social studies organised for the first time in 2011/12 was last administered in May 2015.

In **Slovenia**, one of the three tested subjects rotates and is determined by the minister based on a proposal of the Committee for the National Assessment of Knowledge. The standalone subject 'patriotic and citizenship culture and ethics' was administered in 2011/12 and 2014/15.

In **Finland**, students in grade 9 were tested in social studies in 2010/11 and will be tested again in this field in 2022, according to the evaluation plans of the Ministry of Education and Culture.

In contrast, Estonia, Spain and France administer their monitoring tests on a regular basis.

In **Estonia**, the civic level assessment test takes place every 3-5 years in the last year of primary education.

In **Spain**, national tests in the subject geography and history, which are intended to monitor social and civic competences, were introduced in June 2017. They will be administered annually to students in the last grade of compulsory education in each Autonomous Community.

In **France**, the monitoring tests in history, geography and civic education are administered every six years to students in the last year of both primary and lower secondary education, the last time being 2012.

The tests organised for monitoring the education system are administered to a sample of students or schools, except in Estonia where all students in the grade concerned take the monitoring test.

Finally, in Lithuania, individual schools decide every year whether they will administer standardised tests in the two subject areas that have components of citizenship education, i.e. 'knowledge of the world' in fourth grade of primary education and 'social sciences' in fourth grade of lower secondary education. These standardised tests are provided to schools by education authorities for evaluation and improvement purposes at individual, class and whole school level. Their results are not aggregated at national level.

⁽²⁶⁾ World orientation was the learning area integrating components of citizenship education in 2010/11. See European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a for more information.

National tests administered for certification purposes

Annual national examinations in citizenship education are organised either on a compulsory basis for all students or as an option. This aspect is often associated with the level of education at which the tests take place, which in turn reflect differences between organisational structures for lower and upper secondary education. While students in most cases follow the same curriculum until the end of lower secondary level, upper secondary level is usually organised into different educational pathways which culminate in a wide range of final examinations.

Only in Estonia, do schools decide whether civics and citizenship education is part of the three examinations administered at the end of grade 9. In the other five countries with national examinations in citizenship education administered at the end of lower secondary education, the examinations are compulsory for all students. In France and Ireland, these examinations concern separate subjects in citizenship education, i.e. 'civic and moral education' and 'civic, social and political education' respectively. The latter examination, taken within the framework of the Junior Certificate, was administered for the last time in June 2017. Its removal is part of a broad reform of student assessment at lower secondary level, which aims to award more weight to classroom-based assessment as compared to external assessment. In Latvia, the centralised examinations in history and the Latvian language address topical issues relevant to citizenship education (meaning of citizenship, democracy, tolerance, patriotism, national identity, and attitudes towards migration). In Poland, part of the lower secondary school leaving examination deals with 'humanities', a subject area which has components of citizenship education. In Sweden, national tests in social studies, history, geography and religion, which have components of citizenship education, are compulsory for all students in grade 9.

The national examinations in citizenship education administered at upper secondary level are usually optional. Croatia, Poland, Finland and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), offer national examinations in compulsory or optional subjects devoted specifically to citizenship education. This will also be the case in Ireland as of June 2018, for the optional subject 'politics and society' introduced in 2016/17.

In **Croatia**, students in last grade of upper secondary general education or school-based IVET can choose the optional subject 'politics and economy' to be part of their state *matura* exam.

In **Poland**, 'knowledge about society' is an optional subject for one of the written tests in the matriculation examination. Students in upper secondary general education as well as some students in school-based IVET have the option to sit for the matriculation examination, which is a requirement for applying to higher education.

In **Finland**, students in the last grade of upper secondary general education can choose to take a matriculation examination in social studies.

In the **United Kingdom (England)**, students may opt to take standardised examinations in 'citizenship studies' of increasing levels of difficulty as they progress through the upper secondary level of education. These are the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) in grade 11, the General Certificate of Education Advanced Subsidiary (GCE AS) Level in grade 12 and the General Certificate of Education (GCE) Advanced Level in grade 13. With the exception of the GCSE in Citizenship, which is not available in Wales, these examinations may be taken by students in Wales at the same grades and in Northern Ireland at grades 12-14. The examinations at GCE AS and GCE A Level (for all three jurisdictions) are being discontinued, with the last examinations to take place in 2018.

Moreover, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) organize optional standardised examinations in subjects or subject areas with components of citizenship education. Latvia has both optional and compulsory examinations addressing citizenship education.

In **Latvia**, students in the last grade of upper secondary general education as well as those in first or last grade of school-based IVET can choose to take a centralised examination in Latvian history and world history. Furthermore, all students in the last grade of both general education and school-based IVET have to take a national examination in the Latvian language.

In **Lithuania**, students in the last grade of upper secondary general education or the penultimate grade of school-based IVET have the option to take a national maturity examination in history, which covers topics such as the 'constitution of the Republic of Lithuania' and 'democratic participation'.

In the **Netherlands**, students who have chosen social studies as an elective subject for upper secondary general education have to take the corresponding central examination in their last year of schooling. This examination includes the following areas: skills, 'political decision-making', 'mass media', 'multicultural society', 'people and work', 'crime and law', 'environment and policy' and 'development cooperation'.

In **Slovenia**, students in the last grade of upper secondary general education may choose sociology, which also includes aspects of citizenship education, as one of the two elective subjects of the national general *matura* examination. Students in technical upper secondary education (4-year VET programme) finish their education with the vocational *matura* but they may decide to take an additional exam of the general *matura* in sociology in order to access HE academic study programmes.

In the **United Kingdom (Wales)**, students in grade 10 or 11 may have the option of taking a GCSE in 'personal and social education' (PSE). The GCSE assesses three themes from PSE: 'active citizenship'; 'health and emotional well-being'; 'sustainable development and global citizenship'. This qualification is being discontinued, with the final examination in 2017.

In the **United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)**, students in the last year of compulsory education can choose to take a GCSE in 'learning for life and work', a compulsory area of learning with components of citizenship education.

3.3.2. Scope and types of questions in national tests in citizenship education

The aspects of citizenship education covered by national testing vary across countries. Standardised assessment which focuses on all the main components (knowledge, skills and attitudes) can be found in Belgium (Flemish Community), Estonia, Ireland, Spain, France, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovenia (monitoring test) and Poland.

In **France**, the *Diplôme national du Brevet* at the end of lower secondary education includes a written examination in moral and civic education, which asks students to reflect about a civic issue, on the basis of a real life situation which may be detailed in supporting documents. The examination is based on the competences set out in the *Socle Commun*, and include an evaluation of students' understanding of the laws and norms for living together in society, the capacity to exercise judgement (thinking for oneself and developing one's ideas with others), and the ability to engage in society (acting individually or collectively in a responsible manner).

In contrast, in the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), national tests in citizenship assess students' knowledge and skills but not attitudes. Finally, in Croatia and Slovenia (certification tests), only students' knowledge is targeted by standardised assessment in citizenship.

In most of the education systems concerned, national tests in citizenship take the form of a traditional written examination. In certain countries, a system of computer-based testing has been developed. For instance, in the Czech Republic, the sample-based monitoring tests in social studies are closely adapted to the individual attainment level of students taking them. The level of attainment reached by the student in the first part of the test determines what questions will be included in following parts of the questionnaire.

As regards to the particular types of questions set in national tests in citizenship, Croatia uses exclusively multiple-choice questions. All the other countries use a mix of multiple-choice items, short answers or essays, and/or open-ended questions. In Poland, for instance, the matriculation examinations in civics include the interpretation of diagrams/data, the comprehension of source texts, problem solving, the assessment of political party programmes or social phenomena, descriptions of events, etc.

Moreover, a few national tests in the specific subjects devoted to citizenship education include also some form of project-based assessment, which provides evidence of learning accumulated over time in the context of practical experiences relevant to citizenship education.

In **France**, the *Diplôme national du Brevet* at the end of lower secondary education includes an optional oral examination where students present a project realised in the context of interdisciplinary or thematic activities relevant to citizenship education (e.g. in the field of citizenship or sustainable development).

In **Ireland**, the formal assessment of students by the State Examinations Commission for obtaining the Leaving Certificate in Politics and Society, which will take place in June 2018 for the first time, will be partly based on a report on the student's participation in a citizenship project.

In the **United Kingdom (England and Northern Ireland)**, students taking the GCSE in citizenship studies are asked questions about the citizenship action they were required to undertake for the course. Citizenship action is defined as 'a planned course of informed action to address a citizenship issue or question of concern aimed at delivering a benefit or change for a particular community or wider society'. Students are required to conduct a critical investigation leading to citizenship action. The questions about the citizenship action account for a minimum of 15 % of the total GCSE marks. Students in the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) taking the qualification at GCE AS Level or GCE A Level must compile an Active Citizenship Profile recording their participation in citizenship activities in the classroom, in school, college or within the wider community. Students should use the information in their profile to analyse and evaluate their own evidence and reflect on the issues raised in response to the questions set.

3.4. External school evaluation

At school, citizenship education takes place in various learning contexts which include not only the formal curriculum but also school life and extra-curricular activities (see Chapter 2). In this respect, a whole-school culture embedding citizenship education may provide important support, in addition to contributions made by individual teachers. As the external evaluation of schools seeks to monitor or improve the overall school quality, including sometimes that of individual teachers, it may be a useful instrument to promote areas of learning such as citizenship education, where the school environment plays an important role. This section examines to what extent aspects of school organisation which impact on citizenship education provision are included in school evaluation.

Many types of school activities may be evaluated in relation to the provision of citizenship education. For analytical purposes, these aspects have been grouped into five main areas:

- classroom teaching
- school/classroom climate
- student involvement in school life
- parental involvement in school life
- relationships with the local/wider community

In a majority of the countries that carry out external school evaluation, this process covers all, or at least four of the areas of school activity important for delivering citizenship education (see Figure 3.4). Student involvement in school life is the area most often evaluated while relationships with the local/wider community is evaluated the least. In a few countries, top level regulations or guidelines on external evaluation do not include any references to citizenship education. This might be due to external evaluation systems focusing on limited aspects of school work (Belgium (French Community)) or focusing mainly on internal evaluation (Austria), or to the decentralisation of educational decision-making at local levels (Denmark) ⁽²⁷⁾.

⁽²⁷⁾ For more information on the external evaluation of schools, see European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015a.

The evaluation of **classroom teaching**, as with other curriculum subjects or areas, examines the adherence to official curriculum content and recommended teaching methods, the quality of the teaching and learning process, and pupil/student learning outcomes.

School or classroom climate mainly refers to 'a system of attitudes, values, norms, beliefs, daily practices, principles, rules, teaching methods and organisational arrangements' (Eurydice, 2005). Evaluation criteria related more specifically to classroom climate typically emphasise the opportunities for students to express themselves with confidence and listen to each other during classroom discussions or debates. More general expectations regarding school climate may refer to safety, security, health, respectful relationships as well as school communication practices. The existence of anti-violence or anti-bullying practices may also be part of the criteria for the evaluation of school climate.

For example, in **Spain**, several Autonomous Communities have included elements such as coexistence and school climate in their inspection plans, within the framework of the Strategic Plan for School Co-existence. Hence, the education inspectorate of **Aragon** has defined the following indicators to monitor activities carried out by schools to promote a good atmosphere and root out of all forms of violence. Inspectors should:

- assess the model adopted to monitor and improve school life based on evidence from school plans and policies;
- verify that policies to combat violence in school, especially bullying, have been adopted and implemented;
- check that the Coexistence Plan and, where appropriate, innovation projects (related to the subject) have had a positive effect on improving school life and have helped in resolving conflicts.

Addressing recently emerging priorities, inspectors in the United Kingdom (Wales) should consider how the school keeps pupils safe from the dangers of radicalisation and extremism in making judgements on safeguarding arrangements. Furthermore, a few countries report external evaluation criteria dealing with specific values to be promoted at school.

For instance, in the **Czech Republic**, inspectors look at whether teachers support the development of democratic values and citizenship commitment.

In **Slovenia**, inspectors oversee whether schools support national identity and knowledge of the history of Slovenia and its culture by commemorating national holidays, singing the national anthem and displaying the flag.

In the **United Kingdom (England)**, Ofsted inspectors must evaluate the effectiveness and impact of the provision for pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development. One of the indicators of pupils' social development is an 'acceptance and engagement with the fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs; they develop and demonstrate skills and attitudes that will allow them to participate fully in and contribute positively to life in modern Britain' (28).

The evaluation of **student involvement in school life** may be concerned with participation in activities organised by the school, or in school decision-making through representation on school or student bodies (29). Some countries also look at other aspects:

For example, in **Sweden**, where the focus of external evaluation is laid down in the Education Act (30), evaluating student involvement in school life includes assessing their influence over the content, work methods and structure of education, e.g. whether students participate in developing assignments.

In **France**, a tool enabling schools and education authorities to evaluate not only the level of student participation in upper secondary schools but also its main obstacles was recently made available by the Ministry of National Education.


(28) https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/553942/School_inspection_handbook-section_5.pdf

(29) For more information on regulations and recommendations on student participation in school governance, see European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a.

(30) http://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/skollag-2010800_sfs-2010-800

Schools' capacity to ensure **parental involvement in school life** may be measured by looking at parent participation in school governance bodies⁽³¹⁾, educational meetings or special days. The quality of communication with parents may also be appraised, for instance by considering the way the strategic school documents such as mission statements are shared with parents.

Figure 3.4: Aspects of citizenship education included in external school evaluation according to top level regulations and recommendations, in primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

External evaluation is conducted by evaluators who report to a local, regional or top level authority and who are not directly involved in the activities being evaluated. School evaluation focuses on the activities carried out by school staff without seeking to assign responsibility to individual staff members. Evaluation of this kind seeks to monitor or improve school quality and/or student results, and findings are presented in an overall report that does not include individual teacher appraisal information.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE nl): The focus of each inspection is determined by a preliminary investigation. Therefore, the aspects of citizenship education shown in Figure 3.4 may not be systematically evaluated.

Belgium (BE nl) and France: The evaluation of student and/or parent involvement in school life concerns only secondary schools.

Germany: The responsibility for evaluation criteria lies with the *Länder*. Information shown reflects criteria commonly used across the *Länder*.

Estonia, Ireland and Liechtenstein: Information only applies to general education.

Spain: Information shown reflects aspects covered by the Education Inspectorates of Andalucía, Aragón and Balears (Illes).

Cyprus: The aspects taken into account in external evaluation of schools apply to ISCED 2 and 3 of general education.

Malta: Information only applies to ISCED 1 and 2 of general education, as well as school-based IVET.

Switzerland: Information shown for ISCED 1 and 2 reflects areas of school activity commonly included in the Canton's framework for external school evaluation. For ISCED 3 and IVET, the inclusion of aspects of citizenship education in external evaluation depends on their inclusion in the school's quality programme.

Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia: Student involvement in school life is evaluated from ISCED 2.

A school's relationships with the local and wider community may be measured through, for example, the development of projects or partnerships with institutions and non-governmental organisations, or education and culture centres.

⁽³¹⁾ For more information on regulations and recommendations on parents' participation in school governance, see European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a.

For instance, in the **United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)**, inspectors consider the links that have been established between the school and the wider community, including, for secondary schools, links with employers.

Various sources and methods may be used by inspectors for evaluating the quality of citizenship education. In some countries, schools are asked to formalise their commitment towards the implementation of citizenship education in strategic documents, sometimes following recently issued top level education policies related to this area of learning.

In **Germany**, within the framework of the 2014 recommendations of the Standing Conference of the Ministers for Education and Cultural Affairs, *Remembering our Past for our Future*, schools are expected to develop school profiles which reflect respect for democracy, human rights, and remembrance, and firmly establish these values within the 'school programme', which is subject to external evaluation in each *Land*.

In **France**, national inspectors examine the citizenship sections (*volet citoyenneté*) of the school plan, to assess, for example, the involvement of school heads, parents and students in the Committee for Health and Citizenship Education (*Comité d'éducation à la citoyenneté et à la santé* – CESC) and in other actions at school and wider community level.

In the **Netherlands**, in addition to monitoring the basic targets on school climate, inspectors also look at the explicit inclusion of references to citizenship education in school mission statements and other school planning documents. Schools have to develop a school plan in which they formulate a mission and vision for the citizenship education they will offer and which explains and how learning goals will be obtained.

Inspection reports compiling external evaluation findings may provide an overview of school practices in various aspects of citizenship education, as well as highlight challenges and good practices in the field.

For instance, in **Germany**, in the *Land* of Hamburg, inspectors have issued an online guide explaining the characteristics of schools that promote democracy education ⁽³²⁾.

In **France**, the involvement of parents at school level has also been examined and made available in inspection reports which provide an overall view of the situation ⁽³³⁾.

In the **United Kingdom (England)**, in 2013, the Inspectorate published a survey report evaluating the quality of citizenship education in primary and secondary schools ⁽³⁴⁾, as part of its annual programme of subject and thematic surveys.

In the **United Kingdom (Wales)**, in 2014, the Inspectorate published the results of its survey of primary and secondary schools on the progress made in education for sustainable development and global citizenship ⁽³⁵⁾.

Ad hoc surveys commissioned by education authorities

In addition to regular inspections conducted by school inspectors or other types of external evaluators, education authorities commission ad hoc surveys on various aspects of school activities which relate to citizenship education. For instance, the Czech School Inspectorate administered an online questionnaire in 2016 to a sample of schools providing primary and lower secondary education in order to evaluate conditions, content and quality of citizenship education as well as assess pupils' knowledge in relevant themes. The Czech School Inspectorate also surveyed and evaluated various specific school activities that enable the development of pupils' citizenship knowledge and skills in real life. A final report, including recommendations for improving teaching and learning citizenship education at school, is available online ⁽³⁶⁾.

⁽³²⁾ <http://li.hamburg.de/demokratie/material/3137692/artikel-merkmale-demokratiepaedagogischer-schulen/> (p. 18)

⁽³³⁾ <http://media.education.gouv.fr/file/47/0/3470.pdf> - http://cache.media.education.gouv.fr/file/11_-_novembre/66/1/20151110_Rapport_statut_parent_delegue_496661.pdf

⁽³⁴⁾ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/citizenship-consolidated-a-survey-of-citizenship-in-schools>

⁽³⁵⁾ <https://www.estyn.gov.wales/thematic-reports/esdgc-progress-education-sustainable-development-and-global-citizenship-june-2014>

⁽³⁶⁾ http://www.csicr.cz/html/TZ_Obcanka/html5/index.html?&locale=CSY

In France, a number of surveys on school climate⁽³⁷⁾ or student wellbeing were recently carried out by the ministry responsible for education. Moreover, the ministry monitors annually the proportion of parents voting in elections to choose their school representatives and publishes results on its website⁽³⁸⁾. In addition, in Estonia, evaluations of the classroom climate are carried out through sociometric questionnaires within the framework of bullying prevention programmes⁽³⁹⁾. In 2015, the Confederation published a report on citizenship education at upper secondary level (general and VET)⁽⁴⁰⁾. The main objective was to find out how the Cantons and their schools cover citizenship education and to identify potential for improvement. Based on the results, the Confederation concluded that an expert commission should develop citizenship elements for framework curricula, education plans should be more detailed, and teachers should all be made more aware of citizenship education⁽⁴¹⁾.

Summary

Two main ways through which education authorities can provide a framework for student assessment in citizenship education have been examined: central guidelines for classroom assessment by teachers, and national tests. Overall, the analysis in this chapter tends to show that student assessment in citizenship education is not an area systematically addressed at central level across the countries covered.

Twenty-six education systems provide teachers with official guidelines on assessment in the classroom which apply to citizenship education. In the remaining education systems, more autonomy is left to the local level, to schools or teachers to develop assessment procedures. Where they exist, official guidelines consist in most cases of a general framework for the whole assessment process, irrespective of the subject concerned. Though, in ten education systems⁽⁴²⁾, where assessment guidelines are defined for specific subjects or cross-curricular areas included in their respective national curricula, guidelines specific to citizenship education are provided.

Regarding the focus of assessment within the official guidelines, a majority of the countries concerned recommend assessing all three components of citizenship education, i.e. knowledge, skills and attitudes. In contrast, official guidelines in Austria, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland) limit the scope of assessment to knowledge and skills.

