

Washington University in St. Louis

Washington University Open Scholarship

All Theses and Dissertations (ETDs)

January 2011

National Education Systems in the European Union

Edmund Staude

Washington University in St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Staude, Edmund, "National Education Systems in the European Union" (2011). *All Theses and Dissertations (ETDs)*. 458.

<https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/etd/458>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations (ETDs) by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

University College

International Affairs

NATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS

IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

by

Edmund D. Staude

A thesis presented to the
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
of Washington University in
partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts

May 2011

Saint Louis, Missouri

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN UNION.....	3
3. EUROPEAN UNION EDUCATION POLICIES AND PRACTICES.....	7
4. CIVICS EDUCATION AND THE EUROPEAN UNION.....	19
5. EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.....	21
6. CIVICS EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.....	26
7. EDUCATION IN GERMANY.....	38
8. CIVICS EDUCATION IN GERMANY.....	42
9. CONCLUSIONS.....	59
10. REFERENCES.....	63

1. INTRODUCTION

The European Union is an institution balancing the need for international agreement and cooperation in order to promote a growth economy, while at the same time acknowledging Member States' national interests and sovereignty, even in areas in which those individual interests are intertwined with the success of the larger group. Education is one such area. Education is a distinctively local, regional, and even national domain depending upon the nation; yet it is of primary importance to the success of the European Union. The manner in which the EU and its member states balance the tension among educational interests is the topic of this paper. The history of the EU is about more than states simply joining forces to create a stronger economy. Its beginnings go to the basis for creating a political system that would engage Europeans in a common purpose to prevent the kinds of confrontations and devastation among nations that characterized the late 19th and first half of the 20th centuries.

In her 2002 article "Locating Europe" Jasemin Nuhogiu Soysal described an "emerging European public space" and the manner in which it is being developed through education. She bases her beliefs on the notion that education has the ability to shape, at least to some degree, students' perspectives:

Textbooks and curricula reflect the official and codified versions of Europe, but these are increasingly products of the work of an effective network of actors – from teachers, academics, advocacy groups to ministerial and EU officers, and to international organizations of various sorts, UNESCO, council of Europe and the like. These bodies convene and attend meetings and conferences on teaching in Europe, survey and evaluate definitions and histories of Europe, and discuss and develop tools and texts for educating the future generation of "Europeans". Through their activities, Europe is revisited, revised and re-mapped (Soysal, 2002, p. 269).

Soysal argues that the education curriculum of European states is being driven or even dictated by forces outside the state, and that such forces are intentionally guiding students to a greater Euro-centric view of themselves and their surroundings. Since the majority of European nations belong to the EU, and it would be a benefit to the EU for its population to have a more Euro-centric view of themselves, it is logical to investigate to what extent the education policies of the EU are pursuing such actions. Soysal's assertions also deal with individuals' attitudes toward regional space and ones place in that space. The social sciences provide for instruction in areas covering ideas such as this, specifically through the subject of civics or citizenship. EU and national curricular goals in civic/citizenship education may shed further light on the extent to which Soysal's assertions may be an accurate description of what is or is not occurring.

Over the years of its existence, the EU and its preceding entities have developed an ever-growing participation in education policy, programs, and curricula, which encourage education that promotes a European perspective or European Dimension. However, because of the local nature of education, curricular decisions made at the local (even classroom) level, especially in the area of civics education, will produce European citizens with a distinctively national, regional, and even local flavor.

To illustrate these points, this paper will outline the early stages of the European Union to show the ongoing concerns over issues of national sovereignty. It will then move to a discussion of the EU focus on education, particularly in secondary schooling with attention given to goals for citizenship education. This will be followed by a review of the educational systems of both England and Germany, two of the larger but

structurally different school systems in the EU. These two countries were also chosen because of the role, or at least perceived role, each plays in the European Union. England is sometimes viewed as being a bit on the fringe of the EU because of such things as its concerns over open borders and its reluctance to join the Euro zone. Germany, on the other hand is often perceived as being more ‘all in’ even a leader when it comes to participation in the EU. Their education systems will be examined to determine how their education agendas are determined and carried out. Finally, curriculum goals and standards for Civics or Citizenship education on the secondary level will be considered for all three entities. A number of questions will be considered through the material presented. To what extent has the EU of today gone beyond the early concerns over issues of national sovereignty? How is the balance being kept with respect to national education systems and EU standards? Ultimately, to what extent do EU Member States determine their own education agendas and to what extent is there a *de facto* EU school system?