In general, countries with guidelines on classroom assessment recommend using specific assessment methods. There are no major differences in the assessment methods recommended in the general guidelines for all subjects and the specific guidelines related to subjects or cross-curricular themes addressing citizenship education. Overall, there is not much difference in the degree to which the guidelines promote traditional assessment methods such as multiple choice questionnaires, or the alternative methods considered to be particularly suitable in the context of citizenship education, such as project-based assessment or self/peer assessment. However, portfolio assessment, which is also

⁽³⁷⁾ http://cache.media.education.gouv.fr/file/2015/10/1/depp-ni-2015-50-neuf-eleves-sur-dix-declarent-se-sentir-bien-dans-leur-lycee_517101.pdf ; http://cache.media.education.gouv.fr/file/2013/97/7/DEPP_NI_2013_26_perception_climat_scolaire_collegiens_reste_positive_283977.pdf; http://cache.media.education.gouv.fr/file/2015/66/5/depp-ni-2015-49-sivis-2014-2015_514665.pdf

⁽³⁸⁾ <http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid2659/les-parents-d-eleves.html>

⁽³⁹⁾ <http://www.kivaprogram.net/estonia>

⁽⁴⁰⁾ http://edudoc.ch/record/122676/files/3751_Expertenbericht_f_DEF.pdf

⁽⁴¹⁾ https://www.sbf.admin.ch/dam/sbf/fr/dokumente/2016/06/bericht-br.pdf.download.pdf/PO_13-3751_BR-Bericht_f_DEF.pdf

⁽⁴²⁾ Estonia, Ireland, Spain, France, Latvia, Slovenia, United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), Iceland, Serbia and Turkey

among the assessment methods emphasised as particularly suitable for citizenship education, is referred to in the national guidelines of eight countries only across primary and secondary education.

Almost half of education systems (17) organise national testing in citizenship education. National tests in the separate subjects devoted to citizenship education and in the subjects or subject areas integrating components of citizenship education are organised in eight and eleven education systems respectively⁽⁴³⁾. National tests focusing on citizenship competences delivered across the curriculum, which is another challenge specific to assessment in citizenship education highlighted by the research literature, can be found in Belgium (Flemish Community).

The purpose of national tests in citizenship is most often to award certificates or take formal decisions with regard to student progression to the next stage of education. However, eight education systems⁽⁴⁴⁾ administer national tests in citizenship education with the purpose of evaluating and monitoring the education system as a whole and/or individual schools, and not to make decisions on student progression.

In most of the education systems concerned, national tests in citizenship take the form of a traditional written examination, including a mix of multiple-choice items, short answers or essays, and/or open-ended questions. In contrast, in France, Ireland and the United Kingdom (England and Northern Ireland), national tests in citizenship education also include some form of project-based assessment. As highlighted by the research literature, such methods may enable students to demonstrate a wide set of skills accumulated over time in the context of practical experiences relevant to citizenship education.

Beyond national tests, another way to gather information on the quality of citizenship education is through external school evaluation. In a majority of the countries that carry out external school evaluation, this process covers several of the areas of school activity important for delivering citizenship education. Student involvement in school life is the area most often evaluated while relationships with the local/wider community is evaluated the least.

⁽⁴³⁾ National tests in separate subjects devoted to citizenship education: Estonia, Ireland, France, Croatia, Poland, Slovenia, Finland and United Kingdom (England). National tests in subjects or subject areas integrating components of citizenship education: Belgium (Flemish Community), Czech Republic, Spain, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden and United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland).

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Belgium (Flemish Community), Czech Republic, Estonia, Spain, France, Lithuania, Slovenia and Finland

CASE STUDY 3: DEVELOPING ASSESSMENT TOOLS FOR SOCIAL AND CITIZENSHIP COMPETENCES IN ESTONIA

National curricula for compulsory and upper secondary education in Estonia specify eight fields of general competences for students. All teachers should share responsibility for delivering these competences, which are seen as essential for personal fulfilment and development both during schooling and in later life. This case study deals with the recent national initiatives in Estonia intended to promote the eight general competences which form a cross-curricular element at all levels of the school system. It describes the Ministry of Education and Research's approach to further developing teaching and assessment materials to support these general competences by commissioning a research project from Tallinn University. It also emphasises some of the difficulties resulting from this approach.

Defining citizenship education as a cross-curricular theme is widespread among European countries. However, implementing a curriculum area in a transversal manner poses significant challenges in terms of teaching and assessment. For instance, integrating cross-curricular topics into the teaching of individual subjects such as mathematics or languages, requires a common understanding among teachers of the learning outcomes to be achieved (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b). Furthermore, as the literature suggests (see Chapter 3), cross-curricular themes are more likely to be effectively implemented when they are based on coordinated assessment measures instead of individual subject-bound methods of assessment. The on-going national developments, which have focused on improving teachers' shared knowledge and understanding of the best methods of teaching and assessing students in cross-curricular social and citizenship competences, are presented here.

The information below is primarily based on interviews with key actors in the Ministry ⁽¹⁾ and in the team of researchers ⁽²⁾ at Tallinn University who carried out the above-mentioned research project. Information is also based on interviews with a lecturer overseeing the initial education of history and civics teachers ⁽³⁾, as well as a representative of the state agency responsible for the national testing system ⁽⁴⁾. All these interviews were organised and facilitated by the Head of the Estonian Unit of the Eurydice Network ⁽⁵⁾.

Rationale and main objectives

Findings from external evaluations of the education system ⁽⁶⁾ highlighted that integrating the general competences within their subject teaching was perceived as a challenging task by teachers.

Areas of general competence for compulsory and upper secondary education in Estonian national curricula, 2014	
Cultural awareness and values	Communication
Social awareness and citizenship	Mathematics, science and technology
Self-awareness	Entrepreneurship
Learning to learn	Digital world

The Ministry's interpretation is that the main reason for teachers' difficulties is the lack of guidance in national curricula on suitable learning and assessment methods. Indeed, national curricula only provide a short description of the main aims and learning objectives to be achieved with respect to the

(1) Aivar Ots and Kersti Kivirüüt (Chief Experts)

(2) Eve Kikas (Professor of School Psychology), Mariliis Kaldoja (Associate Professor), Elina Malleus (Researcher)

(3) Mare Oja (Lecturer of History Didactics)

(4) Regina Multram (Head of External Evaluation)

(5) Kersti Kaldma

(6) See for instance Loogma et al. (2009), an analysis of the Estonian results in the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey.

general competences. Furthermore, as these main aims and learning objectives apply equally across the entire period of primary and secondary education, there is no indication as to how teachers should break these down in order to construct a coherent and progressive curriculum appropriate for children across the school years.

The general competences are not a new feature of Estonian curricula. Although the last revision of national curricula in 2014 strengthened the emphasis on their acquisition, the general competences were already part of the first national curricula published in Estonia in 1996, after the country had become independent from the Soviet Union in 1991.

To better support teachers in developing students' general competences, in 2011, the External Evaluation Department of the Ministry of Education and Research commissioned the Department of Psychology of Tallinn University to undertake a research project. The project was intended to develop suitable learning outcomes as well as provide teachers with the tools needed to assess students' general competences and thereby improve their teaching. Furthermore, although the Ministry's intention was to enable teachers to establish progressive curricula throughout the school years, the research project focused initially on one level of education, i.e. lower secondary (grades 7-9).

Process and outcomes

Led by the University of Tallinn, the project team was made up of researchers with backgrounds in both psychology and education. In order to be able to develop suitable learning outcomes and assessment tools for lower secondary level, the team of researchers firstly set about improving their knowledge of the level of attainment to be expected from students in general competences through the collection of empirical data. Hence, the research project launched a longitudinal survey of student performance which was administered in autumn 2011, 2012 and 2013 to a sample of students in grades 7, 8 and 9 successively ⁽⁷⁾. Moreover, in order to be able to identify the predictors of the successful acquisition of general competences by students, contextual questionnaires were also administered to teachers and parents.

In order to assess students' social and citizenship competences during the longitudinal survey, a variety of assessment tools was used, which included the following:

- videos and vignettes on different topics (bullying, peer acceptance), followed by computer-based tests with questions on students' perceptions and reactions to the videos, as well as individual interviews with students;
- assignments (emotion-recognition tasks and social planning tasks both based on pictures);
- a questionnaire on social skills (measuring students' level of agreement with 16 statements dealing with their humour, pro-social behaviour, communication and self-control);
- a questionnaire about societal beliefs (measuring students' level of agreement with three statements dealing with possibilities for active participation in society, three statements about self-efficacy beliefs regarding involvement in societal activities, four statements about their interest in societal topics);
- a questionnaire on students' understanding of different concepts related to democracy;
- a questionnaire about attitudes towards democracy including 10 statements;
- a questionnaire about attitudes towards minorities including three statements.

⁽⁷⁾ The longitudinal survey involved 1 277 students distributed in 26 Estonian-language schools (45 classes) and six Russian-language schools (12 classes). The sample was broadly the same from one year to another.

The results of the research project delivered to the External Evaluation Department of the Ministry of Education and Research in 2014 included model assessment tools for the various general competences featured in the national curricula. During the longitudinal survey, a wide range of assessment tools was designed and developed. For the final research report, only those considered by the research team to be the most suitable for use by teachers in their classrooms, considering the necessary expertise for correctly administering the assessment tool and interpreting its results, were included. Hence, for the social and citizenship competences, the research report included a self-assessment questionnaire on students' social skills as well as another questionnaire on students' attitudes towards democracy.

In addition to the research report, a handbook on teaching and learning the general competences in compulsory schooling (Kikas, E. & Toomela, A., 2015)⁽⁸⁾ was distributed to all schools in Estonia. This handbook gives an overview of learning and development, emphasising the different personal and contextual factors that play a role in this development (e.g. norms, laws, values, parent involvement, peers and educational level, etc.). It thus highlights that teachers are only one of the factors that can influence students' general competences. The handbook also includes chapters on all the general competences listed above except self-awareness. Each chapter conceptualises a competence and provides advice on suitable assessment tools.

Interestingly, although social and citizenship competences are combined in Estonian national curricula, a distinction is made between them in the handbook. The main argument behind this is that social competences already include three dimensions which each need to be developed on their own, as indicated by empirical data collected through the longitudinal survey. These three dimensions are: intrapersonal (self-management), interpersonal ('self' in relation to peers) and societal ('self' in relation to society). More specifically, the longitudinal survey showed that growth in the interpersonal dimension does not necessarily involve a similar growth in the societal dimension. Indeed, a high level of social skills, as measured by empathy towards peers, was not consistently correlated with respectful attitudes towards minorities.

Follow-up of the research project and next steps

The intention of the Ministry of Education and Research was twofold: to use the research deliverables to develop a system of national assessment with a view to monitoring students' level of attainment in the general competences; and to provide the tools for teachers to assess students' general competences internally. However, the model assessment tools included in the research report were not all deemed to be appropriate for this purpose. Nevertheless, a questionnaire on motivation and learning to learn competences in mathematics has already been integrated into the national certification tests in mathematics administered at the end of lower secondary education, with the purpose of providing feedback to individual schools, and hence improve teaching and learning. In contrast, the two assessment tools developed for social and citizenship competences (i.e. the questionnaires on social skills and attitudes towards democracy) were not considered as suitable for internal assessment by teachers or for national assessment. Indeed, as the guidelines for the research project were not specific enough regarding the users of its deliverables, the two questionnaires were designed for use by psychologists or special education teachers. Both the questionnaires on social skills and attitudes towards democracy need to be further adapted so they can be used by mainstream teachers or integrated into existing national tests. As a result, the Ministry has planned a one-year project starting autumn 2017 during which the two questionnaires will be adapted for use by teachers as diagnostic assessment tools.

⁽⁸⁾ https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/oppimine_ja_opetamine_3_kooliastmes.pdf

Building on the findings of the 2011-2014 research project carried out by Tallinn University, the Ministry has commissioned the same team of researchers to undertake a second research project (2016-2018) to develop the tools needed for assessing the general competences in primary education. This is in line with the Ministry's vision to support teachers in developing curricula that allow students to acquire the general competences progressively through each stage of school education.

As explained above, the Ministerial work to develop top level assessment tools and national tests in social and civic competences is still on-going. In this respect, a few contextual pieces of information are worth considering. When the Ministry commissioned the research project from Tallinn University in 2011, it was the first time that a national subsidy had been assigned to the development of assessment tools for the general competences. The new National Strategy for Lifelong Learning 2014-2020, provides renewed impetus for this policy initiative. Indeed, the Strategy emphasises the importance of raising achievement in the general competences as well as developing methods for assessing students' level of attainment.

However, a potential obstacle to future work in this area is the fact that the subjects and topics covered by the national tests are set down in regulations. These were recently amended to extend the national tests to cover the general competence of learning to learn (see above), but this has not yet been the case for the social and citizenship competence. A further amendment of the legislation on national tests will thus depend on political priorities, bearing in mind that the possibilities for national testing are limited, due to the burden in terms of costs and organisation on the Estonian education system. In this respect, integrating the assessment of competences into an existing national test, as has already been done in the case of mathematics (see above), might represent a valuable option. However, previous reforms in national tests do not attest to a consistent level of priority apportioned to citizenship education. Indeed, whereas two national tests in civic and citizenship education were introduced in 2006, the one administered at the end of upper secondary education was subsequently abolished in 2012 in favour of other subjects including foreign languages. In sum, the future development of assessment tools in relation to the general competences is an evolving process with a potential for further obstacles to overcome.

Main findings

- To support teachers in developing students' general competences within their subject teaching, the Ministry of Education and Research took the initiative to commission a university research project in 2011, with a view to better understanding how to develop and assess students' general competences at school.
- The research project approach was to build learning outcomes and corresponding assessment tools based on a thorough knowledge of the development of students' general competences gained from empirical data collected by means of a sample-based longitudinal survey.
- The assessment tools for social and citizenship competences produced by the research project were not considered suitable for teacher assessment purposes or for national assessment without further modification.
- The future introduction of new assessment tools for social and citizenship competences is still on the agenda but will also depend on political priorities regarding the subjects and topics chosen for national testing.

CHAPTER 4: TEACHER EDUCATION, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT

Teachers are key players in the provision of citizenship education in schools. In their 'Conclusions on effective teacher education' ⁽¹⁾, EU Education Ministers emphasised the major role that teachers have in supporting students develop the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values they need in order to reach their full potential as active members of society. The availability of relevant, high-quality teacher training for citizenship education is an important prerequisite for equipping teachers with the competences they need to fulfil this role. The question that arises therefore, is how top level education authorities address this issue in their regulations and recommendations on Initial Teacher Education (ITE), Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and other support measures for teachers and school heads.

The European IEA report of the 2009 'International Civic and Citizenship Education' (ICCS) study (Kerr et al., 2010) showed that teacher confidence in teaching certain topics related to civic and citizenship education was relatively high. On average, across the participating European countries, the majority of teachers felt confident to teach about the constitution and political systems (79 %), the EU (78 %), and the global community and international organisations (77 %). However, other studies have shown the reverse, with several indicating that teachers believe they have not received adequate training to teach citizenship education and, consequently, they lack clear concepts of citizenship education, and either do not feel confident to teach it, or feel unsure about choosing the right teaching approaches (Barr et al., 2015; Chin & Barber, 2010; Patterson, Doppen & Misco, 2012; Thornberg, 2008; Willemse et al., 2015).

This chapter thus aims to shed light on the theoretical and practical elements necessary for effective initial education, professional development and support for teachers involved in the provision of citizenship education in schools. It starts with a review of the research literature in the field (see Section 4.1), looking first at what makes an effective subject teacher before providing some insights into the essential knowledge and competences needed for teaching this subject area, and indicating some of the policies and measures that can help improve the effectiveness of initial education and professional development.

The sections following the literature review present the existing top level regulations and recommendations as well as some of the measures adopted by European countries to promote teachers' professional competences for citizenship education and provide them with relevant education, training and support. Section 4.2 focuses on policies related to the initial education of teachers responsible for citizenship education; while section 4.3. analyses teachers' opportunities for further professional development in this area.

School heads have an important role to play in ensuring that students receive the high quality citizenship education that will enable them to become full and active members of society. Therefore, this chapter also investigates how school heads' are prepared for this role. This is not reflected in the literature review due to a current lack of research in the area; however, the policy analysis in section 4.3.2 does explore the citizenship related CPD activities for school heads currently organised or supported by top level education authorities. Lastly, section 4.4 examines some of the other measures available to both teachers and school heads to support the implementation of citizenship education in schools.

⁽¹⁾ Council conclusions on effective teacher education. OJ C 183, 14.6.2014, pp. 22-25. ([http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52014XG0614\(05\)&from=EN](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52014XG0614(05)&from=EN))

4.1. Review of the research literature

There are three essential elements to effective subject teaching: academic and scientific knowledge of the subject matter, pedagogical skills and competences, and an understanding of the social and cultural context of education. Moreover, teacher training should encourage teachers to be reflective and critical with regard to their teaching practice, the management of information and knowledge as well as their interactions with others, especially their students, peers and the local community (Salema, 2005 and 2012).

Teacher training for citizenship education has an added dimension in that the knowledge, skills and competences to be developed by teachers must be firmly based on democratic values and human rights. Crucial to the process is the importance of the personal, ethical and moral development of teachers and the strengthening of their capacity to act as models of active and responsible citizenship (*ibid.*). In order to prepare children and young people for active democratic life, teachers of citizenship education need to become 'carriers and messengers of democratic knowledge, skills and values' (Mrnjaus 2012, p. 82).

At the same time, it can be argued that teaching in general is a moral activity which seeks to help students' develop their personal identity, including their moral and social capacities and their critical reflective abilities (Willemse et al., 2015). All teachers, therefore, can be considered responsible for developing their students' citizenship competences – not just those specialised in the subject or subjects most closely related such as history and social sciences – and all teachers, therefore, should be trained in how to integrate citizenship education into their daily teaching.

The questions that follow from this are: what are the competences needed by teachers citizenship education specialists and teachers of other subjects alike – in order to encourage students to develop the skills necessary to become active, democratic citizens, and what kinds of policies and other support measures are needed to meet teachers' professional development needs?

4.1.1. Essential teacher competences

In order for teachers to become competent and effective in teaching citizenship education, they need to have a profound knowledge of this area, its aims and purposes. However, contrary to traditional, yet in practice, still prevalent models of teaching and learning, which limit the teacher's role to transmitting knowledge and skills and the students' role to listening, teaching citizenship education requires a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional approach. It requires teachers 'to provide a wide range of dynamic learning opportunities that go beyond the borders of school and the community, bridge divisions between formal and non-formal education, between curricular and extra-curricular activities as well as between schooling and socialisation' (Dürr, Spajic-Vrakaš & Martins 2000, p. 60).

According to Dürr and colleagues – who participated in the Council of Europe's (CoE) project on 'Education for Democratic Citizenship' ⁽²⁾, which aimed not only to identify the skills and values required to become participating citizens but also to ascertain how these skills and values can be acquired and taught – teachers' competences with respect to citizenship education need to 'shift from a compartmentalised to an interdisciplinary knowledge of the subject matter', i.e. linking it with other

⁽²⁾ The 'Education for Democratic Citizenship' project group comprised representatives of education ministries, specialists, international institutions and NGOs active in the field of education for democratic citizenship. The group developed a framework of concepts for education for democratic citizenship, including the identification of the basic skills required for democratic practices in European societies. It also investigated innovative and empowering initiatives in which citizens actively participated in society and which involved partnerships between different actors dealing with education for citizenship. Finally the group identified effective methods and ways of learning, teaching and training education for democratic citizenship.

school subjects. They must also move away from linear and static learning to 'create a multiple and dynamic teaching and learning process characterised', for example, by flexible lesson planning and class management as well as diversified instructional and assessment models; and from setting only 'cognitive goals to multiple education goals', which promote students' capacities to act in a complex world (ibid.).

Over and above this, teachers of citizenship education are expected to 'internalise the understanding, skills, attitudes and values that should be developed by their students. They should see themselves as role models for active, democratic citizenship in both their teaching as well as in their relationships with students and their colleagues' (Huddleston, 2005). 'Modelling and demonstrating values, principles and human rights' can, in fact, be considered one of the most effective, implicit ways to promote citizenship education (Salema, 2012).

Finally, teachers need to find ways to balance their students' learning of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values. These elements are interrelated and therefore cannot be learned in isolation (Salema, 2005). Moreover, since citizenship education is above all a practical activity, teachers need to learn how to integrate these four elements in a practical way in the classroom (ibid.).

What all the above shows is that there are many and very high expectations when it comes to teacher competences for citizenship education. Consequently, there is no definitive list of the specific competences expected of citizenship education teachers. However, there have been several attempts to classify the competences needed with a view to providing some structure and guidance for those working in the field (cf. Audigier, 2000; Bîrzéa, 2000; Dürr, Spajic-Vrakaš & Martins, 2000; Huddleston et al., 2007; Brett, Montpoint-Gaillard & Salema, 2009).

First and foremost is the dimension for teaching citizenship education, which is, according to the different classifications, related to **teachers' knowledge and understanding**. This encompasses a profound subject knowledge, i.e. the general aims and purposes of citizenship education as well as the range of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that are to be developed by the students (Huddleston et al., 2007; Brett et al., 2009). It therefore also includes a thorough understanding of core principles and values, such as human rights and freedoms, democracy and democratic principles; the concepts of citizen, civil society, globalisation, etc. (Audigier, 2000; Bîrzéa, 2000; Dürr et al., 2000; Brett, et al., 2009); knowledge of a legal and political nature, i.e. concerning the rules of collective life and the distribution of power in a democratic society at all levels of political governance, as well as knowledge of the present world, including its historical, social, cultural and economic dimensions (Audigier, 2000); and the key international frameworks and principles which are related to citizenship and human rights education (Brett et al., 2009).