2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Since the late 19th century, the nations of Western Europe have participated in several major wars against each other. In the years immediately following World War II, several of these nations sought ways to cooperate amongst themselves in order to create an atmosphere that would discourage future intra-continental conflict. Ultimately, rather than relying on military treaties, they turned to trade agreements to help maintain a peaceful environment. The end result of that cooperation is today’s European Union.

Officially, the European Union would not begin, at least in its current form, until 1993 with the Treaty of the European Union, more commonly referred to as the Maastricht Treaty. However, the seeds of the idea for working together under a formal agreement predate World War II.

In a speech to the General Assembly of the League of Nations in September of 1929, France's foreign minister, Aristide Briand, presented the idea for, "some sort of federal connection" (French Ministry) among European nations. His concept included a common market; however, he was careful to suggest that it would not affect member nations' sovereignty. The proposal fell flat, especially among nations which would once again be at war with each other only a few years later; Germany, Italy, France and Great Britain.

After World War II ended, it became clear to all parties that European countries had to work together at an even greater level than they had prior to the war on efforts to keep such events from engulfing Europe yet again. Plans were already coming together for participation in the United Nations, but Western Europeans wanted to be intentional and self-reliant about guarding the peace on their continent. One of the first attempts came out of the Brussels Treaty in 1948. This treaty was signed by five Western European nations; France, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, and it focused on working jointly in a number of areas including economically, culturally and militarily. One provision of the treaty, which appears as a remnant from World War II, specifically addressed the fear of further German aggression. Yet the first provision they created, which dealt with trade, can be seen as a precursor to today's

European Union. It called for the signatories of the treaty to,

... organize and co-ordinate their economic activities as to produce the best possible results, by the elimination of conflict in their economic policies, the co-ordination of production and the development of commercial exchanges.

(“The Brussels Treaty,” 2006, Article 1)

In May of 1950, the French Foreign Minister, Robert Schuman, submitted a declaration which would lead to the formation of the European Coal and Steel Community, considered the initial stage for today’s European Union. While this agreement initially only included France and Germany, a number of subsequent agreements and developing organizations would ultimately morph into today’s European Union. Membership would increase at each step along the way, as would the reach of the various treaties’ areas of concern. Each new treaty and organization would include recognition of the concern for national sovereignty over domestic affairs; however, as the areas of Community interest became more complex, national domestic concerns more easily affected the common goals of the Member States. Care continued to be taken to maintain the agreements as primarily economic conferences.

In 1992, today’s European Union was officially born. The EU had been evolving through the various treaties that preceded it, but it was made official by the Treaty on European Union signed in Maastricht, the Netherlands on February 7, 1992. The treaty began on November 1, 1993, and its structure reflected concerns regarding governance by a supranational institution. It was designed around three pillars covering economic

relations, foreign affairs and home affairs. Each pillar dealt with a specific aspect of the operation of the EU and assigned specific functions to either the Union, particularly in the area of economics, or to the individual member nations. The treaty widened EU responsibilities expanding supranational structures in some areas and also set up a new range of intergovernmental responsibilities in common foreign policy and home affairs. The European Commission retained responsibility for the economic pillar, but the remaining two pillars were to be controlled by the European Council. Because this group was comprised of members who were ministers in their respective states, the areas of foreign affairs and home affairs were more directly connected to the individual member nations (“Treaty of Maastricht,” 2010).

Economic cooperation among member states remains a priority of the EU; however, concerns over economic growth have become intertwined with education as the EU has begun to focus upon becoming a ‘knowledge society’, stressing opportunities for life-long learning in order to become a competitive knowledge-based economy able to generate ever better job opportunities and greater social cohesion among its members. Education, therefore, plays a critical role, and although it continues to be a domestic policy issue for nations, it has become fairly widely addressed by the EU. The European Union and member states continue to work to achieve a balance between national interests and traditions in education and the interests of the European Union.

3. EUROPEAN UNION EDUCATION POLICIES AND PRACTICE

Since the early treaties, the different European communities have developed support roles in the area of education. A variety of collective education policies have been in effect even prior to 1993. Member States are in charge of their own school systems, including career training; however, they do cooperate within the EU to reach common goals (“Treaty Basis”, 2010). As early as the Treaty of Rome in 1957, vocational training was identified as an area of Community action.