Teachers' knowledge and understanding must also include a profound knowledge of the content, aims and purposes of the curriculum for citizenship education (Huddleston et al., 2007; Brett et al., 2009), an understanding of the hidden curriculum – transmitted through project work, field visits, networking, etc. – as well as familiarity with an interdisciplinary, holistic and transversal approach to citizenship education (Bîrzéa, 2000). All these cognitive elements form part of the essential knowledge that teachers need in order to be able to implement the citizenship curriculum and to achieve the right balance between knowledge, skills, attitudes and values learning.

Next to their knowledge about what needs to be taught, another set of fundamental competences for teaching citizenship education highlighted by the different classifications is related to **teachers' methodological capacity** to plan learning activities, implement them and assess students' learning and development. As citizenship education is a particular type of subject area, which aims to prepare students to become active, democratic citizens, teachers 'need to be able to promote students' active

learning and their engagement in learning activities that are relevant, participatory, interactive, collaborative and stimulating' (Huddleston et al., 2007; Brett et al., 2009). Examples of related teaching and learning approaches are structured debates, problem-solving, brainstorming, role play and simulations, media-supported learning, workshops and similar methods, putting students' active participation, engagement and development at the centre of the learning process. (Bîrzéa, 2000; see also Chapter 2).

The teacher competences related to the implementation of citizenship education also encompass their ability to incorporate relevant principles, values and practices within other subjects (Brett et al., 2009). They also include an understanding of the kinds of learning that can be assessed in citizenship education and how this assessment can be carried out, e.g. using a range of techniques for formative and summative assessment; facilitating peer and self-assessment; and using assessment information effectively and responsibly (Pepper, 2013; see also Chapter 3).

A third dimension essential for teaching citizenship education is related to **teachers' social competences**. This encompasses, for example, knowing how to encourage discussions and debates in the classroom within a learning climate that is non-threatening and enables everyone to think critically and speak freely, in particular when dealing with controversial and sensitive topics; it also refers to their capacity to promote student engagement in school life by giving children and young people specific roles and responsibilities related to the running of the school; and it includes the ability to develop active citizenship in students by promoting and supporting their participation in community initiatives or events (Huddleston et al., 2007).

The latter, moreover, also implies teachers' collaboration skills that enable them to work with appropriate partners such as fellow teachers and other education professionals, parents or families, media, civil society organisations and political representatives, etc. in order to plan and implement a wide range of opportunities for students' to engage with citizenship issues in their communities and in society at large (Audigier, 2000; Bîrzéa, 2000; Brett et al., 2009).

Last but not least, another area of competence needed for teaching citizenship education, which is considered in the different classifications, refers to **teachers' capacity for reflection, evaluation and improvement**. Being a dynamic subject area that is linked to social, cultural, political and economic developments, citizenship education requires teachers to constantly reflect on and improve their teaching and learning activities and thereby become reflective practitioners (Bîrzéa, 2000).

Other important aspects of reflection concern teachers' awareness of their own values and attitudes and the relationship between these values and their approaches to implementing citizenship education. Teachers' need for professional development in order to update and innovate their teaching competences constitutes yet another important element for reflection (Huddleston et al., 2007).

And what is finally also included in this competence dimension is teachers' capacity to contribute to evaluations of the extent to which students have opportunities to participate in decision-making in school and become engaged in community life (Brett et al., 2009); and, more generally, teachers' ability to evaluate the implementation of citizenship education in their schools as a whole and their potential to get involved in developing proposals and actions for improvement (Huddleston et al., 2007).

4.1.2. Policies and measures to support teacher training

Having considered some of the main competences for citizenship education required of teachers, this section presents some of the policies and measures intended to improve the effectiveness of teacher training in this area. The Education Council Conclusions on effective teacher education ⁽³⁾ encourages European countries indeed to promote the development of comprehensive professional competences frameworks for teachers, which can be used to raise quality standards in initial teacher education, by defining the competences and qualities teachers require at different stages of their careers or in different teaching situations.

One of the few research documents addressing the ways in which policies can promote teachers' citizenship education related knowledge and competences is the CoE's 'Tool on Teacher Training for Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education' ⁽⁴⁾. In this document, Huddleston (2005) argues that having a 'written policy expressing the desirability of a national approach to teacher training in citizenship education and a commitment to finding the resources needed to implement it' (ibid. p. 57) is one important element in this regard. Such a policy commitment – which could be, for example, part of a national strategy or action plan for citizenship education (see [Annex 1](#) available online) – should cover both ITE and CPD, and it should also emphasise the important contribution of civil society organisations in relation to citizenship education teacher training (Huddleston et al., 2007).

With regard to ITE more specifically, Huddleston (2005) recommends introducing a general citizenship education module covering the main competences needed to teach this topic into the training of all new teachers, i.e. all generalist teachers at primary level as well as secondary education teachers specialised in different subjects. In addition, encouraging teacher specialisation in citizenship education would lead to the creation of a body of citizenship education specialists who could not only provide citizenship education as a separate subject but also share their expertise and train other teachers in the school (ibid.).

Additional training elements may be necessary in order to ensure the effectiveness of ITE in citizenship education. According to Huddleston et al. (2007), these include the provision of opportunities to practice citizenship education in real settings, e.g. through internships or placements in schools that can be considered examples of good practice in delivering citizenship education. Moreover, on completing ITE, beginning teachers should have an induction period which allows them to consolidate their learning and they should be provided with a professional mentor who can offer the range of support needed by teachers at the start of their professional career (ibid.).

Regarding teachers' CPD, as an important first step towards developing a systematic approach, Huddleston et al. (2007) recommend investigating the range of existing training activities as well as identifying gaps in provision. Organising and coordinating all CPD activities, for example by a (national or regional) coordinating body, could ensure better coverage that meets the needs of general citizenship education training for all teachers as well as specific training aimed at deepening the knowledge and competences of specialist citizenship education teachers, and it could also facilitate regular monitoring and evaluation of the quality of provision (ibid.).

Other support structures that can foster effective citizenship education training opportunities for teachers include, according to Huddleston (2005), resource centres – either in the form of institutions or websites – which provide access to a multitude of teaching and training materials. These materials

⁽³⁾ Council conclusions on effective teacher education. OJ C 183, 14.6.2014, pp. 22-25. ([http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52014XG0614\(05\)&from=EN](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52014XG0614(05)&from=EN))

⁽⁴⁾ The tool is based on the CoE's then 46 member states' experiences and expertise with regard to the kind of action needed to support teachers who wish to promote citizenship education and human rights.

can be used by teachers to develop learning activities, inform them about new forms of practice in citizenship education and act as a supplement to CPD courses. A professional association represents another element of support for teacher training in citizenship education, e.g. through helping to establish peer groups, arranging and coordinating seminars and workshops, disseminating research or sharing experiences in a professional journal or newsletter, etc. (Huddleson et al., 2007).

The policies and measures considered here constitute just some of the elements required to ensure the effectiveness of teacher training for citizenship education. Considering that citizenship education is a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional subject area that places many demands on teachers and schools, a corresponding wide range of initiatives and a high level of policy commitment and practical coordination is likely to be required.

4.2. National policies on initial teacher education

Before looking in detail at the top level regulations or recommendations that aim to prepare teachers of citizenship education for their role, it is necessary to first consider the types of teachers employed and the specific qualifications they need to teach the subject at the various levels of education in different European countries. The availability of teachers who have specialised in some way in citizenship education can, as mentioned in section 4.1.2 of the literature review, facilitate the provision of citizenship education as a separate subject as well as support the knowledge and capacity building of other teachers in the school to teach the subject.

4.2.1. Teachers responsible for citizenship education at primary level


Where citizenship education is taught at primary level (see Figure 1.1 in Chapter 1), it is mainly delivered by generalist teachers who are qualified to teach all or most curriculum subjects. However, a few countries – Denmark, Estonia and Luxembourg – report that citizenship education, like other subjects, is taught by specialist or semi-specialist teachers in particular subjects or subject areas. These generally include history, political science, social sciences/sociology, philosophy, geography, economics, religion, ethics, languages and psychology.

In Norway and Turkey, both generalist teachers and teachers specialised in some of the above-mentioned subjects are responsible for delivering citizenship education at primary level. And in Belgium (French Community), responsibility for teaching citizenship education as a separate subject at primary level (in schools offering a choice between different courses in religion and moral studies) will lie exclusively with teachers specialised in citizenship education once this specialisation becomes obligatory in September 2020 (see country example below for more information about the introduction of this specialisation). In government-dependent private schools, the content and objectives of 'philosophy and citizenship' must be implemented by all teachers in all primary education subjects.

4.2.2. Teachers responsible for citizenship education at secondary level

In contrast to primary education, in most countries at secondary level, including IVET, citizenship education is taught by teachers who are specialised in particular subjects i.e. either citizenship education or other subjects (see Figure 4.1). In some countries, there are differences between general education and IVET. In Austria, semi-specialist teachers of citizenship education teach citizenship in general secondary education, while staff specialising in other subjects also teach it in part-time vocational school/apprenticeships. In Switzerland, generalist teachers are responsible for teaching citizenship education in IVET; in Iceland, the subject is not taught on the IVET pathway; and in Liechtenstein, IVET students attend Swiss VET colleges. Information on citizenship education in IVET is not available for Cyprus and therefore not included in this Figure.

Figure 4.1: Teachers generally responsible for teaching citizenship education in general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 2-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

'Specialist teacher of citizenship education' refers to teachers who have specialised during ITE on teaching citizenship education. 'Semi-specialist teacher of citizenship education' refers to teachers who have specialised during ITE on teaching citizenship education and up to three other subjects. These profiles can be mainly found at the level of secondary education.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE fr): The specialisation 'Teacher of Philosophy and Citizenship' was introduced in September 2016 and will be progressively implemented so that by September 2020 only teachers who have obtained a certificate in this specialisation will be able to teach the subject 'Philosophy and Citizenship'. Teachers must also have a minimum of a Bachelor's degree, and have undergone training in 'neutrality' (*formation à la neutralité*).

Denmark: The programme 'Master of Authority and Citizenship' has been available since autumn 2017.

Cyprus: Information about citizenship education in IVET is not available.

Austria: In IVET, teachers specialised in other subjects also teach this topic.

Switzerland: In IVET, generalist teachers are responsible for teaching citizenship education.

Iceland: Citizenship education is not taught in school-based IVET.

Liechtenstein: No school-based IVET.

Where citizenship education is a cross-curricular theme at secondary level (see Figure 1.1 in Chapter 1) all subject teachers share the responsibility for delivering it, and nine education systems⁽⁵⁾ have regulations or recommendations in place that aim to ensure that all teachers attain specific competences for teaching citizenship education during ITE (see also section 4.2.3 below on 'Developing teacher competences during ITE').

In the education systems in Europe where citizenship education is either a separate subject or integrated into other subjects (see Figure 1.2 in Chapter 1), it is taught in the majority of cases by teachers who are specialised in subjects such as history, political science, social science/sociology, philosophy, etc. Whereas in the 2010/11 school year it was only possible to specialise in citizenship education during ITE in the United Kingdom (England) (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a), in 2016/17 this was possible in five education systems, Belgium (French Community), Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (England); and since autumn 2017 this opportunity has also become available in Denmark:

⁽⁵⁾ German-speaking Community of Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Spain, France, Hungary, Netherlands, United Kingdom (Wales) and Norway

In the **French Community of Belgium**, in schools offering a choice between different courses in religion and moral studies, the specialisation of Teacher of Philosophy and Citizenship was introduced in September 2016⁽⁶⁾ and was to be progressively implemented alongside the rollout of the new school subject 'philosophy and citizenship' (from 2016/17 in primary schools and 2017/18 in secondary schools). As from September 2020, only teachers who have obtained this specialist certificate and have, in addition, a minimum of a Bachelor's degree, as well as training in 'neutrality' (*formation à la neutralité*) will be allowed to teach the subject. The certificate is awarded by ITE providers who are either funded or subsidised by the French Community.

In **Ireland**, an increasing number of teachers have a diploma in 'civic, social and political education' (CSPE) methods, as part of a post-graduate degree in education (at ISCED 2). Teachers seeking Teaching Council recognition in CSPE need to hold a Bachelor's/Master's degree focusing on sociology and/or politics, must demonstrate sufficient knowledge, skills and understanding to teach the CSPE syllabus, and must have completed one or more methodology modules on the teaching of CSPE⁽⁷⁾. At upper secondary level (ISCED 3), teachers of the new subject 'politics and society', which is currently being introduced and is still optional for students, have degrees in politics, sociology and related subject areas. It is expected that with the full implementation of this subject in 2018 more detailed guidance about qualification requirements for teachers of this subject will be provided.

In **Luxembourg**, specialist teachers of citizenship education have been trained and recruited since 2015. These teachers have a Master's degree in political sciences, with a focus on political theories and systems, international relations, European integration, political economy, sociology and citizenship education. They are then recruited on the basis of their results in an exam containing, amongst other things, a written test and a dissertation on topics related to citizenship education⁽⁸⁾.

In the **Netherlands**, citizenship education is generally taught by teachers specialised in 'civics and sociology'. Those teaching at ISCED 2 and in IVET follow a Bachelor's degree lasting four years, while the specialist teachers teaching at ISCED 3 follow an additional one year Master's degree.

In the **United Kingdom (England)**, a citizenship-specific qualification – the 'Professional Graduate Certificate in Education/ Postgraduate Certificate in Education in Citizenship (PGCE)' – is available, but not taken up by significant numbers of prospective teachers⁽⁹⁾. PGCE courses in citizenship are offered by several higher education institutions and last an academic year.

Finally, in **Denmark**, the 'Master of Authority and Citizenship' has been available since autumn 2017. It is a two-year part-time Master's degree which allows participants to develop the pedagogical and didactic competences necessary to help students understand the relationship between the individual and the community in association with concepts such as individualism, globalisation, Europeanisation and multi-culturalism. Participants will also be able to understand and evaluate different forms of citizenship and their relevance and validity in different contexts.

In seven other countries, citizenship education is generally taught by semi-specialist teachers, i.e. teachers who are specialised in civic or citizenship education as well one or two other subjects, but mainly history:

In the **Czech Republic**, teachers are usually specialised in two subjects. Civic education is therefore mainly taught by teachers who studied civics in addition to another school subject. However, a teacher who is fully qualified can, with the agreement of the school head, also teach other subjects outside his/her specialisms.

In several countries, teachers combine specialisations in citizenship education and history teaching. This is the case, for example, in **Estonia** and **Poland**, where civic and social competences are generally taught by teachers specialised in history and civics. Similarly, in **Latvia**, citizenship education in grade 10-12 is taught by semi-specialist teachers trained in social studies and another subject such as history or geography. In **Lithuania**, the new Bachelor's degree in 'Subject Teaching – History and Civic Education' is taken up by students who wish to teach history or citizenship education or both these subjects. The social studies specialisation covers four components: citizenship education, ethics education, health education and economics. In **Austria** too, teachers of

⁽⁶⁾ [http://www.enseignement.be/hosting/circulaires/upload/docs/FWB_%20-%20Circulaire_%205821_%20\(6052_20160720_104743\).pdf](http://www.enseignement.be/hosting/circulaires/upload/docs/FWB_%20-%20Circulaire_%205821_%20(6052_20160720_104743).pdf)

⁽⁷⁾ <http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/Publications/Registration/Documents/Curricular-Subject-Requirements-after-January-2017.pdf>

⁽⁸⁾ <http://www.men.public.lu/fr/secondaire/personnel-ecoles/recrutement-enseignant-fonctionnaire/programmes-epreuves/sciences-politiques.pdf>

⁽⁹⁾ According to allocations data from the National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL), the initial teacher training allocation for the citizenship subject specialisation for the academic year 2015/16 was 175 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-allocations-for-academic-year-2015-to-2016>)

citizenship education generally have a Bachelor's/Master's degree in 'History, Social Studies and Citizenship Education' and in other additional subjects.

Finally, in **Slovakia**, citizenship education is generally taught by semi-specialist teachers who have been trained to teach philosophy and citizenship education.

In Liechtenstein, Montenegro and the Republic of Serbia, citizenship education is generally taught by teachers specialised in subjects other than citizenship education who, however, must also undertake professional training in this area (see [Annex 5](#) available on line):

Since student teachers from **Liechtenstein** complete their ITE in Switzerland or Austria, on entry to the profession, they must take and pass three courses and exams covering citizenship and civic education, school legislation and national history.

In **Montenegro**, all teachers may teach civic education provided they have completed two mandatory training modules on the basic concepts of the civic education curriculum and on the use of appropriate learning strategies for teaching this subject. Similarly, in **Serbia**, any fully qualified teacher can teach citizenship education provided that they have completed one or more designated CPD courses. These CPD courses are specifically aligned with the citizenship education topics in the curriculum and are supported by the top level education authorities.

4.2.3. Developing teacher competences during ITE

During ITE, prospective teachers of citizenship education are expected to acquire a significant amount of basic knowledge as well as the skills, attitudes and values that prepare them to effectively perform their role and responsibilities in the classroom, school and wider community. In many European education systems, higher education institutions (HEIs) have full autonomy for determining the content of their ITE programmes. In others, top level education authorities have put in place regulations or recommendations defining some of the essential competences that prospective teachers of citizenship education need to develop during ITE (see also the review of the research literature on teacher competences for citizenship education in section 4.1.1 as well as the necessary policy frameworks outlined in section 4.1.2).

Only five of the 12 education systems, which have specialist or semi-specialist teachers of citizenship education responsible for teaching citizenship education at secondary level, have top level regulations or recommendations specifying particular competences to be covered during ITE (see Figure 4.2a). This low number may be explained by the fact that the content of ITE programmes for specialist and semi-specialist teachers naturally focuses on citizenship related competences, and consequently there is less need for top level regulations or recommendations in this area.

In two of the countries where such regulations or recommendations exist – the Netherlands and Austria – they refer to specific citizenship education related competences to be acquired during ITE by the future specialist and semi-specialist teachers. In Ireland, Poland and the United Kingdom (England), on the other hand, the essential teacher competences to be acquired during ITE are not specific to but are relevant for citizenship education. Consequently, these regulations or recommendations apply not only to these countries' prospective specialist or semi-specialist teachers of citizenship education but also to all other subject teachers (see also Figure 4.2b).

Although HEIs are autonomous in the **Netherlands**, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science has funded the creation of knowledge bases. The Association of Universities of Applied Sciences has, consequently, developed a knowledge base for each subject, and teacher training institutes integrate them into their programmes on a voluntary basis. The teacher training programme for the Dutch student teachers specialising in civics and sociology thus covers the topics determined in the knowledge bases for the Bachelor's⁽¹⁰⁾ and Master's degrees⁽¹¹⁾ in 'Civics and Sociology'. This includes issues such as political, constitutional and


⁽¹⁰⁾ <https://www.10voordeleraar.nl/toetsen/oefenmateriaal?openhandleiding=26>

⁽¹¹⁾ https://www.10voordeleraar.nl/documents/kennisbases_master/kb_maatschappijleer_master.pdf

democratic citizenship; mass media and communication; crime and safety; labour and welfare; social pluralism; culture and socialisation; social and global developments.

In **Austria**, the 14 university colleges of teacher education and several Austrian universities offering teacher training studies have been organised into four regional clusters. Since the 2016/17 academic year, all clusters follow the basic structure of the 'New teacher training' Bachelor's and Master's programmes⁽¹²⁾; however, each cluster has its own curriculum. The curriculum for the North-East cluster (Lower Austria, Vienna), for example, determines the teaching and learning outcomes for prospective teachers of 'history, social studies and citizenship education'. These include knowing the basic theories, methods, concepts and categories of political didactics; being able to pass on knowledge through appropriate methods, including new media; being familiar with the competency model for citizenship education; being able to reflect on citizenship education, seek feedback and evaluate one's own teaching; knowing how to cooperate with external actors; and being able to deal with diversity and inclusion as well as promote gender equality⁽¹³⁾. The curricula of the other clusters have similar teaching and learning outcomes and are also competence-based.

Figure 4.2a: Top level regulations or recommendations on the development of competences during ITE to teach citizenship education – prospective specialist and semi-specialist teachers at general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 2-3), 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

Competences for teaching citizenship education to be developed during ITE may cover knowledge of the citizenship education curriculum, objectives and content; teaching skills and methods appropriate to citizenship education; the ability to engage with students, parents and the local community; and the ability to reflect on and improve practice and performance, etc.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE fr) and Luxembourg: Top level education authorities are currently in the process of defining the essential competences that must be acquired by all future citizenship education specialist teachers during ITE.

Denmark: The programme 'Master of Authority and Citizenship' has been available since autumn 2017.

In Belgium (French Community), Denmark and Luxembourg, where citizenship education specialisations have been introduced very recently, top level education authorities are in the process of defining the essential competences that must be acquired during ITE by all future citizenship education specialist teachers.

Besides the policies to promote the development of competences among specialist and semi-specialist teachers of citizenship education, nearly half of all European education systems have broader top level regulations or recommendations on ITE which address all prospective primary and/or


⁽¹²⁾ http://www.schulpsychologie.at/fileadmin/upload/bildungsinformation/bw_engl.pdf

⁽¹³⁾ http://www.univie.ac.at/mtbl02/2015_2016/2015_2016_243.pdf

secondary level teachers' competences (see Figure 4.2b). Again, a distinction can be made between those countries where the existing regulations or recommendations focus specifically on competences for teaching citizenship education and those that have policies promoting the development of general pedagogical skills which are also relevant and conducive to the implementation of citizenship education.

Top level regulations or recommendations that aim to promote the development of specific competences for teaching citizenship education during ITE among all student teachers exist in nine education systems – the German-speaking Community of Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Spain, France, Hungary, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom (Wales) and Norway (see also the table below Figure 4.2b for an overview of the specific competences for citizenship education promoted through ITE). In Portugal, there are no top level regulations or recommendations promoting the development of specific teacher competences; however, the national body responsible for the accreditation of study programmes for ITE (*Avaliação e Acreditação do Ensino Superior*) verifies that the citizenship component is present in the areas covered by courses.

Figure 4.2b: Top level regulations or recommendations on the development of competences during ITE to teach citizenship education – all prospective teachers at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17



Explanatory note

Competences for teaching citizenship education to be developed during ITE may cover knowledge of the citizenship education curriculum, objectives and content; teaching skills and methods appropriate to citizenship education; the ability to engage with students, parents and the local community; and the ability to reflect on and improve practice and performance, etc.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE de): ITE is only being offered for students training to become teachers at ISCED 1.

Luxembourg: Since 2017/18, all prospective teachers can follow a modular training course on democratic school culture (12 hours)⁽¹⁴⁾.

Liechtenstein: Student teachers finish their education in Switzerland or in Austria; however, they must take three courses and exams covering citizenship and civic education, school legislation and national history focused on Liechtenstein upon entry into the profession.

Netherlands: The knowledge bases for the Bachelor's and Master's degrees in 'Civics and Sociology' as well as the general knowledge bases for teacher training have been developed by the Association of Universities of Applied Sciences, with funding from the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Teacher training institutes integrate the knowledge bases into their programmes on a voluntary basis.

⁽¹⁴⁾ <https://ssl.education.lu/ifen/descriptionformation?idFormation=109382>

Overview of the specific competences to teach citizenship education to be developed during ITE by all prospective teachers at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17 (Figure 4.2b)

Belgium – German-speaking Community

ITE for ISCED 1 ⁽¹⁵⁾

- ❖ Basic knowledge of political concepts and citizenship education
- ❖ Translating political concepts into a child-friendly language
- ❖ Discussing and dealing with current social issues
- ❖ Being open, tolerant and respectful towards others
- ❖ Building effective and constructive relations with others, including parents
- ❖ Critically assessing citizenship education
- ❖ Reflecting on cultural identity, diversity and ethnocentric thinking

Denmark

BA Teacher education programme ⁽¹⁶⁾

- ❖ Knowledge of human and children's rights and the philosophical basis for reflecting on relationships between human rights, religion and democracy
- ❖ Knowledge of the various forms of citizenship and world citizenship in a historical and contemporary perspective
- ❖ Ability to deal with complex challenges within the teaching profession in the context of cultural, value-based and religious pluralism
- ❖ Ability to ensure pupils' learning, development and well-being

Germany

Content requirements and standards for teacher training ⁽¹⁷⁾

- ❖ Democracy education and democracy didactics for teachers in the subject-area politics/social studies/economics
- ❖ Knowledge of the constitution, law and the conventions on human rights

Spain

BA Primary education school teacher (ISCED 1); and

MA Teacher training for lower and upper secondary education, vocational training and foreign language teaching (ISCED 2 and 3, general and IVET) ⁽¹⁸⁾

For primary level teachers (ISCED 1):

- ❖ Promoting democratic citizenship education and the practice of social critical thinking
- ❖ Critically analysing and incorporating the most relevant issues in today's society such as: changes in gender and cross-generational relations, multi-culturalism and interculturalism, discrimination and social inclusion, and sustainable development
- ❖ Creating and regulating learning spaces in diverse contexts with attention to gender equality, equity, respect for human rights, and the values of citizenship education
- ❖ Collaborating with the different sectors of the educational community and the social environment

⁽¹⁵⁾ http://www.ahs-dg.be/PortalData/13/Resources/downloads/Kursbeschreibung_Lehramt_Primar_2015-2016.pdf

⁽¹⁶⁾ <https://www.retsinformation.dk/forms/R0710.aspx?id=174218>

⁽¹⁷⁾ http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2008/2008_10_16-Fachprofile-Lehrerbildung.pdf; and http://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2004/2004_12_16-Standards-Lehrerbildung.pdf

⁽¹⁸⁾ Orden ECI/3857/2007; Orden ECI/3858/2007; Orden EDU/3498/2011

Overview of the specific competences to teach citizenship education to be developed during ITE by all prospective teachers at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17 (Figure 4.2b)

Spain (continued)

For secondary level teachers (ISCED 2 and 3, general and IVET):

- ❖ Relating education to the environment and understanding the educational role of the family and the community, both in the acquisition of skills and learning and regarding rights and freedom, equal rights and opportunities for men and women, and equal treatment and non-discrimination against people with disabilities
- ❖ Mastering skills and social skills necessary to foster learning, interaction, communication and co-existence in the classroom, and addressing the issues of discipline and conflict resolution
- ❖ Developing and carrying out formal and informal learning activities that help make the school a place of participation and co-existence in the environment where it is located

France

Competence framework for the teaching profession, ISCED 1-3, general and IVET; and

Action plan 'The great school mobilisation for the values of the Republic' ⁽¹⁹⁾

- ❖ Promoting secularism and rejecting all forms of violence and discrimination
- ❖ Promoting the values of the Republic
- ❖ Taking into account student diversity and accompanying students in their learning process
- ❖ Acting as a responsible and ethical educator
- ❖ Integrating digital tools into the teaching process
- ❖ Cooperating in teams, with parents and school partners
- ❖ Contributing to the actions of the school community

Hungary

Ministerial decree on the learning outcomes of teacher training ⁽²⁰⁾

- ❖ Basic knowledge of democratic processes, multi-culturalism and the development of social communities
- ❖ Developing a tolerant milieu in the classroom and the community of students
- ❖ Handling conflicts and helping to develop active citizenship among students
- ❖ Being committed to democratic and national values, being free from prejudices, and being willing to accept and respect different opinions and values
- ❖ Cooperating with parents

The Netherlands

General knowledge bases for teacher training ⁽²¹⁾

- ❖ Basic knowledge of and skills for citizenship education

⁽¹⁹⁾ http://www.education.gouv.fr/pid25535/bulletin_officiel.html?cid_bo=73066; <http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid85644/onze-mesures-pour-un-grande-mobilisation-de-l-ecole-pour-les-valeurs-de-la-republique.html>

⁽²⁰⁾ http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A1300008.EMM×hift=20160901

⁽²¹⁾ <http://www.arbeidsmarktplatformpo.nl/fileadmin/bestanden/themas/opleidentotleraar/generiek.pdf>; and https://10voordeleraar.nl/documents/kennisbases_bachelor/kb-generiek.pdf

Overview of the specific competences to teach citizenship education to be developed during ITE by all prospective teachers at primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2016/17 (Figure 4.2b)

United Kingdom (Wales)

Qualified teacher status standards Wales; and

Education for sustainable development and global citizenship: Information for teacher trainees and new teachers in Wales ⁽²²⁾

- ❖ Knowing and understanding the national curriculum aims and guidelines, in particular being familiar with the most recent national guidance on the promotion of education for sustainable development and global citizenship
- ❖ Taking appropriate opportunities to promote and teach education for sustainable development and global citizenship in all relevant aspects of their teaching
- ❖ Ensuring the integration of the topic education for sustainable development and global citizenship in the school's ethos
- ❖ Establishing links with the wider school community

Norway

Framework plans for primary and lower secondary teacher education (ISCED 2 general) ⁽²³⁾

- ❖ Knowledge and skills related to the topics of democracy and citizenship

In most of the education systems above, in developing the specific competences for teaching citizenship education in ITE among all prospective primary and/or secondary level teachers, the focus is on developing not only the knowledge but also the skills and attitudes relevant for teaching this topic. Moreover, in Denmark, Spain, France and Hungary the competences promoted also include values, i.e. being committed to values related to citizenship (e.g. democratic values) and respecting others, as well as being able to deal with differences in values, as in the case of Denmark, Spain and Hungary; and promoting national values, as in France and Hungary.

The knowledge dimension in all these education systems includes a basic knowledge of citizenship education issues referred to as democracy education (Germany), democratic citizenship education (Spain) and education for sustainable development and global citizenship (United Kingdom – Wales). Moreover, this dimension includes a knowledge of human and children's rights (Denmark, Germany and Spain), an understanding of political concepts (German-speaking Community of Belgium) and an awareness of the historical perspective (Denmark and Liechtenstein).

Regarding the skills for teaching citizenship education, the top level regulations/recommendations in four countries (Denmark, Spain, France and Hungary) refer to the need to promote teachers' ability to create appropriate learning spaces, develop tolerance and deal with the challenges related to the diversity of students, including cultural, religious and value-based diversity. Reference is also made to the skills needed to encourage communication and discussion, especially about current social issues (German-speaking Community of Belgium and Spain) as well as for handling conflicts and promoting co-existence (Spain and Hungary).

Another crucial competence related to engagement with students, parents and the local community is included in top level regulations or recommendations for ITE in the German-speaking Community of Belgium, Spain, France, Hungary and the United Kingdom (Wales). It includes building effective

⁽²²⁾ <http://gov.wales/legislation/subordinate/nonsi/educationwales/2009/3220099/?lang=en> and <http://gov.wales/docs/dcells/publications/081204infoteachertraineesen.pdf>

⁽²³⁾ <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/c454dbe313c1438b9a965e84cec47364/forskrift-om-rammeplan-for-grunnskolelærerutdanning-for-trinn-1-7---engelsk-oversettelse-l1064431.pdf>; and <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/c454dbe313c1438b9a965e84cec47364/forskrift-om-rammeplan-for-grunnskolelærerutdanning-for-trinn-5-10---engelsk-oversettelse.pdf>

relationships and working in teams in school and with the education community, school partners, parents and, more generally, the local community, with a view to promoting active democratic citizenship among students.

Finally, competences related to reflecting on, evaluating and improving citizenship education are only mentioned in the top level regulations or recommendations of the German-speaking Community of Belgium and Spain. In both cases the emphasis is on the critical assessment of citizenship education and its contents.

Another ten European education systems – the Flemish Community of Belgium⁽²⁴⁾, Bulgaria⁽²⁵⁾, Ireland⁽²⁶⁾, Italy⁽²⁷⁾, Lithuania⁽²⁸⁾, Austria⁽²⁹⁾, Poland⁽³⁰⁾, Slovenia⁽³¹⁾ and the United Kingdom (England⁽³²⁾ and Northern Ireland⁽³³⁾) – also have top level regulations or recommendations that aim to promote the competences of all teachers through ITE. However, their focus is not specifically on citizenship education related competences but rather on the general pedagogical skills that can also be beneficial for the implementation of citizenship education.

In all of these education systems, the main emphasis of top level regulations or recommendations is on the development of teachers' subject-specific knowledge as well as teaching and learning methods (such as encouraging cooperation and learning in groups), but not on their attitudes and values. In Italy and Lithuania, special emphasis is put on promoting inclusive learning; and similarly, in Slovenia and the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), the requirements include teachers' ability to provide a safe and supportive learning environment in which students feel accepted and where diversity in terms of students' social, cultural, language, religious and other personal circumstances is respected.

Another recurrent element in many of these education systems' top level regulations or recommendations is the ability to work in teams and establish partnerships in schools, with parents as well as with other stakeholders in the local community. On the other hand, none of these education systems make reference to the development of teacher competences related to reflection and improving practices in the subject they are teaching.

4.2.4. Professional training during ITE and in the transition to the teaching profession

As highlighted in section 4.1.2 of the literature review, opportunities to practice teaching citizenship education in real settings through placements, during the induction period or with the help of a professional mentor constitute important elements of practical training for future and beginning teachers. While all three elements exist in most European countries and many national authorities

⁽²⁴⁾ http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/decretenbundel/documenten/2006_lerarenopleidingen.htm

⁽²⁵⁾ Ordinance No 12 of the Minister of Education and Science of 01.09.2016 on the status and professional development of teachers, directors and other pedagogical specialists (prom. SG. 75 27.099.2016) and Application № 2 to art. 42, para. 2 pt. 1 of the ordinance.

⁽²⁶⁾ <http://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/Publications/Teacher-Education/Initial-Teacher-Education-Criteria-and-Guidelines-for-Programme-Providers.pdf>

⁽²⁷⁾ Law 107/2015, Art. 1, par. 115-120 and Ministerial Decree n. 850/2015.

⁽²⁸⁾ http://www.smm.lt/web/lt/teisesaktai/listing?date_from=2015-12-10&date_till=2015-12-10&text=&submit_lawacts_search=No.V-1264

⁽²⁹⁾ Federal Act on the Organisation of Universities and their Studies – Universities Act 2002; Higher Education Act, 2006; Federal framework law on the introduction of a new teacher education, 2013; and Regulation on Curricula for Higher Education, 2013.

⁽³⁰⁾ <http://isap.sejm.gov.pl/DetailsServlet?id=WDU20120000131>

⁽³¹⁾ <http://www.uradni-list.si/1/objava.jsp?urlid=201194&stevilka=4013>

⁽³²⁾ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teachers-standards>

⁽³³⁾ http://www.gtnci.org.uk/userfiles/file/The_Reflective_Profession_3rd-edition.pdf

define their minimum duration (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015b), the content is not usually influenced by top level policies.

Only six European education systems – France, Hungary, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) – have existing top level regulations or recommendations promoting citizenship education related competences through placements, an induction phase and/or mentoring, for all subject teachers. Amongst these, France and Slovenia are the only countries which combine specific requirements on citizenship education related teacher competences during the induction period with the provision of support through mentoring:

During the second year of professional teacher training in **France**, student teachers come into contact with students, they spend teaching time in classes and are mentored by qualified teachers. The competence framework⁽³⁴⁾ underlying student teachers' professional development focuses on issues such as promoting the values of the Republic, taking into account the diversity of students, acting as a responsible and ethical educator, working in teams with parents and school partners, and contributing to the actions of the school community (see also Case study 4).

The **Slovenian** 'Rules on traineeships for professionals in education'⁽³⁵⁾ stipulate that both the induction period and professional mentoring must include content related to the promotion of democracy among students, as well as respect for human diversity and multi-culturalism.

In Hungary and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), the top level regulations or recommendations on the teacher competences to be developed during ITE (see section 4.2.3) also apply to placements, the induction period and professional mentoring. As classified above, the provisions in Hungary and the United Kingdom (Wales) are more focussed on the promotion of citizenship education related teacher competences, while in England and Northern Ireland they are general pedagogical skills that are also relevant and conducive for teaching citizenship education.

4.3. Continuing professional development

Following teachers' initial education and entry into the profession, the need for further professional development arises. The focus of the following sections is therefore on citizenship education related CPD activities organised and/or supported by top level education authorities, firstly for teachers and secondly school heads.

4.3.1. CPD activities for teachers organised or supported by top level education authorities

The organisation and provision of CPD is generally characterised by variety both in terms of providers, and subjects covered. In most European countries, the range of providers includes teacher training centres, teacher associations, schools, HEIs, private providers, etc. CPD is considered a professional duty in the majority of education systems, but in a few, it is only recommended or optional (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015b).

Figure 4.3 shows that, in the area of citizenship education, top level education authorities in around two thirds of all European education systems are involved in the provision of relevant CPD activities (see also [Annex 5](#), as well as Case study 4), even though HEIs are generally autonomous. The main objective of these CPD activities is to develop the knowledge and competences of the teaching workforce and so improve the teaching of citizenship education in schools, even though teacher participation often remains optional. The involvement of top level authorities may include the provision of relevant CPD through national or regional training institutions and/or the provision of top level funding to support such activities.

⁽³⁴⁾ http://www.education.gouv.fr/pid25535/bulletin_officiel.html?cid_bo=73066


⁽³⁵⁾ <http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=PRAV6697>

While in most education systems the CPD activities organised or supported by top level education authorities are intended for all teachers, some countries target teachers of particular subjects. This may be specialist or semi-specialist teachers of citizenship education – as is the case, for example, in the French Community of Belgium, Ireland, Lithuania and Slovakia; or teachers of other specific subjects, such as social studies, history, geography, ethics, etc. – as is the case, for example, in France, Italy, Malta and Turkey. It must be noted, however, that in Ireland, Lithuania and Italy, citizenship related CPD is not reserved exclusively for the subject teachers targeted.

In the **French Community of Belgium, Ireland, Lithuania** and **Slovakia**, the CPD courses organised and/or supported by the top level education authorities are directly related to the objective of strengthening specialist or semi-specialist teacher knowledge, skills and competences in the curriculum subject or area of citizenship education.

In **France, Italy, Malta** and **Turkey**, on the other hand, some CPD courses organised or supported by top level education authorities target the subject teachers usually involved in teaching citizenship education. They cover teachers' knowledge of topics such as law and justice, human rights and democratic citizenship as well as European citizenship and civic competences. In addition, collaborative and management skills, inclusive and participatory teaching approaches, awareness of issues such as the integration of minority groups, international conventions on children's rights and ethical values are also included.

Figure 4.3: CPD activities organised or supported by top level education authorities to help teachers develop the competences needed for delivering citizenship education, 2016/17



Explanatory note

Competences for teaching citizenship education to be developed during CPD may cover knowledge of the citizenship education curriculum, objectives and content; teaching skills and methods appropriate to citizenship education; the ability to engage with students, parents and the local community; and the ability to reflect on and improve practice and performance, etc.

In other education systems ⁽³⁶⁾, top level education authorities organise and/or support CPD activities to develop the competences of all teachers in the area of citizenship education:

For example, in **Spain**, a number of CPD programmes are provided by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport (MECD) and the governments of different Autonomous Communities. The topics covered include, amongst others, co-existence in school and active citizenship in the digital age (MECD); promoting respect and tolerance for gender diversity (Government of *Castilla y León*); conflict resolution (Government of *Castilla-La Mancha*); volunteering and active participation of students in solidarity projects, intercultural education, inclusive education, values education and global citizenship (Government of *Galicia*).

⁽³⁶⁾ German-speaking Community of Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Spain, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Liechtenstein, Montenegro and Serbia

In **Cyprus**, the CPD seminars for secondary education teachers offered by the Cyprus Pedagogical Institute in 2016/17 address issues such as cultivating empathy, applying anti-racist policies in schools, human relations and crisis management, human rights education, integration of migrant students in schools, developing empathy skills and respect for diversity.

The most recent CPD activities provided by the Centre for Education Development run by the Ministry of National Education in **Poland**, covered issues such as legal education at school, counteracting hate speech, ethics education, social and civic competences in formal education, active schools and global responsibility, school democracy, citizenship and human rights education, multi-culturalism in school practice.

In **Portugal**, the Ministry of Education/Directorate-General for Education provides CPD training courses for teachers of all subjects and levels in accordance with the 'Citizenship Education Guidelines'. The issues covered most recently include financial education, learning through entrepreneurial challenges and education for peace.

Some countries seek to influence the development of citizenship related competences among all subject teachers, not only through the provision of training courses and seminars, but also through other methods such as running national conferences (Croatia), creating academic specialisations (Austria) and providing online CPD packages (Sweden). In Germany, the top level authorities intervene directly by specifying content requirements for CPD courses.

In **Germany**, several official documents issued by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the *Länder* lay down common content requirements for teacher training, which apply to all *Länder*. They include democracy education and democracy didactics, knowledge of the Basic Law (German constitution) and conventions on human rights.

In **Croatia**, a series of national conferences open to all teachers was recently held which addressed topics such as civic education and sustainable development, methods of non-formal learning in civic education, civic education and communication for experts in education and rehabilitation, and structural and functional dimensions of civic competences in teaching geography.

The **Austrian** Federal Ministry of Education finances, every second year, the participation of 12 teachers in a Master's degree in citizenship education at the Danube University Krems (University for Continuing Education). The course aims to provide teachers with academic and practical skills related to citizenship education. They are trained to implement citizenship education as an integrated topic as well as a cross-curricular educational principle. The topics covered by the course include the basic concepts of citizenship education, politics and media, culture, economics, Europe, participation, etc. Each cycle of studies is devoted to another main topic.

The **Swedish** National Agency for Education provides several online CPD course packages for teachers as well as school heads on citizenship education related topics such as cooperative learning, enhancing critical thinking and media literacy, and promoting democratic values.

In addition to the on-going CPD offer mentioned above, some European countries also aim to develop teachers' competences for teaching citizenship education through participation in European projects and initiatives:

For example, **Cyprus** participated as a full partner country in the two cycles of the EU/CoE project on 'Teaching Controversial Issues – Developing Effective Training for Teachers and School Leaders'. The aim of the project was to develop effective training on these issues and to strengthen the capability and confidence of teachers and school leaders in this area. Other countries involved in the project were Ireland, Spain, the United Kingdom and Montenegro, with the support of France, Austria, Sweden and Albania. The first cycle of the project was conducted in 2014-2015 (on 'Living with Controversy – A Training Tool for Teachers') and the second cycle in 2015-2016 (on 'Managing Controversy: A Whole-School Training Tool'). The outcome of the project is a professional development programme for teachers designed to support and promote the teaching of controversial issues in schools in Europe.

In 2016, **Poland** participated in the project 'Democracy at School', a joint venture of the Ministry of National Education, Centre for Education Development, the European Wergeland Centre (EWC)⁽³⁷⁾ and the CoE. It is a year-long project implemented in an international environment and composed of two stages, a week-long training course at the training centre of the Centre for Education Development and 10-month implementation of projects in schools.

⁽³⁷⁾ The EWC is a resource centre established in 2008 by the CoE and Norway to promote education for intercultural understanding, human rights and democratic citizenship.

Several other European countries, including the **Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania** and **Slovakia** have also participated in initiatives organised by the EWC, in particular the Regional and National (Summer) Academies⁽³⁸⁾. The Academies aim to foster a more democratic culture in schools across Europe through building the competences of education professionals and community actors in citizenship and human rights education. Participants learn and actively use practical tools and strategies to promote democracy and human rights in schools and their communities. Regional and National Academies are offered by the EWC in close cooperation with the Ministries of Education, the national teacher training institutions and the CoE.

4.3.2. CPD activities for school heads organised or supported by top level education authorities

Like teachers, school heads are also important actors with regard to the implementation of citizenship education at schools. School heads have a key role to play, for instance, in encouraging a favourable school culture, in promoting the active participation of all members of the school community or in creating opportunities for citizenship related activities (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a). Generally, school heads are free to participate in all the CPD activities offered to teachers. However, targeted professional training and support can help provide school heads with the specific competences they need for their role.

In the 2016/17 school year, there were 14 European countries⁽³⁹⁾ in which top level education authorities organised or supported CPD activities to promote school heads' competences for implementing citizenship education in their schools (see Figure 4.4). In four of them – Bulgaria, France, Austria and Poland – the focus is on citizenship education in a broader sense:

In **Bulgaria**, for example, the National Institute for Education and Qualifications provides thematic training activities for school heads, including on civic education, with a focus on practical work and active learning methods⁽⁴⁰⁾. Similarly, in **France**, the National Training Plan 2016/17 includes training for school heads on civic and moral education and the citizen's pathway, the prevention of radicalisation, the transmission of the values of the Republic, etc.

In Croatia, Italy and the Netherlands, on the other hand, training programmes for school heads provided by top level education authorities address, amongst other things, more specific aspects related to the implementation of the citizenship education curriculum:

In both **Croatia** and **Italy**, the issues covered by workshops and seminars for school heads include the implementation of citizenship education as a cross-curricular topic in schools.

In the **Netherlands**, one of the courses provided by top level education authorities called 'Forming Citizens'⁽⁴¹⁾ enables school heads and managers to develop ideas on how to integrate citizenship education in primary schools.

Some of the CPD activities for school heads in several other countries – including Estonia, Ireland, Cyprus, Latvia and Slovenia – have their main focus on the implementation of citizenship education through school culture and governance. While the training programme in Slovenia is mandatory for all future school heads, the ones in Estonia and Cyprus aim to reach those who have recently been appointed; and in Ireland, Spain and Latvia all school heads are being addressed:

Top level education authorities in **Slovenia** provide a programme on managing schools as learning environments in which citizenship is being implemented. Participation in this 'Headship Licence' training programme is a prerequisite for becoming a school head. The programme contains modules on topics such as human rights education, people in organisations, school heads as educational leaders and implementing human and children's rights in school as part of school culture and as one of the school head's

⁽³⁸⁾ <http://www.theewc.org/Content/What-we-do/Summer-Academies>

⁽³⁹⁾ Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Austria, Poland and Slovenia

⁽⁴⁰⁾ <http://www.niokso.bg/obucheniya/katalog-2016>

⁽⁴¹⁾ <http://www.onderwijsadvies.nl/diensten/dienstenoverzicht/burgerschap/>


responsibilities. Optional CPD programmes for school heads cover other citizenship education related topics such as leadership, professionalism and ethics ⁽⁴²⁾.

In both **Estonia** and **Cyprus**, the CPD activities recently provided by top level education authorities target school heads in post. The Estonian programme focuses on democratic school governance ⁽⁴³⁾, whereas the Cypriot one is on the role of school leadership (in primary and secondary schools) in teaching, managing and enhancing socio-cultural diversity ⁽⁴⁴⁾. Moreover, the Cyprus Pedagogical Institute and the Ministry of Education and Culture offer seminars for school heads working in primary schools, addressing topics such as how to address racism and stereotypes in schools and promote and teach equality and human rights.

Professional training opportunities for school heads in **Ireland** focus on promoting citizenship and student engagement through school cultural change ⁽⁴⁵⁾. And a training programme in **Latvia** for representatives of school administrations, including directors, deputy heads and methodology specialists covers issues such as citizenship education in working with parents, in educational work and out of class activities; resources for citizenship education and their application; and strategies for promoting teacher cooperation on implementing citizenship education in school.

In **Spain**, legislation ⁽⁴⁶⁾ developed by the MECED requires that the topic of school co-existence (i.e. prevention of conflict and strategies, programmes and measures to improve co-existence) must be addressed in training courses for school heads. In other words, the Autonomous Communities and the MECED in its managed territories (the Autonomous Cities of Ceuta and Melilla) must include this theme in the CPD activities for school heads held in their territories.

Figure 4.4: CPD activities organised or supported by top level education authorities to help school heads develop the competences needed to implement citizenship education, 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Country-specific notes

Luxembourg: The Centre for Citizenship Education (*Zentrum fir politesch Bildung*) is planning to provide CPD for school heads as of 2018.

Liechtenstein: School heads can take part in the CPD activities for teachers (see Figure 4.3 and [Annex 5](#)).

⁽⁴²⁾ <http://www.solazaravnatelje.si>

⁽⁴³⁾ <https://www.hm.ee/et/tegevused/opetaja-ja-koolijuht/alustavate-koolijuhtide-arenguprogramm>

⁽⁴⁴⁾ <http://enimerosi.moec.gov.cy/d/dme6871>

⁽⁴⁵⁾ <http://www.pdst.ie>


⁽⁴⁶⁾ <https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=BOE-A-2014-11494>

4.3.3. Top level coordinating bodies for CPD

The previous sections on CPD for teachers and school heads in the area of citizenship education showed that there are indeed a large number of training opportunities organised or supported by top level education authorities across many European countries. A top level coordinating body, as described in the literature review (see Section 4.1.2), can help with the management of all CPD activities, ensure wider coverage, and provide courses that meet the needs of teaching professionals.

Figure 4.5 shows that nearly half of the European education systems ⁽⁴⁷⁾ have a top level coordinating body for professional training activities, which generally addresses all curriculum subjects and pedagogical topics, including citizenship education (see [Annex 6](#) available online for a list of all national coordinating bodies). In most countries, this is a national centre or institute (e.g. a university, pedagogical institute, national training centre, etc.) directly linked to or funded by the ministries of education. These top level coordinating bodies may have several different tasks, including ensuring policy implementation with regard to CPD for teachers and school heads, coordinating existing CPD activities, providing training courses as well as developing training materials and monitoring and evaluating the quality of CPD provision.

Figure 4.5: Top level coordinating bodies for CPD, including on citizenship education, 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

A top level coordinating body refers to a national centre or institute (e.g. university, pedagogical institute, national training centre, etc.) tasked by top level authorities to ensure policy implementation with regard to CPD for teachers and school heads, including coordinating and providing training initiatives, and monitoring and evaluating the quality of training provision.

Country-specific notes

Germany: The institutes of school pedagogy of the *Länder* serve as coordinating centres for teachers' CPD, including on the topic of citizenship education.

Spain: The National Institute of Educational Technologies and Teacher Training (INTEF), under the MEC and in collaboration with the Autonomous Communities, develops specific programmes for teachers' CPD. It is responsible for organising such training in the MEC management territories (the Autonomous Cities of Ceuta and Melilla). In addition, the Autonomous Communities, through their Departments of Education, organise CPD programmes in their territories.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ French and German-speaking Communities of Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Greece, Spain, France, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, United Kingdom (England) and Serbia

Italy: Coordination of CPD activities for teaching professionals is ensured through the National Plan for Teacher Training, which is a CPD framework allocating financial resources to schools for in-service professional training on nine priority themes, including integration, citizenship competences and global citizenship.

United Kingdom (ENG): Despite the absence of central provision and prescription regarding CPD (see Figure 4.4), a national coordinating body exists, which helps schools and their partners develop and deliver high-quality CPD and leadership training.

In only a few countries – France, Luxembourg, Austria and Poland – do the top level coordinating bodies have a more specific mandate to manage CPD activities on citizenship education.

In **France**, the Directorate General for School Education (DGESCO) determines the national guidelines for teacher training, including on citizenship education, and delegates this task to the General Inspectorate. The General Inspectorate ensures the integration of CPD opportunities on citizenship education in the training plans of the different *académies*, i.e. the main administrative districts of the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Higher Education and Research. Every *académie* thus organises professional training, designates official days or weeks and arranges events dedicated to citizenship education.

In **Luxembourg** the Centre for Citizenship Education (*Zentrum fir politesch Bildung*)⁽⁴⁸⁾ was established in October 2016. It is a foundation created by the Ministry of Education, but it works independently. One of its missions is to coordinate and offer CPD for teachers and school heads on implementing and promoting citizenship education.

In **Austria**, a Federal Centre of Societal Learning (*Bundeszentrum für Gesellschaftliches Lernen*)⁽⁴⁹⁾ was set up in 2013 by the Federal Ministry of Education. The Federal Centre contributes to a sustainable improvement of the quality of history and citizenship education as well as academic research within the didactics of history and citizenship education. The results of its didactic and scientific basic research have a significant influence on the ITE and CDP of Austrian teachers at all school levels and in all school types. In addition to its scientific activities and publications, the Federal Centre organises conferences for teachers, develops materials for the competence-oriented teaching of citizenship education and has established cooperation between University Colleges of Teacher Education and university institutions that are entrusted with the didactics of history and citizenship education.

The Centre for Education Development⁽⁵⁰⁾ in **Poland** is a public establishment run by the Ministry of National Education offering in-service teacher training on a national scale. The Centre includes a department on 'Social and Civic Competences Development'. The scope of this department's activities includes support for the in-service teacher training institutions offering CPD on social and civic competence development; support for teacher trainers and teacher networks dealing with the topic; and cooperation with national and international governmental and non-governmental organisations active in the field of developing social and civic competences.

4.4. Other support measures for teachers and school heads

In addition to CPD activities and their coordination through a top level body, education authorities also provide other forms of support to help teachers and school heads implement citizenship education (see Figure 4.6 and also the review of the research literature on policies and measures to support teacher training for citizenship education in section 4.1.2).

The most common forms of support in order of popularity is the provision of websites, followed by resource centres and finally teacher associations. All three are either set up by the education authorities themselves or financially supported by them. It is important to note, however, that in practice, these three forms of support may overlap.

For example, in **Croatia**, the Education and Teacher Training Agency⁽⁵¹⁾ combines all three support measures. It organises and supports networks of teachers and teacher trainers involved in citizenship education. It also produces teaching resources for citizenship education and makes these available on its websites.

There are other similar cases where resource centres, i.e. physical institutions providing teachers with information, learning materials as well as training in citizenship education, promote their work online:

⁽⁴⁸⁾ www.zpb.lu

⁽⁴⁹⁾ www.geschichtsdidaktik.com

⁽⁵⁰⁾ <https://www.ore.edu.pl/materialy-do-pobrania>


⁽⁵¹⁾ <http://www.azoo.hr/index.php?Itemid=615>

For example, in **Germany**, the Federal Agency for Civic Education (*Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung*)⁽⁵²⁾ is a federal centre providing citizenship education and information on political issues for all people in Germany, and it provides a multitude of resources, including reports and teaching materials, etc. through its website.

And lastly, teacher associations or networks also often operate online, on a dedicated website:

In **Lithuania**, for example, the website 'Education Garden' (*Ugdymo sodas*)⁽⁵³⁾ is an information system for educational content. It contains educational material on citizenship education as well as on other subjects; and there is a space for teachers to exchange and discuss education related issues.

Figure 4.6: Other forms of support provided by top level education authorities to support teachers and school heads in the implementation of citizenship education, 2016/17



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The forms of support other than teacher education provided or supported by top level authorities to help teachers and school heads in the implementation of citizenship education may include the provision of resource centres, teacher associations or websites. In practice, these three forms of support may overlap, e.g. resource centres may promote their work on their website or teacher associations or networks may operate online.

Country-specific note

Luxembourg: The Centre for Citizenship Education (*Zentrum fir politesch Bildung*) provides all three support measures.

The websites provided by top level education authorities to support teachers and school heads in the implementation of citizenship education usually provide access to all the important information and news about schools and education, conferences and training as well as educational materials on various subjects and topics, including on citizenship education. Only very few countries, such as Spain, Austria, Slovakia and Switzerland have websites that are dedicated more specifically to citizenship education and its closely related issues:

The **Spanish** website 'School co-existence'⁽⁵⁴⁾ offers a variety of information about school life and co-existence. The website is organised into several sections that provide resources related to the 'School Life Strategic Plan' developed by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport in collaboration with the Autonomous Communities, including information about teacher training, protocols, publications, legislation and other useful links.

In both **Austria**⁽⁵⁵⁾ and **Switzerland**⁽⁵⁶⁾, there are websites serving as an information platform on citizenship education offering information about curricula, institutions, teaching materials and, in the case of Switzerland, networking possibilities for teachers and students interested in citizenship education.

In **Slovakia**, the website 'Global Education'⁽⁵⁷⁾ aims to increase awareness of global issues, to promote critical thinking and to increase understanding of topics related to global issues among interested teachers, students and parents.

⁽⁵²⁾ www.bpb.de
⁽⁵³⁾ <https://sodas.ugdome.lt>
⁽⁵⁴⁾ <http://www.mecd.gob.es/educacion-mecd/eu/mc/convivencia-escolar/inicio.html>
⁽⁵⁵⁾ www.politische-bildung.at
⁽⁵⁶⁾ www.politischebildung.ch
⁽⁵⁷⁾ <http://www.globalnevezdelavanie.sk/co-je-gv>

Resource centres – which refer here to physical institutions supporting educational professionals with information, learning materials, training, etc. – are in many cases dedicated to teaching and learning more generally, but they include citizenship education. However, in a few countries, including Germany, Austria and Norway, some resource centres specialise in citizenship education or very closely related issues:

Apart from the above-mentioned Federal Agency for Civic Education (*Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung*), top level education authorities in **Germany** also support the German Society for Democratic Education (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Demokratiepädagogik*)⁽⁵⁸⁾. This is a non-profit organisation which brings together experts in educational research and practice, educational publishers, parents and students in order to jointly promote democracy through education.

The **Austrian** Centre for Citizenship Education (*Zentrum polis – Politik Lernen in der Schule*)⁽⁵⁹⁾ is another example of a central education institution for promoting citizenship education in schools. The centre helps teachers to implement citizenship and human rights education in the classroom, serves as an information platform and advisory centre, develops new materials for the classroom on a regular basis, offers examples of good practice in citizenship education, plays a part in the European and Austrian discussions on citizenship education, has an influential role in teacher training and coordinates the annual 'Austrian Citizenship Days'.

In **Norway**, there are six 'Peace and Human Rights' centres⁽⁶⁰⁾ receiving state funding from the education authorities. The centres offer educational activities for teachers, students and the general public related to one or more of the following themes: human rights, genocides, the Holocaust/World War II, prevention of radicalisation, minority issues, democracy and participation.

In addition to the above-mentioned teacher associations or networks operating online, in some countries there are professional groups of teachers collaborating on citizenship education and related issues. While the work of the teacher association in Ireland is focused on citizenship education, the ones in Estonia, Latvia and Malta focus on history and civics or social studies. The teacher association in Slovenia focuses on citizenship education and other subjects that address related topics.

The **Irish** Department of Education and Skills provides support and funding to the Association of Civic, Social and Political Education Teachers (ACT)⁽⁶¹⁾. ACT disseminates many resources for teachers and holds a training conference annually.

The National Education Institute of the Republic of **Slovenia** employs an expert in the field of citizenship education and coordinates a study group for teachers of the subject 'patriotic and citizenship culture and ethics', which provides a link between teachers and experts in the field through, amongst other things, a virtual classroom⁽⁶²⁾. Study groups exist for all subjects, including those which incorporate citizenship education.

The teachers associations in **Estonia**, **Latvia** and **Malta** focus on history education (Latvia⁽⁶³⁾), history and civics (Estonia⁽⁶⁴⁾) and history, personal, social and career development (PSCD) and social studies (Malta⁽⁶⁵⁾). Their main objectives are to provide a forum for teachers to connect, discuss, and share resources and important information. They also organise seminars as well as provide training for their members.

It should be noted that similar types of support for teachers is provided or backed by NGOs and other civil society organisations. Although these initiatives have not been explored here, they form part of the landscape of professional development organisations, activities and resources that support teachers and school heads in the area of citizenship education.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ www.degede.de

⁽⁵⁹⁾ www.politik-lernen.at

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Center for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities (Oslo – <http://www.hlsenteret.no/english/>), The Nansen Center for Peace and Dialogue (Eastern Norway – <http://peace.no/>), The Falstad Centre (Mid-Norway – <http://falstadsenteret.no/en/>), Stiftelsen Arkivet (Southern Norway – <http://www.stiftelsen-arkivet.no/english>), Narvik War Museum (Northern Norway – <http://warmuseum.no/>), The Rafto Foundation (Western Norway – <https://www.rafto.no/>)

⁽⁶¹⁾ <http://www.cspeteachers.ie/>

⁽⁶²⁾ <https://skupnost.sio.si/course/index.php?categoryid=903b>

⁽⁶³⁾ <http://www.vsb.lv/>

⁽⁶⁴⁾ <http://www.eays.edu.ee/aja/>

⁽⁶⁵⁾ <http://history.skola.edu.mt/>; <https://htamalta.wordpress.com/>; <http://psd.skola.edu.mt/>; <http://mpsd.org.mt/>

Summary

The analysis in this chapter of the policies and measures currently in place across Europe to support the development of teachers' professional competences in the area of citizenship education shows that top level education authorities have, overall, increased their efforts in recent years. Whereas, for example, in the 2010/11 school year, the possibility to specialise in citizenship education through ITE existed only in the United Kingdom (England), in 2016/17, this was possible in four more education systems – Belgium (French Community), Ireland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands; and since autumn 2017, it has also become possible in Denmark. An additional seven countries – the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Austria, Poland and Slovakia – train teachers to become semi-specialist teachers of citizenship education. Finally, in Liechtenstein, Montenegro and Serbia, all subject teachers may teach citizenship education, provided they have completed designated professional training in this area.

Nine education systems – the German-speaking Community of Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Spain, France, Hungary, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom (Wales) and Norway – have defined a set of common competences specifically linked to citizenship education to be acquired by all prospective primary and/or secondary teachers. And an additional ten education systems promote general pedagogical competences that are not specific to but are relevant for teaching citizenship education. Altogether they cover the essential dimensions highlighted in the review of the research literature, in particular, teachers' knowledge and understanding, their teaching skills and the social skills needed to engage with students, parents, peers and the local community. The competences related to the reflective practices needed for constantly evaluating and improving teaching and learning activities in the area of citizenship education is, however, only being addressed in the top level regulations or recommendations of the German-speaking Community of Belgium and Spain.

Likewise, although there is a focus on developing the knowledge, skills and attitudes for teaching citizenship education in all the countries that include citizenship education related competences in ITE, only four countries – Denmark, Spain, France and Hungary – place a similar level of importance on promoting understanding and awareness of the associated values such as democracy, the rule of law, human rights and equality.

Another area that remains largely uninfluenced by top level education authorities is the practical training of teachers in citizenship education before their entry into the teaching profession. Even though opportunities to practice citizenship education in real settings, e.g. through placements, an induction phase and/or with the help of a mentor are highlighted in the research literature as important training elements, they are referred to in top level regulations or recommendations in only six European education systems – France, Hungary, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland).

With regard to teachers' professional in-service training, top level education authorities in around two thirds of European education systems are involved in the provision of CPD activities. The majority of these are open to all teachers, specialist, semi-specialist as well as other subject teachers, and they cover a large range of relevant issues (citizenship and human rights education, school democracy, preventing discrimination and promoting respect for diversity, intercultural education, global responsibility and citizenship, multi-culturalism in practice, peace education, etc.). The training is provided in different formats (courses and seminars, conferences, online packages, etc.). Some countries also specify requirements for the content to be covered. The main objective of these CPD activities is to improve teachers' ability to deliver citizenship education in school, even though the training is generally not mandatory. In addition, some countries are involved in European projects to

provide effective teacher training for citizenship education. These include cooperation with European organisations such as the CoE and the European Wergeland Centre.

Another development in the area of CPD concerns school heads who have a key role to play in creating a school culture that is favourable to the implementation of citizenship education. In the 2016/17 school year, in 14 European countries – Bulgaria, Estonia, Ireland, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Austria, Poland and Slovenia – top level education authorities were organising or supporting professional in-service training for school heads on how to promote citizenship education in schools, through the curriculum as well as through a democratic school culture and governance, including through work with parents, extra-curricular activities and through promoting teacher cooperation.

Half of the European education systems also have a national body responsible for coordinating existing CPD activities for teachers and school heads. These bodies also provide training as well as training materials. Their work usually covers all curriculum subjects and issues, and in four countries – France, Luxembourg, Austria and Poland – they have a specific mandate to manage CPD on citizenship education.

In addition to CPD activities, top level education authorities in almost all European countries support other measures to help teachers and school heads with the implementation of citizenship education. Websites are the main means by which information and best practice on citizenship education and other subjects is disseminated but conferences and training courses also play their part. Educational materials on various subjects and topics including citizenship education are also provided. Some countries also have resource centres that provide information, learning materials and training, while teacher associations or networks provide a space for teachers to connect, exchange ideas and collaborate on the topic of citizenship education.

It is worth noting that apart from the above-mentioned official policies and measures, other non-governmental initiatives exist across Europe to support teachers and other educational staff with the implementation of citizenship education. These initiatives cover not only school and classroom activities, but also informal and non-formal learning activities outside of school. While these initiatives have not been included in this chapter, this is not meant to minimise their significance. On the contrary, civil society organisations have traditionally played an important role in promoting democratic values, human rights and citizenship education, and therefore their input and expertise can provide a valuable resource for promoting the education and professional development of teaching professionals and support them in the implementation of citizenship education in schools in Europe.

CASE STUDY 4: TEACHER EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN FRANCE

The reform in the field of teacher education and training in France (*Loi d'orientation et de programmation de la refondation de l'école de la République*)⁽¹⁾, which was introduced in July 2013, placed an increased emphasis on the need for teachers to acquire certain core professional skills. These included specific competences for promoting a culture of democracy and civic and moral education (*enseignement moral et civique* – EMC). This case study was selected because of the comprehensive nature of the reform, which initially concerned only initial teacher (ITE), but was then extended to continuing professional development (CPD) and other support measures such as the provision of teaching resources. Thus, all the main elements that contribute to the effective delivery of citizenship education as discussed in Chapter 4 of this report have been covered by the reform in France.

The information in this case study was gathered during the Peer Learning Activity (PLA) of the Education and Training 2020 Working Group on 'Promoting Citizenship and the Common Values of Freedom, Tolerance and Non-Discrimination through Education' entitled 'Teacher training, a key instrument of the implementation of the Paris Declaration', which took place on 29-31 March 2017 in Paris. During this PLA various presentations were given, which addressed the different elements of teacher education and training related to civic and moral education, and these have been used for the development of this case study. Moreover, other information has been included that was gathered through informal exchanges during the PLA with some of the stakeholders involved in teacher education and training in France – a representative of the Ministry of Education, Directorate for Schools/Training Unit; a professor at the Initial Teacher Training Centre of Toulouse; and a student teacher currently enrolled in the teaching and education college of Paris (*École supérieure du professorat et de l'éducation de Paris* – ESPE).

Rationale and main objectives

In an effort to promote teachers' professional competences through professional development (an element of teacher education and training that had been abolished in September 2010), the French government introduced, as part of its school reform programme of 8 July 2013, a new policy on teacher education and training and established new teaching and education colleges. These new colleges, called ESPEs (*Écoles supérieures du Professorat et de l'Éducation*) – which are higher education institutions embedded in and working with universities – opened their doors on 1 September 2013; and a two-year master's degree in education (*Masters des métiers de l'enseignement, de l'éducation et de la formation* – MEEF) was launched⁽²⁾.

The new programme offers future teachers early contact with students, considerable time spent in classrooms and high quality support, including through mentoring by qualified teachers. It involves a core curriculum⁽³⁾, which trains all student teachers to: promote the values of the Republic; take diversity into account when supporting students in their learning process; act as a responsible and ethical educator; cooperate in teams, with parents and school partners, and contribute to the activities of the school community. The curriculum also integrates digital tools into the teaching process. All student teachers enrolled in the ESPEs' Master's programme must take a competitive teacher exam at the end of the first year; during the second year they are placed in schools for practical experience

⁽¹⁾ <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?sessionId=?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000027677984&dateTexte=&oldAction=rechJO&categorieLien=id>

⁽²⁾ <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/eli/arrete/2013/8/27/ESRS1319419A/jo/texte>

⁽³⁾ http://www.education.gouv.fr/pid285/bulletin_officiel.html?cid_bo=73066

and they work on their Master's thesis. The student teachers who have studied for and passed the competitive teacher exam outside of the ESPEs (i.e. who have followed a different Master's degree) must nevertheless follow the second year at the ESPE and, consequently, obtain the same Master's degree in education (MEEF) upon completion.

Today there are 32 ESPE's with 179 training sites all over France, and about 60 000 students currently enrolled in ESPE programmes. The directors of the ESPEs are elected jointly by the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Higher Education and Research; and all ESPEs share the same objective, which is to create strong links between universities and schools. They therefore also involve many different professionals: teacher trainers, inspectors, school heads, professionals from universities as well as representatives of civil society organisations.

Another related measure proposed under the French government's school reform programme of 8 July 2013 concerns changes to the curriculum of civic and moral education ⁽⁴⁾. The main pillars of the new programme, from primary to upper secondary education, are based on the principles and values enshrined in the major human rights declarations, the International Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Constitution of France's Fifth Republic.

Instead of imposing dogmas or behavioural patterns, the new civic and moral education curriculum seeks to impart a civic and moral culture and a critical spirit, the ultimate aim of which is the development of provisions that enable students to develop awareness of their responsibilities in their personal and social lives. This education programme is based on the following four dimensions: awareness, rules and rights, judgement and engagement. It articulates values (e.g. freedom, equality, fraternity, secularism, solidarity, justice, respect and the absence of all forms of discrimination); knowledge (literary, scientific, historical, legal, etc.); and competences (e.g. developing the ability to reason, take into account the point of view of others and take action).

Process and outcomes

The attention devoted to the role of schools and teachers in providing civic and moral education and in particular for promoting the above-mentioned French values increased significantly after the terrorist attacks of 7-9 January 2015. Following the tragic events on 22 January 2015, the French Minister of Education, Najat Vallaud-Belkacem, presented an action plan containing eleven measures for the 'Great school mobilisation for the values of the Republic' (*Grande mobilisation de l'école pour les valeurs de la République*) ⁽⁵⁾. The transmission of the common values of secularism, citizenship and a culture of engagement, the fight against social inequalities and prejudice as well as the mobilisation of higher education and research are at the centre of this action plan.

With a view to attaining these objectives, the first of the eleven measures proposes actions on the education and training of teachers and school staff. For ITE, the ESPEs have been tasked with placing a strong emphasis on the teaching of secularism and the rejection of all forms of violence and discrimination within the common core of the curriculum for initial education and training, which applies to all teachers and educators in primary and secondary education, whatever their specific disciplines. Moreover, candidates for the training courses have been assessed in their ability to explain and promote the values of the Republic since the 2015 teacher recruitment competitions.

⁽⁴⁾ https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do;jsessionid=?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000027677984&dateTexte=&oldAction=rec_hJO&categorieLien=id

⁽⁵⁾ <http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid85644/onze-mesures-pour-un-grande-mobilisation-de-l-ecole-pour-les-valeurs-de-la-republique.html>

A national plan for the continuing professional development (CPD) of teachers and school staff has been created to help them deal with issues relating to (French and European) citizenship, secularism and the fight against prejudice. This national training plan contained three phases.

- In phase 1 (June 2015), the focus was on the presentation of the new programme to around 1 000 education professionals, in particular inspectors and teacher trainers, within the different French *académies* – i.e. the main administrative districts of the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Higher Education and Research – who were then tasked with passing on this knowledge to their peers in their *académie*. The objective being that, by the end of 2017, 300 000 teachers will have been trained in this way.
- Phase 2 (2015-2016) marked the publication of Eduscol and Canopé resources (see also the information presented further below about teacher support).
- Phase 3 embarked on the promotion of change in professional practices and pedagogical methods conducive to the transmission of a culture of democracy through, amongst other things, a national training seminar on the teaching of civic and moral education and the implementation of the citizen's pathway in classrooms and schools (*parcours citoyen*) ⁽⁶⁾ (Brive, 8-9 March 2017).

The national seminar involved presentations dedicated to citizenship and social issues. These included professional practice workshops on the driving forces and obstacles to promoting the knowledge and competences of students related to civic and moral education in classrooms and schools; exchanges between professionals on educational policy in the *académie* in order to promote collective responsibility for civic and moral education in primary and secondary education; and the creation of a shared online training platform, 'm@gistère' ⁽⁷⁾ to capitalise on the contributions of the training seminar. To ensure continuation, the next national training seminar of this kind is expected in March 2018; and it will focus on civic and moral education, in particular the teaching of factual information on religions, developing critical awareness, the 'citizen's pathway', the fight against discrimination, etc.

In order to further respond to the training needs of teachers and educational staff, the academic correspondents of the General Inspectorate of National Education (IGEN) and the General Inspectorate for the Administration of National Education, Teaching and Research (IGAENR) will collect information annually on the types of difficulties encountered and the training needs expressed at ground level, on the basis of which the IGEN and the Directorate-General for School Education (DGESCO) will draw up appropriate training activities and produce teaching resources.

New pedagogical resources as well as training courses are being produced and made available to teachers and educational staff, including on the M@gistère platform and focusing on the pedagogy of secularism and the secular teaching of factual information on religions. A booklet containing essential pedagogical content (e.g. texts and secularism charter ⁽⁸⁾), links to training resources, legal questions/answers on sensitive subjects related to secularism has also been produced. In the audio-visual arena, new educational video content for the next school year has been produced with the

⁽⁶⁾ The citizen's pathway is part of the students' overall education programme. It is aimed at developing citizens who gradually become aware of their rights, their duties and their responsibilities. Supported by all school subjects, in particular civic and moral education, media and information education, and being part of the common core of knowledge, skills and culture, the citizen's pathway contributes to the transmission of the values and principles of the Republic and of life in democratic societies. It is implemented throughout the length of students' school education, from primary to upper secondary level, but also across students' formal, informal and non-formal learning experiences. See: <http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid100517/le-parcours-citoyen.html>

⁽⁷⁾ <https://wiki.magistere.education.fr>

⁽⁸⁾ <http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid95865/la-laicite-a-l-ecole.html>

Canopé network⁽⁹⁾). It comprises a series of short films presenting episodes from history on, for example, the struggle for secularism and significant figures from the past and present. In addition, a portal has been created which provides access to teaching resources on the fight against racism and anti-Semitism, and is linked to the Inter-Ministerial Delegation for the Fight against Racism, Anti-Semitism and Hate towards LGBT (DILCRA). Lastly, a booklet with practical help on combatting radicalisation has been prepared through inter-ministerial consultation.

Reflections on the reform

The overall impression of the different stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of policies and reforms concerning teacher education and training in France is positive. Substantial changes in this area have been introduced since 2013 – in particular, the efforts made since 2015 to strengthen teachers' competences in transmitting the values related to civic and moral education through ITE, CPD and teaching resources. One aspect that may have been conducive to these changes is the fact that many different related elements, including the curriculum, pedagogical approaches, student assessment and teacher training have all been reviewed as part of a broad reform that aims to support the development of students as citizens who can think critically and have a moral conscience that will enable them to understand, respect and share the humanist values of solidarity, respect and responsibility.

However, there are still some challenges to be faced. All the different stakeholders – including the Ministry of Education, teacher training institutions and student teachers – agreed that at the outset there was a need to improve teachers' initial education and training, as teaching is something that needs to be learned. Knowledge of the subject to be taught is not enough, a common core of competences is essential, in particular when it comes to the teaching of transversal areas such as civic and moral education, and must be acquired by all teachers. All stakeholders also stressed that the connection between teacher training and schools is critical in this context. Effective ITE requires multi-professional involvement bringing together universities, inspectors, teacher trainers and school heads. It was also underlined that existing teacher training needs to undergo regular evaluation in order to constantly improve. In the case of France, an overall national evaluation of the reforms on teacher education and training is expected to be carried out five years from the start date.

With regard to teachers' CPD, the stakeholders emphasised that schools need to be made aware of their fundamental role in recognising the training needs of their teachers and educational staff. The principles that were emphasised in the context of the French approach are flexibility of the system and trust in the stakeholders on the ground. In the absence of obligatory CPD for teachers teaching at secondary education level, schools are being encouraged to work alongside inspectors and training institutions to find solutions for training needs; and likewise teachers are expected to take an active role in their further training and even share the knowledge acquired with their peers.

The above-mentioned changes in teacher education and professional development are related to another key challenge in France. The education system has traditionally been characterised by teachers transmitting knowledge, as opposed to transversal competences such as civic and moral ones, and students listening instead of critically reflecting and debating with the teachers as well as with each other. The shift which has occurred as a result of the present reform in teacher education and training is according to all stakeholders a fundamental one, and not all teachers are well prepared as yet. It requires teachers to accept a new dynamic, in which they are no longer at the centre of the

⁽⁹⁾ Canopé is a network of 102 resource and training centres in every *académie* in France providing a multitude of paper- and web-based resources and teacher training in five key areas: pedagogy, ICT, citizenship education, arts and culture and documentation. See: <https://www.reseau-canope.fr/>

classroom and 'in control', but rather guides who accompany their students and facilitate their learning and development.

The new system of ITE seeks to promote these changes by equipping student teachers with the necessary competences for their new role in the classroom and providing them with practical skills and opportunities to connect theory with practice, and by encouraging them to look at research and experiment with new approaches, such as using media and ICT, etc. With regard to in-service training, the focus is similarly on learning through practical situations and experiences, such as controversial debates, moral dilemmas, role plays, etc., and a multitude of online and printed resources have been developed to support teachers in this professional development.

To sum up, many elements of teacher education, training and support in France have been reformed over the last few years, and bringing about such comprehensive changes takes time. Apart from the significant change in the role of teachers as facilitators of students' learning, including the promotion of students' ability to engage in debates and the development of their critical thinking skills, there are also other on-going challenges teachers are facing in the classrooms, such as large class sizes and the different abilities and backgrounds of the students. Nevertheless, it seems that in France many initial steps have been taken to ensure that the reform of teacher education and training is effective and can support other on-going efforts to promote students' civic and moral competences and thus ensure the transmission of French values through the teaching and learning delivered in schools.

Main findings

- The reforms to ITE in France started in 2013, with the establishment of new teaching and education colleges and the introduction of a two-year Master's degree in education that all future teachers must obtain. This new system requires teachers to adopt a new role as a facilitator in students' learning and development.
- The action plan developed as a result of the terrorist attacks in 2015 led to increased efforts to strengthen teachers' professional competences so that they are able to transmit common values, an understanding of secularism and citizenship, and a culture of engagement, etc. through relevant ITE and CPD.
- The defined competence framework and related assessment procedures in ITE are perceived as helpful for ensuring that all teachers obtain the necessary knowledge, skills, attitudes and values for implementing a transversal teaching area, such as civic and moral education.
- The national in-service training plan that was developed to promote citizenship, secularism and the fight against prejudice resulted, amongst other things, in the training of a significant number of education professionals such as inspectors and teacher trainers, who were then tasked with passing on this knowledge to their peers in their *académie*.
- Thus, despite the fact that CPD is not obligatory for teachers teaching at secondary education level, an open channel of communication and interaction between the Ministry of Education, inspectors, teacher trainers, schools and teachers has helped to highlight teachers' training needs and to promote their knowledge and skills related to civic and moral education.
- Stakeholders underlined that effective CPD activities on civic and moral education involves learning through practical situations and experiences, such as debating controversial issues, discussing moral dilemmas or performing role plays.

REFERENCES

- Adam, S., 2004. *Using Learning Outcomes: A consideration of the nature, role, application and implications for European education of employing 'learning outcomes' at the local, national and international levels*. United Kingdom Bologna Seminar 1-2 July 2004, Heriot-Watt University (Edinburgh Conference Centre) Edinburgh, Scotland.
- Altrichter, H., 2005. Curriculum implementation - limiting and facilitating factors. In: P. Nentwig & D. Waddingto, eds. *Context based Learning of Science*. Münster: Waxmann, pp. 35-62.
- Anderson, J., Bachor, D., 1998. A Canadian perspective on portfolio use in student assessment. *Assessment in Education*, 5(3), pp. 327-353.
- Andrade, H., Valtcheva, A., 2009. *Promoting Learning and Achievement Through Self-Assessment, Theory Into Practice*, 48:1, pp. 12-19. [Online] Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577544> [Accessed 03 March 2017].
- Aristotle, 1944. *On politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Aristotle, 350BC. *Nicomachean Ethics* Book II. [Online] <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.2.ii.html> [Accessed 10 May 2017].
- Audigier, F., 2000. *Concepts de base et compétences-clés pour l'éducation à la citoyenneté démocratique*. Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe.
- Auer, S., 2010. 'New Europe': Between cosmopolitan dreams and nationalist nightmares. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48 (5), pp. 1163-1184.
- Austrian Federal Chancellery, 2013. *Work programme of the Austrian Federal Government. Austrian Federal Chancellery: Vienna*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.bka.gv.at/DocView.axd?CobId=53588> [Accessed 26 September 2016].
- Barr, D. et al., 2015. A randomized controlled trial of professional development for interdisciplinary civic education: Impacts on humanities teachers and their students. *Teachers College Record*, 117(4), pp. 1-52.
- Barrett, M., 2016. *Competences for democratic culture and global citizenship: components and assessment*. [Online] Available at: http://www.academia.edu/28260557/Competences_for_democratic_culture_and_global_citizenship_components_and_assessment [Accessed 03 March 2017].
- Biesta, G., 2011. *Learning democracy in school and society*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Bîrzéa, C., 2000. *Education for democratic citizenship: A lifelong learning perspective*. Council of Europe. Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC). Project on "Education for Democratic Citizenship". Strasbourg, 20 June, 2000. DGIV/EDU/CIT (2000) 21. [pdf] Available at: <http://www.bpb.de/files/F0R5Q8.pdf> [Accessed 22 September 2016].
- Black, P., William, D., 1998. *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. London: GL Assessment.
- Black, P., William, D., 1999. *Assessment for Learning: beyond the Black Box*. London: GL Assessment.
- Black, P.J. et al., 2002. *Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom*. London: UK: King's College London School of Education.

Bozec, G., 2016. *Education à la citoyenneté à l'école, Politiques, pratiques scolaires et effets sur les élèves*. [pdf] Available at http://www.cnesco.fr/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Rapport_education_citoyennete.pdf [Accessed 24 April 2017].

Brett, P. et al., 2009. *How all teachers can support citizenship and human rights education: A framework for development of competencies*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2009. [pdf] Available at: http://dswy.eu/pdfs/How_all_Teachers_HRE_EN.pdf [Accessed 26 September 2016].

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Frauen, 2016. *Curriculum of History, Social Studies and Citizenship Education Sek. I (2016)*. Vienna. Federal Ministry for Education and Women: [pdf] Available at: www.ris.bka.gv.at/Dokumente/BgblAuth/BGBLA_2016_II_113/BGBLA_2016_II_113.pdf

Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kunst, 1978. *Grundsatzlerlass "Politische Bildung in den Schulen". vom 11.4.1978, ZI. 33.464/6-19a/1978*. Federal Ministry for Education and the Arts: Vienna.

CEDEFOP, 2011. *Using learning outcomes*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Chin, K., Barber, E. B., 2010. A multi-dimensional exploration of teachers' beliefs about civic education in Australia, England, and the United States. *Theory & Research in Social Education* 38(3), pp. 395-427.

Citizenship Foundation, 2006. *Citizenship education inquiry 2006: Submission to the Select Committee on Citizenship Education by the Association for Citizenship Teaching*. [Online] <http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/page.php?281> [Accessed 10 May 2017].

Cogan, J.J., Derricott, R., 2012. *Citizenship for the 21st Century: An International Perspective on Education*. New York: Routledge.

Council of Europe, 2010. '*Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)7 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education*'.

Council of Europe, 2016. *Competences for democratic culture - Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council of Europe, 2017. *Learning to live together*. Council of Europe Report on the state of citizenship and human rights education in Europe. [Online] Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/the-state-of-citizenship-in-europe-e-publication/168072b3cd>[Accessed 24 April 2017].

Council of the European Union, 2016a. *The role of the youth sector in an integrated and cross-sectoral approach to preventing and combating violent radicalisation of young people - Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council (30 May 2016)*. Outcomes of proceedings. Brussels, 1 June 2016. 9640/16. [pdf] Available at: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-9640-2016-INIT/en/pdf> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

Council of the European Union, 2016b. *Developing media literacy and critical thinking through education and training - Council conclusions (30 May 2016)*. Outcome of proceedings. Brussels, 1 June 2016. 9641/16. [pdf] Available at: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-9641-2016-INIT/en/pdf> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

Council of the European Union, 2017. *Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on Inclusion in Diversity to achieve a High Quality Education For All - Council conclusions (17 February 2017)*. Brussels, 17 February 2017, 6356/17. [pdf] Available at: <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-6356-2017-INIT/en/pdf> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

Deakin Crick, R. et al., 2004. A systematic review of the impact of citizenship education on the provision of schooling. In: *Research Evidence in Education Library*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education.

Delanty, G., 2000. *Citizenship in a global age*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Doğanay, A., 2012. A curriculum framework for active democratic citizenship education. In: M. Print and D. Lange, eds. *Schools, Curriculum and Civic Education for Building Democratic Citizens*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 19-40.

Dürr, K., Spajic-Vrkas, V. and Ferreira Martins, I., 2000. *Project on 'Education for Democratic Citizenship'. Strategies for Learning Democratic Citizenship*. DECS/EDU/CIT (2000) 16. [pdf] Available at: <http://www.storiairreer.it/sites/default/files/norme/2000%2007%2019%20Duerr.pdf> [Accessed 10 May 2017].

Elfrink, T. R. et al., 2017. Positive educative programme: A whole school approach to supporting children's well-being and creating a positive school climate: a pilot study. *Health Education*, 117(2), pp. 215-230. [pdf] <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/HE-09-2016-0039> [Accessed 26 September 2016].

European Commission, 2006. EU Research on Social Sciences and Humanities. Lifelong Learning, Governance and Active Citizenship in Europe – ETGACE Project 1999. *Lifelong Learning, Governance and Active Citizenship in Europe: Final Report, 1999*. [pdf] <http://cordis.europa.eu/documents/documentlibrary/82607991EN6.pdf> [Accessed 10 May 2017].

European Commission, 2009. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Key competences for a changing world: Draft 2010 joint progress report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the 'Education and Training work programme'*. COM(2009) 640 final. [pdf] <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2009:0640:FIN:EN:PDF> [Accessed 10 May 2017].

European Commission, 2011. *Using learning outcomes – European Qualifications Framework*. Series: Note 4. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission, 2012. *Commission Staff Working Document. Assessment of Key Competences in initial education and training. Policy Guidance. Accompanying the document. Communication from the Commission. Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes*. [pdf] <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52012SC0371&from=EN> [Accessed 10 May 2017].

European Commission, 2015a. *Informal meeting of European Union Education Ministers, Paris, Tuesday 17 March 2015. Declaration on Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education.* [pdf] Available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/news/2015/documents/citizenship-education-declaration_en.pdf [Accessed 24 April 2017].

European Commission, 2015b. *Youth work and non-formal learning in Europe's education landscape: A quarter of a century of EU cooperation for youth policy and practice.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c7542061-e046-11e5-8fea-01aa75ed71a1/language-en> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

European Commission, 2016. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions supporting the prevention of radicalisation leading to violent extremism.* COM(2016) 379 final. [pdf] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/library/publications/2016/communication-preventing-radicalisation_en.pdf [Accessed 24 April 2017].

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2009. *National Testing of Pupils in Europe: Objectives, Organisation and Use of Results.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/df628df4-4e5b-4014-adbd-2ed54a274fd9/language-en/format-PDF/source-33978686> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2011. *Teaching reading in Europe: Contexts, policies and Practices.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/cb864934-0f5a-4984-bd56-51a8b9d44cfa/language-en/format-PDF/source-33978790> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a. *Citizenship Education in Europe.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ecd20d86-e56b-4635-976c-b103d49cc46c/language-en> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012b. *Developing Key Competences at School in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities for Policy. Eurydice Report.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/47063155-d7f7-4de8-87b0-8103e8b84197/language-en> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015a. *Assuring Quality in Education: Policies and Approaches to School Evaluation in Europe.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at:

<https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/4a2443a7-7bac-11e5-9fae-01aa75ed71a1/language-en> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015b. *The Teaching Profession in Europe: Practices, Perceptions, and Policies. Eurydice Report.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/36bde79d-6351-489a-9986-d019efb2e72c/language-en> [Accessed 24 April 2017].

- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2016a. *Entrepreneurship Education at School in Europe, 2016. Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/74a7d356-dc53-11e5-8fea-01aa75ed71a1/language-en> [Accessed 24 April 2017].
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2016b. *Promoting citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education. Overview of education policy developments in Europe following the Paris Declaration of 17 March 2015*. [pdf] <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ebbab0bb-ef2f-11e5-8529-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF> [Accessed 24 April 2017].
- Eurydice, 2005. *Citizenship education at school in Europe*. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/704958d3-5bdc-4ad4-be6f-11dff3731df/language-en/format-PDF> [Accessed 24 April 2017].
- Geboers, E. et al., 2013. Review of the effects of citizenship education. *Educational Research Review*, 9, pp. 158-173.
- Gordon, J. et al., 2009. *Key competences in Europe: Opening doors for lifelong learners across the school curriculum and teacher education*. Warsaw: Case-Center for Social and Economic Research.
- Grimmer, J., Stewart, B. M., 2013. Text as data: the promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. *Political Analysis*, 21, pp. 267-297.
- Habbeger, Sh., 2008. The Principal's Role in Successful Schools: Creating a Positive School Culture. [pdf] https://www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/resources/1/Principal/2008/S-O_p42.pdf [Accessed 5 May 2017].
- Halász, G., Michel, A., 2011. Key Competences in Europe: interpretation, policy formulation and implementation. *European Journal of Education*, 46(3), pp. 289-306.
- Hargreaves, L. G., 2008. The whole-school approach to education for sustainable development: From pilot projects to systemic change *Policy & Practice: Education for Sustainable Development* 6. [pdf] <https://www.developmenteducationreview.com/sites/default/files/article-pdfs/hargreaves%20pers%202.pdf> [Accessed 5 May 2017].
- Harlen, W., 2007. *Assessment of Learning*. London: Sage Publications LDT.
- Harvey, L., 2004. *Analytic Quality Glossary, Quality Research International*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.qualityresearchinternational.com/glossary/learningoutcomes.htm> [Accessed 24 April 2017].
- Heater, D., 2002. The history of citizenship education. *Parliamentary Affairs* 55, pp. 457-474.
- Hobsbawm, E., 1989. *The age of empire: 1875-1914*. New York: Vintage.
- Hoskins, B., Kerr, D., 2012. Final Study Summary and Policy Recommendations: Participatory Citizenship in the European Union Institute of Education. Report 4. European Commission, Europe for Citizens Programme, Submitted 10th May 2012. [pdf] http://ec.europa.eu/citizenship/pdf/report_4_final_study_summary_and_policy_recommendations.pdf [Accessed 24 April 2017].
- Hoskins, B., Saisana, M. and Villalba, C., 2015. Civic competence of youth in Europe: Measuring cross national variation through the creation of a composite indicator. *Social Indicators Research*, 123 (2), pp. 431-457.

- Huddleston, T., 2005. Teacher training in citizenship education: Training for a new subject or for a new kind of subject? *Journal of Social Science Education*, 4(3), pp. 50-63.
- Huddleston, T., Kerr, D., 2006, *Making sense of citizenship – a Continuing Professional Development Handbook*. London: The Citizenship Foundation.
- Huddleston, E. et al., 2007. *Tool on teacher training for education for democratic citizenship and human rights education (revised version September 2007)*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2007. [Online] Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016802f7279> [Accessed 26 September 2016].
- Hyslop-Margison, E. J., Sears, A. M., 2006. Neo-liberalism, globalization and human capital learning. *Reclaiming Education for Democratic Citizenship*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance), 1999. *Youth Voter Participation - Involving Today's Young in Tomorrow's Democracy*. Varberg: IDEA International (Sweden).
- Jansen, Th., Chioncel, N. and Dekkers, H., 2006. Social cohesion and integration: Learning active citizenship. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 27 (2), pp. 189-205.
- Jerome, L., 2008. Assessing Citizenship Education. In: J. Arthur, I. Davies and C. Hahn. *Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Keating, A., Orloff, D.H. and Stavroula, P., 2009. Citizenship education curricula: The changes and challenges presented by global and European integration. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41 (2), pp. 145-158.
- Keating, A., 2014. *Education for Citizenship in Europe. European Policies, National Adaptations and Young People's Attitudes*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Kerr, D., 1999. Citizenship education in the curriculum: An international review. *The School Field*, 10 (3/4), pp. 5-32.
- Kerr, D. et al., 2004. *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study Second Annual Report – Making Citizenship Education Real*. London: NFER (National Foundation for Education Research).
- Kerr, D., Keating, A. and Ireland, E. 2009. *Pupil Assessment in Citizenship Education: Purposes, Practices and Possibilities*. Report of a CIDREE Collaborative Project. Slough: NFER/CIDREE.
- Kerr, D. et al., 2010. *ICCS 2009 European Report. Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in twenty-four European countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Keser, F. et al, 2011. Role of extracurricular activities in active citizenship education. *Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 43, No.6, pp. 809-837.
- Kikas, E., Toomela, A., 2015. Õppimine ja õpetamine kolmandas kooliastmes. Üldpädevused ja nende arendamine. [*Learning and teaching in basic school. General competences and supporting their development*]. Tartu: Eesti Ülikoolide Kirjastus.
- Linklater, A., 1998. Cosmopolitan citizenship. *Journal of Citizenship Studies*, 2 (1), pp. 23-41.

- Loogma, K. et al., 2009. Õpetaja professionaalsus ning tõhusama õpetamis- ja õppimiskeskonna loomine. *Opetaja professionaalsus ning tohusama opetamis- ja oppimiskeskonna loomine. OECD rahvusvahelise opetamise ja oppimise uuringu TALIS tulemused*. [Teacher professionalisms and more effective teaching and learning for a learning environment. Results OECD International Teaching and Learning].
- Looney, J., 2011. 'Integrating Formative and Summative Assessment: Progress Toward a Seamless System?'. *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 58. Paris. OECD Publishing. [Online] <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kghx3kbl734-en> [Accessed March 2010].
- Macchiaveli, N., 2008. *The prince*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maes, B., 2005. 'Introduction: education for democratic citizenship'. In: B. Maes, ed. *Different phases of citizenship. Development of citizenship education in European countries*. Report of a CIDREE Collaborative Project. Sint-Katelijne-Waver: CIDREE, pp. 7-14.
- Mark A. Pike, 2007. Values and visibility: the implementation and assessment of citizenship education in schools. *Educational Review*, 59:2, pp. 215-229.
- Marshall, H., 2009. Educating the European citizen in the global age: Engaging with the post-national and identifying a research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41 (2), pp. 247-267.
- Maslowski, R. et al., 2009. A conceptual framework on informal learning of active citizenship competencies. In: J. Scheerens, ed. *Informal Learning of Active Citizenship at School*. London: Springer, pp. 11-24.
- Mons, N., 2009. *Theoretical and real effects of standardised assessment. Background paper to the study National Testing of Pupils in Europe: Objectives, Organisation and Use of Results*. Brussels: EACEA/Eurydice. [pdf] Available at: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/111EN.pdf [Accessed March 2010].
- Mrnjaus, K., 2012. Teacher competences for education for democratic citizenship. *Schools, Curriculum and Civic Education for Building Democratic Citizens*, pp. 81-98.
- NCETM (National Centre for Excellence in the Teaching of Mathematics (UK)), 2008. *Mathematics Matters: Final Report*. [pdf] Available at: <https://www.ncetm.org.uk/public/files/309231/Mathematics+Matters+Final+Report.pdf> [Accessed March 2010].
- Nemo, P., 2013. *A history of political ideas*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2005. *Formative Assessment – Improving Learning in Secondary Classrooms*. Paris: OECD.
- Patterson, P., Doppin, F. & Misco, T., 2012. Beyond personally responsible: A study on teacher conceptualizations of citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 7(2), pp. 191-206.
- Pepper, D., 2011. Assessing Key competences across the Curriculum and Europe, *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 46, No. 3.

Pepper, D., 2013. KeyCoNet 2013. Literature Review. *Assessment for key competences*. [pdf] Available at: http://keyconet.eun.org/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=b1475317-108c-4cf5-a650-dae772a7d943&groupId=11028 [Accessed 28 September 2016].

Philippou, S., Keating, A. and Ortloff, D. H., 2009. Citizenship education curricula: comparing the multiple meanings of supra-national citizenship in Europe and beyond. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41 (2), pp. 291-299.

Plato, M. L., 1987. *The Republic*. London: Penguin Books.

Rauner, M., 1999. UNESCO as an organizational carrier of civics education information. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19, pp. 91-100.

Roca, E., Sánchez Núñez-Arenas, R. 2008. Citizens' competences and education for the 21st century-Working and assessing competences in the Spanish education system. In: C. Van Woensel, ed. *Toolkit for the European citizens: the implementation of Key competences, challenges and opportunities*. Slough: NFER, pp. 107-122.

Salema, M. H., 2005. Teacher and trainer training in education for democratic citizenship competencies. *Journal of Social Science Education* 4(3), pp. 39-49.

Salema, M. H., 2012. Linking teachers' competences to students' competences. Pedagogical Processes. In: M. Print and D. Lange, eds. *Schools, Curriculum and civic Education for Building Democratic Citizens*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 129-144.

Scallon, G., 2007. *L'évaluation des apprentissages dans une approche par compétences* [Assessing learning in a competence-based approach]. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Schulz, W. et al, 2010. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic Knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary students in 38 countries*. Amsterdam: IEA. [pdf] Available at: http://www.iea.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Electronic_versions/ICCS_2009_International_Report.pdf [Accessed 26 September 2016].

Schulz, W. et al, 2016. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 Assessment Framework*. Cham: Springer.

Sliwka, A., 2006. Citizenship Education as the Responsibility of a Whole School: Structural and Cultural Implications. In: A. Sliwka, M. Diedrich and M. Hofer, eds. *Citizenship Education. Theory - Research - Practice*. Münster: Waxmann, pp. 7-19.

Smith, A., 1991. *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books.

Sundström, M. and Fernández, C., 2013. Citizenship education and diversity in liberal societies: Theory and policy in a comparative perspective. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice Journal*, 8 (2), pp. 103-117.

Ten Dam, G. and Volman, M., 2004. Critical thinking as a citizenship competence: Teaching strategies. *Learning and Instruction*, 14 (4), pp. 359-379.

Ten Dam, G. et al., 2010. *Burgerschapscompetenties: de ontwikkeling van een meetinstrument* [Citizenship competences: the development of a measurement instrument]. *Pedagogische Studiën*, 87, pp. 313-333.

- Ten Dam, G. et al., 2011. Measuring young people's citizenship competences. *European Journal of Education*, 46 (3), pp. 354-372.
- Thornberg, R., 2008. The lack of professional knowledge in values education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(7), pp. 1791-1798.
- Thornberg, R., 2009. Rules in Everyday School Life: Teacher Strategies Undermine Pupil Participation. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 17(3):393-413.
- Turner, B., 1993. Contemporary problems in the theory of citizenship. In: B. Turner, ed. *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: Sage, pp. 1-18.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), 1998. *Citizenship Education for the 21st Century*. [Online] Adapted version available at: http://www.unesco.org/education/tlsf/mods/theme_b/interact/mod07task03/appendix.htm [Accessed April 2017].
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). IBE (International Bureau of Education), 2013. *Glossary of Curriculum Terminology*. [pdf] http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/IBE_GlossaryCurriculumTerminology2013_eng.pdf [Accessed April 2017].
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 2015. *Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives*. Paris: Unesco.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). IBE (International Bureau of Education). APCEIU (Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding), 2017. *Global Citizenship Concepts in Curriculum Guidelines of 10 Countries: Comparative Analysis. In-Progress Reflections No. 9 on Current and Critical Issues in Curriculum, Learning and Assessment*. [pdf] <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002477/247788E.pdf> [Accessed April 2017].
- Van Driel, B., Darmody, M., and Kerzil J., 2016. Education policies and practices to foster tolerance, respect for diversity and civic responsibility in children and young people in the EU. *NESET II report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Wikipedia, 2010. Electronic portfolio. [Online] Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electronic_portfolio [Accessed 10 March 2010].
- Willemsse, T. M. et al., 2015. Fostering teachers' professional development for citizenship education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 49, pp. 118-127.
- Zahabioun, S. et al., 2013. Global citizenship education and its implications for curriculum goals at the age of globalization. *International Education Studies*, 6 (1), pp. 195-206.
- Zajda, J., 2009. Nation-building, identity and citizenship education: Introduction. In: J. Zajda, H. Daun and L. Saha, eds. *Nation-Building, Identity and Citizenship Education*. London: Springer, pp. 1-11.

GLOSSARY

I. Definitions

Attitude: A settled way of thinking or feeling which may have been learned, and may lead individuals to evaluate things or react to ideas, persons or situations in certain ways, either consciously or unconsciously. Attitudes are underpinned by values and beliefs and have influence on behaviour. (UNESCO. IBE (International Bureau of Education), 2013).

Civic competences: The combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes that equip individuals to fully participate in civic life, based on knowledge of social and political concepts and structures, and a commitment to active and democratic participation. (Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning, OJ L 394, 30.12.2006, p. 10).

Civil society organisation: The multitude of associations around which society voluntarily organises itself and which represent a wide range of interests and ties. These can include community-based organisations, indigenous peoples' organisations and non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

Continuing professional development (CDP): Refers to in-service, formal and non-formal professional development activities, which may, for example, include subject-based and pedagogical training. In certain cases, these activities may lead to supplementary qualifications.

Evaluation of schools: Focuses on the activities carried out by school staff without seeking to assign responsibility to individual staff members. Evaluation of this kind seeks to monitor or improve school quality and/or student results, and findings are presented in an overall report that does not include individual teacher appraisal information. The evaluation of schools may be external or internal.

Extra-curricular activities: Activities outside the realm of the formal curriculum and regular class timetable. Participation in these activities is voluntary.

Guidance and support material: Documents produced by top level authorities to support teachers and/or schools in implementing national curriculum objectives. These documents can include: legislation, pedagogical advice, explanatory notes, content guides and/or tools.

Induction period: A structured support phase provided for newly, fully qualified teachers. During induction, new entrants carry out wholly or partially the tasks incumbent on experienced teachers, and are remunerated for their activity. Normally, induction includes training and evaluation, and a professional mentor providing personal, social and professional support is appointed to help new teachers within a structured system. The phase lasts at least several months, and can occur during the probationary period.

Initial teacher education (ITE): Comprises both pre-service, general education (providing student teachers with a thorough knowledge of one or more subjects as well as a broad general education) and professional training. The latter provides prospective teachers with both a theoretical and practical insight into their future profession. In addition to courses in psychology and teaching methods, it usually includes unremunerated in-school placements. Initial teacher education excludes an induction phase except in cases where professional training only takes place during this phase.

Internship/placement: A period of hands-on work experience in a school or college, normally lasting a few weeks. It is an integral part of pre-service professional training and may be remunerated or not. The prospective teacher is usually supervised by an experienced teacher in the school, with periodic assessment by staff from the training institution.

Knowledge: The outcome of the assimilation of information through learning. Knowledge is the body of facts, principles, theories and practices that is related to a field of study or work (CEDEFOP 2011/2014).

Learning outcomes: Statements of what a learner knows, understands and is able to do on completion of a level or learning module. Learning outcomes are concerned with the achievements of the learner rather than the intentions of the teacher (expressed in the aims of a module or course) (Harvey, 2004). Learning outcomes indicate actual attainment levels while learning objectives define the competences to be developed in general terms.

National curriculum: Any official steering document issued by top level authorities containing programmes of study or any of the following: learning content, learning objectives, attainment targets, guidelines on pupil assessment or syllabuses. Specific legal decrees in some countries have also been taken into account. More than one type of steering document containing provisions relating to citizenship education may be in force at any one time in a country and these may impose different levels of obligation on schools to comply. They may, for example, contain advice, recommendations or regulations. However, whatever the level of obligation, they all establish the basic framework in which schools develop their own teaching to meet their pupils' needs.

National programme: A set of projects or activities on a particular theme or with a shared goal, either initiated or recommended by top level education authorities, and the top level authority should provide at least partial funding.

National tests: Standardised tests/examinations set by top level public authorities and carried out under their responsibility. Standardised tests/examinations are any form of test that (a) requires all test takers to answer the same questions (or questions selected from a common bank of questions) and (b) is scored in a standard or consistent way. Tests designed at school level on the basis of a centrally designed framework of reference are not considered as national tests.

Professional association: A network operating at national level to support teachers' professional development and the sharing of information on research and best practice e.g. through newsletters, seminars/workshops, online platforms, etc.

Professional mentoring: The professional support given to newly qualified teachers usually by a more experienced colleague. Mentoring can be part of the induction phase for teachers new to the profession. It may also be available to any teacher in need of support.

Resource centre: A centre that provides teachers with information, learning materials, methods and advice on good practice.

School-based initial vocational education and training (IVET): Refers here to ISCED levels 2 and/or 3 pathways that include at least part-time school-based education, which may alternate with periods of practical work experience at a workplace. For this report, the precise coverage of school-based IVET is mainly focused on the curriculum common to all students (core curriculum), and to optional subjects available to all students, regardless of the particular vocational branch they are following.

Skill: The ability to perform tasks and solve problems (CEDEFOP, 2011/2014).

Social competences: These include personal, interpersonal and intercultural competences and they draw on a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes. Social competences cover all forms of behaviour that equip individuals to participate in an effective and constructive way in social and working life. They are particularly important in the context of increasingly diverse societies as they can

help to resolve conflict (Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning, OJ L 394, 30.12.2006, p. 10).

Specialist or semi-specialist teacher of citizenship education: Specialist teacher of citizenship education refers here to teachers who have specialised during ITE on teaching citizenship education. Semi-specialist teacher of citizenship education refers to teachers who have specialised during ITE on teaching citizenship education and up to three other subjects. These profiles can be mainly found at the level of secondary education.

Top level authority: The highest level of authority with responsibility for education in a given country, usually located at national (state) level. However, for Belgium, Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom, the *Communautés, Länder, Comunidades Autónomas* and the devolved administrations respectively are either wholly responsible or share responsibilities with the state level for all or most areas relating to education. Therefore, these administrations are considered as the top level authority for the areas where they hold the responsibility, while for those areas for which they share the responsibility with the national (state) level, both are considered to be top level authorities.

Top level coordinating body for teacher training: A public body or an institution (e.g. university, pedagogical institute, national training centre, etc.) tasked by top level authorities to ensure policy implementation with regard to teacher training in citizenship education. It may also coordinate training initiatives and monitor and evaluate the quality of training provision.

Top level strategy/action plan: These are official policy documents on an important policy issue usually issued by top level authorities at either national or regional level. They set out the specific objectives to be met and/or the detailed steps or actions to be taken within a given timeframe in order to reach a desired goal.

Websites for teachers of citizenship education: These are intended to help teachers develop their professional knowledge through the dissemination of information. They support student teachers, newly qualified teachers, teacher mentors and others with responsibility for citizenship education through the provision of resources, reports, case studies, briefing papers, etc.

II. ISCED Classification

The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) has been developed to facilitate comparisons of education statistics and indicators across countries on the basis of uniform and internationally agreed definitions. The coverage of ISCED extends to all organised and sustained learning opportunities for children, young people and adults, including those with special educational needs, irrespective of the institutions or organisations providing them or the form in which they are delivered. The first statistical data collection based on the new classification (ISCED 2011) took place in 2014 (text and definitions adopted from UNESCO, 1997, UNESCO/OECD/Eurostat, 2013 and UNESCO/UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2011).

ISCED 0: Pre-primary education

Programmes at level 0 (pre-primary), defined as the initial stage of organised instruction, are designed primarily to introduce very young children to a school-type environment, i.e. to provide a bridge between the home and a school-based atmosphere. Upon completion of these programmes, children continue their education at level 1 (primary education).

Pre-primary education is school-based or centre-based and is designed for children aged at least 3 years.

ISCED 1: Primary education

Primary education provides learning and educational activities typically designed to provide students with fundamental skills in reading, writing and mathematics (i.e. literacy and numeracy). It establishes a sound foundation for learning, a solid understanding of core areas of knowledge and fosters personal development, thus preparing students for lower secondary education. It provides basic learning with little specialisation, if any.

This level begins between 5 and 7 years of age, is compulsory in all countries and generally lasts from four to six years.

ISCED 2: Lower secondary education

Programmes at ISCED level 2, or lower secondary education, typically build upon the fundamental teaching and learning processes which begin at ISCED level 1. Usually, the educational aim is to lay the foundation for lifelong learning and personal development that prepares students for further educational opportunities. Programmes at this level are usually organised around a more subject-oriented curriculum, introducing theoretical concepts across a broad range of subjects.

This level typically begins around the age of 11 or 12 and usually ends at age 15 or 16, often coinciding with the end of compulsory education.

ISCED 3: Upper secondary education

Programmes at ISCED level 3, or upper secondary education, are typically designed to complete secondary education in preparation for tertiary or higher education, or to provide skills relevant to employment, or both. Programmes at this level offer students more subject-based, specialist and in-depth programmes than in lower secondary education (ISCED 2). They are more differentiated, with an increased range of options and streams available.

This level generally begins at the end of compulsory education. The entry age is typically age 15 or 16. Entry qualifications (e.g. completion of compulsory education) or other minimum requirements are usually needed. The duration of ISCED level 3 varies from two to five years.

ISCED 4: Post-secondary non-tertiary education

Post-secondary non-tertiary programmes build on secondary education to provide learning and educational activities to prepare students for entry into the labour market and/or tertiary education. It typically targets students who have completed upper secondary (ISCED level 3) but who want to improve their skills and increase the opportunities available to them. Programmes are often not significantly more advanced than those at upper secondary level as they typically serve to broaden rather than deepen knowledge, skills and competencies. They are therefore pitched below the higher level of complexity characteristic of tertiary education.

ISCED 5: Short-cycle tertiary education

Programmes at ISCED level 5 are short-cycle tertiary education, and are often designed to provide participants with professional knowledge, skills and competencies. Typically, they are practice-based and occupation-specific, preparing students to enter the labour market. However, these programmes may also provide a pathway to other tertiary education programmes.

Academic tertiary education programmes below the level of a Bachelor's programme or equivalent are also classified as ISCED level 5.

ISCED 6: Bachelor's or equivalent level

Programmes at ISCED level 6 are at Bachelor's or equivalent level, which are often designed to provide participants with intermediate academic and/or professional knowledge, skills and competencies, leading to a first degree or equivalent qualification. Programmes at this level are typically theory-based but may include practical elements; they are informed by state of the art research and/or best professional practice. ISCED 6 programmes are traditionally offered by universities and equivalent tertiary educational institutions.

ISCED 7: Master's or equivalent level

Programmes at ISCED level 7 are at Master's or equivalent level, and are often designed to provide participants with advanced academic and/or professional knowledge, skills and competencies, leading to a second degree or equivalent qualification. Programmes at this level may have a substantial research component but do not lead to the award of a doctoral qualification. Typically, programmes at this level are theory-based but may include practical components and are informed by state of the art research and/or best professional practice. They are traditionally offered by universities and other tertiary educational institutions.

ISCED 8: Doctoral or equivalent level

Programmes at ISCED level 8 are at doctoral or equivalent level, and are designed primarily to lead to an advanced research qualification. Programmes at this ISCED level are devoted to advanced study and original research and are typically offered only by research-oriented tertiary educational institutions such as universities. Doctoral programmes exist in both academic and professional fields.

For more information on the ISCED classification, see <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf> [accessed March 2017].

EDUCATION, AUDIOVISUAL AND CULTURE EXECUTIVE AGENCY

Education and Youth Policy Analysis

Avenue du Bourget 1 (J-70 – Unit A7)
B-1049 Brussels
(<http://ec.europa.eu/eurydice>)

Managing editor

Arlette Delhaxhe

Authors

Isabelle De Coster (coordination), Sogol Noorani, Emmanuel Sigalas,
with the contribution of Laurence Bonnafous

External expert

Elin McCallum

Graphics and layout

Patrice Brel

Cover

Virginia Giovannelli and Patrice Brel

Production coordinator

Gisèle De Lel

EURYDICE NATIONAL UNITS

ALBANIA

Eurydice Unit
European Integration and International Cooperation
Department of Integration and Projects
Ministry of Education and Sport
Rruga e Durrësit, Nr. 23
1001 Tiranë

AUSTRIA

Eurydice-Informationsstelle
Bundesministerium für Bildung
Abt. Bildungsentwicklung und -reform
Minoritenplatz 5
1010 Wien
Contribution of the Unit: polis – The Austrian Centre for
Citizenship Education in Schools

BELGIUM

Unité Eurydice de la Communauté française
Ministère de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles
Direction des relations internationales
Boulevard Léopold II, 44 – Bureau 6A/008
1080 Bruxelles
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

Eurydice Vlaanderen
Departement Onderwijs en Vorming/
Afdeling Strategische Beleidsondersteuning
Hendrik Consciencegebouw 7C10
Koning Albert II-laan 15
1210 Brussel

Contribution of the Unit: Eline De Ridder (coordination)
Experts:

- Department of Education and Training: Ann Dejaeghere, Emilie Le Roi
- Agency for Higher Education, Adult Education, Qualifications and Study Allowances: Christophe Calis, Marjolein Muys
- Inspection: Wouter Schelfhout

Eurydice-Informationsstelle der Deutschsprachigen
Gemeinschaft
Autonome Hochschule in der DG
Monschauer Strasse 57
4700 Eupen
Contribution of the Unit: Xavier Hurllet

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Ministry of Civil Affairs
Education Sector
Trg BiH 3
71000 Sarajevo
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

BULGARIA

Eurydice Unit
Human Resource Development Centre
Education Research and Planning Unit
15, Graf Ignatiev Str.
1000 Sofia
Contribution of the Unit: Svetomira Apostolova – Kaloyanova

CROATIA

Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i sporta
Donje Svetice 38
10000 Zagreb
Contribution of the Unit: Duje Bonacci

CYPRUS

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education and Culture
Kimonos and Thoukydidou
1434 Nicosia
Contribution of the Unit: Experts: Maria Iacovidou
(secondary education, Ministry of Education and Culture),
Maria Papacosta (primary education, Ministry of Education
and Culture) and Filio Savva (primary education, Ministry of
Education and Culture)

CZECH REPUBLIC

Eurydice Unit
Centre for International Cooperation in Education
Dům zahraniční spolupráce
Na Poříčí 1035/4
110 00 Praha 1
Contribution of the Unit: Simona Pikálková and Marcela
Máchová; experts: Petr Drábek (Czech School Inspectorate)
and Alena Hesová (National Institution for Education)

DENMARK

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Higher Education and Science
Danish Agency for Higher Education
Bredgade 43
1260 København K
Contribution of the Unit: The Ministry of Education and the
Ministry of Higher Education and Science

ESTONIA

Eurydice Unit
Analysis Department
Ministry of Education and Research
Munga 18
50088 Tartu
Contribution of the Unit: Kersti Kaldma (coordination);
expert: Kersti Kivirüüt (chief expert, Ministry of Education
and Research)

FINLAND

Eurydice Unit
Finnish National Agency for Education
P.O. Box 380
00531 Helsinki
Contribution of the Unit: Aapo Koukku and Hanna Laakso

FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

National Agency for European Educational Programmes and
Mobility
Porta Bunjakovec 2A-1
1000 Skopje
Contribution of the Unit: Dejan Zlatkovski and
Darko Dimitrov

FRANCE

Unité française d'Eurydice
 Ministère de l'Éducation nationale (MEN)
 Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche et
 de l'Innovation (MESRI)
 Direction de l'évaluation, de la prospective et de la
 performance (DEPP)
 Mission aux relations européennes et internationales
 (MIREI)
 61-65, rue Dutot
 75732 Paris Cedex 15
 Contribution of the Unit: Anne-Marie Hazard-Tourillon
 (expert & secondary education inspector – IA-IPR) and
 Anne Gaudry-Lachet (MEN-MESRI)

GERMANY

Eurydice-Informationsstelle des Bundes
 Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt e. V. (DLR)
 Heinrich-Konen Str. 1
 53227 Bonn
 Eurydice-Informationsstelle der Länder im Sekretariat der
 Kultusministerkonferenz
 Taubenstraße 10
 10117 Bonn
 Contribution of the Unit: Thomas Eckhardt

GREECE

Eurydice Unit
 Directorate for European Union Affairs
 Ministry of Education, Research and Religious Affairs
 37 Andrea Papandreu Str. (Office 2172)
 15180 Maroussi (Attiki)
 Contribution of the Unit: Magda Trantallidi and
 Georgia Karageorgou

HUNGARY

Hungarian Eurydice Unit
 Educational Authority
 19-21 Maros utca (room 517)
 1122 Budapest
 Contribution of the Unit: Márton Bodó and Attila Varga
 (external experts)

ICELAND

Eurydice Unit
 The Directorate of Education
 Víkurhvarfi 3
 203 Kópavogur
 Contribution of the Unit: Þorbjörn Kristjánsson (expert –
 evaluation and testing, Directorate of Education)

IRELAND

Eurydice Unit
 Department of Education and Skills
 International Section
 Marlborough Street
 Dublin 1 – DO1 RC96
 Contribution of the Unit: Kevin McCarthy (Senior Inspector,
 Department of Education & Skills)

ITALY

Unità italiana di Eurydice
 Istituto Nazionale di Documentazione, Innovazione e
 Ricerca Educativa (INDIRE)
 Agenzia Erasmus+
 Via C. Lombroso 6/15
 50134 Firenze
 Contribution of the Unit: Erica Cimò; expert: Rosario Sergio
 Maniscalco (docente comandato, Direzione generale per gli
 ordinamenti scolastici e la valutazione del sistema nazionale
 di istruzione, Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della
 Ricerca)

LATVIA

Eurydice Unit
 State Education Development Agency
 Valņu street 3 (5th floor)
 1050 Riga
 Contribution of the Unit: Inga Šīna; expert: Sandra Falka
 (Senior Official of the National Centre for Education)

LIECHTENSTEIN

Informationsstelle Eurydice
 Schulamt des Fürstentums Liechtenstein
 Austrasse 79
 Postfach 684
 9490 Vaduz
 Contribution of the Unit: Eurydice National Information
 Centre

LITHUANIA

Eurydice Unit
 National Agency for School Evaluation of the Republic of
 Lithuania
 Geležinio Vilko Street 12
 03163 Vilnius
 Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

LUXEMBOURG

Unité nationale d'Eurydice
 ANEFORÉ ASBL
 eduPôle Walferdange
 Bâtiment 03 – étage 01
 Route de Diekirch
 7220 Walferdange
 Contribution of the Unit: Michèle Schilt, Georges Paulus and
 Marc Schoentgen

MALTA

Eurydice National Unit
 Directorate for Research, Lifelong Learning and Innovation
 Ministry for Education and Employment
 Great Siege Road
 Floriana VLT 2000
 Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

MONTENEGRO

Eurydice Unit
 Vaka Djurovica bb
 81000 Podgorica
 Contribution of the Unit: Nevena Čabrilo and Vidosava
 Kaščelan (Bureau for Education Services)

NETHERLANDS

Eurydice Nederland
 Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap
 Directie Internationaal Beleid
 Etage 4 – Kamer 08.022
 Rijnstraat 50
 2500 BJ Den Haag
 Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

NORWAY

Eurydice Unit
 Ministry of Education and Research
 AIK-avd., Kunnskapsdepartementet
 Kirkegata 18
 P.O. Box 8119 Dep.
 0032 Oslo
 Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

POLAND

Eurydice Unit
 Foundation for the Development of the Education System
 Aleje Jerozolimskie 142A
 02-305 Warszawa
 Contribution of the Unit: Beata Maluchnik (coordination);
 expert: Bożena Kubiczek PhD (the Sosnowiec Education
 Centre 'Educator')

PORTUGAL

Unidade Portuguesa da Rede Eurydice (UPRE)
 Ministério da Educação e Ciência
 Direção-Geral de Estatísticas da Educação e Ciência
 (DGEEC)
 Av. 24 de Julho, 134
 1399-054 Lisboa
 Contribution of the Unit: Isabel Almeida; outside the Unit:
 ANQEP, DGE, IGEC

ROMANIA

Eurydice Unit
 National Agency for Community Programmes in the Field of
 Education and Vocational Training
 Universitatea Politehnică București
 Biblioteca Centrală
 Splaiul Independenței, nr. 313
 Sector 6
 060042 București
 Contribution of the Unit: Veronica – Gabriela Chirea, in
 cooperation with experts Eugen Stoica (Ministry of National
 Education); Laura Elena Căpiță and Angela Teșileanu
 (Institute of Science Education); Zoica Elena Vlăduț
 (National Centre for Vocational and Technical Education)

SERBIA

Eurydice Unit Serbia
 Foundation Tempus
 Ruze Jovanovic 27a
 11000 Belgrade
 Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

SLOVAKIA

Eurydice Unit
 Slovak Academic Association for International Cooperation
 Křížkova 9
 811 04 Bratislava
 Contribution of the Unit: Marta Ivanová and Martina Račková

SLOVENIA

Eurydice Unit
 Ministry of Education, Science and Sport
 Department of Educational Development and Quality
 Masarykova 16
 1000 Ljubljana
 Contribution of the Unit: Barbara Kresal Sterniša; experts:
 Mija Javornik (Ministry of Education, Science and Sport) and
 Eva Klemenčič (Educational Research Institute)

SPAIN

Eurydice España-REDIE
 Centro Nacional de Innovación e Investigación Educativa
 (CNIIE) – P4: Investigación y Estudios
 Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte
 c/ Torrelaguna, 58
 28027 Madrid
 Contribution of the Unit: Montaña Navas García,
 Fátima Rodríguez Gómez, M^a Teresa Álvarez Ordóñez,
 Rocío Arias Bejarano and Elena Vázquez Aguilar. The
 following Autonomous Communities sent the completed
 questionnaire and information on this issue within their field
 of competence: Cantabria, Castilla y León, Castilla-La
 Mancha, Cataluña and Galicia. The Subdirectorato-General
 of Guidance and Vocational Training and the National
 Centre of Innovation and Educational Research, both of
 Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport, also did the same.

SWEDEN

Eurydice Unit
 Universitets- och högskolerådet/
 The Swedish Council for Higher Education
 Box 450 93
 104 30 Stockholm
 Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

SWITZERLAND

Eurydice Unit
 Swiss Conference of Cantonal Ministers of Education (EDK)
 Speichergasse 6
 3001 Bern
 Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

TURKEY

Eurydice Unit
 MEB, Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı (SGB)
 Eurydice Türkiye Birimi, Merkez Bina 4. Kat
 B-Blok Bakanlıklar
 06648 Ankara
 Contribution of the Unit: Osman Yıldırım Uğur and
 Nihan Erdal; expert: Associate Professor Dr. Pasa Tevfik
 Cephe

UNITED KINGDOM

Eurydice Unit for England, Wales and Northern Ireland
 Centre for Information and Reviews
 National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)
 The Mere, Upton Park
 Slough, Berkshire, SL1 2DQ
 Contribution of the Unit: Sigrid Boyd, Maureen Heron and
 Claire Sargent

Eurydice Unit Scotland
 c/o Education Scotland
 The Optima
 58 Robertson Street
 Glasgow G2 8DU
 Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

Citizenship Education at School in Europe – 2017

The Eurydice *Citizenship Education at School in Europe – 2017* report provides a comparative overview of national policies in the area of citizenship education across Europe, at a time when increasing demands are being made on education and training systems to promote this area of learning. It focuses on the curriculum content and organisation, the teaching and learning methods in and outside the classroom, the assessment of students, and the training and support for teachers. These issues are addressed in the four chapters, each of which is complemented by a case study on a recent policy initiative.

The report is primarily based on qualitative data and covers 42 education systems. It draws on the existing regulations and recommendations regarding citizenship education in public sector schools and includes general education and school-based initial vocational education training programmes.

The Eurydice network's task is to understand and explain how Europe's different education systems are organised and how they work. The network provides descriptions of national education systems, comparative studies devoted to specific topics, indicators and statistics. All Eurydice publications are available free of charge on the Eurydice website or in print upon request. Through its work, Eurydice aims to promote understanding, cooperation, trust and mobility at European and international levels. The network consists of national units located in European countries and is coordinated by the EU Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. For more information about Eurydice, see <http://ec.europa.eu/eurydice>.