The first official hints of Community interest in school education came in 1961 as a result of the Bonn-Bad Godesberg summit in which the heads of states articulated a wish for a greater political union and cultural community. Education was specifically singled out as an area for cooperation, and it was suggested that the ministers of education from the participating countries coordinate the effort (European Commission, 2006). Many of the initial attempts at cooperation failed, but the basis for cooperation was now there. The state ministers for education officially met for the first time at the community level in 1971 at meeting called the Council and the Ministers of Education Meeting within the Council. This organizational structure reflected the Community/intergovernmental nature of the policies they would later develop and enact (European Commission, 2006). Work was initially begun on the university level with the goals of enhanced mobility, recognition of diplomas, cooperation among institutions of higher learning, study of modern languages and the exchange of information through a European network.

Movement towards these goals continued slowly and deliberately. It had been agreed that harmonization of national systems was not the goal and made no sense because of the diversity of the systems and their country-specific roots. By 1974, continued efforts by the ministers of education resulted in the adoption of a resolution on education, which created an education committee composed of representatives of the Member States. The early focus was on higher education. Yet, even in the case of higher education, major agreements would not come until 1999 with the signing of the Bologna Declaration. This agreement reached beyond the European Union and included countries not yet in the EU. It was intended to produce common degree standards and quality assurance of degrees throughout Europe. The 1974 resolution included four principles for the committee.

1. Cooperation in education must be adapted to the specific objectives and requirements of this field.
 2. On no account must education be regarded merely as a component of economic life.
 3. Cooperation must make allowance for the traditions of each country and the diversity of their respective education policies and systems.
 4. Harmonization of these systems or policies cannot be considered an end in itself.
- (European Commission, 2006, p.67).

As a result of continued work, by 1976 the program was no longer limited to higher education, but also included school education, yet the 1976 resolution reiterated the guaranteed respect for the diversity of the educational systems and practices of the Member States. The early work in school education primarily included ideas such as the development of pilot projects, topical studies, and study visits. The major plan for these endeavors was to, “create mutual understanding, correspondence, and closer connections

among systems through the exchange of information and experiences (European Commission, 2006, p. 69).” The resolution included a list of the First Six Fields of Cooperation:

1. The education of migrant workers and their children.
 2. Closer relations between educational systems in Europe.
 3. The compilation of up-to-date documents and statistics.
 4. Cooperation in the field of higher education.
 5. The teaching of foreign languages.
 6. Equal opportunities.
- (European Commission, 2006 p. 70)

Following these efforts, the Eurydice Network, an information network designed to report on education in Europe, was set up in 1980 as a kind of clearing house for sharing information from the various studies and efforts implemented by the Member States. By the 1990s, this network developed into a primary source for comparative information on education systems in Europe.

The European Dimension

One important aspect of the work done in the 1970s by the Member States’ ministers of education was the evolution of the concept of the European Dimension in education. The European Dimension stressed a shared sense of European identity based on an understanding of the principles of democracy, social justice and respect for human rights as well as an acceptance of the economic and social development of the European community as it is part of a European union. By 1974, the Commission had already made languages a central component to the introduction of the European Dimension. Additionally, the Community was making specific, intentional efforts to foster greater

understanding of Europe through the distribution in schools of maps of Europe, and the promotion of the European Dimension through classes, information, brochures and other activities (European Commission, 2006). By the 1980s, the Community was beginning to hone its vision of how the peoples of Europe would one-day view themselves. The Stuttgart Declaration of 1983 stressed cooperation among institutions of higher education as well as improvement of information on European history and culture. The goal was to promote European awareness. In 1984, the Fontainebleau Declaration stressed the importance of Community identity for its citizens. Following these two declarations, the concept of the European citizen gradually emerged among the Member States (“Green Paper”, 1993).

The European Dimension continued to be developed for school education two more times in 1985. First, the Adonnino Report proposed development of the image of Europe in education through the creation of resource centers in Member States. These centers would provide educational information and assistance for both schools and teachers by developing manuals and teaching material. Also that year, as a result of the European Council of Milan, education ministers agreed to ‘teaching about the European Dimension as part and parcel of the education of future citizens of Europe’. They then defined the fields in which national and Community actions should be conducted. These included foreign language, study visits, class exchanges, school curricula, teacher training, and cooperation among teacher training institutes (European Commission, 2006, p. 132).

In 1986, the Single European Act further clarified a need for the inclusion of a European Dimension in education. By 1987, priority was given to increasing teachers' and pupils' knowledge of Europe and to providing them with opportunities to develop an awareness of Europe and a reasonable knowledge and understanding of the geographical, historical, and political aspects of the European community.

In 1988, the Council and Ministers of Education Meeting within the Council presented a resolution on the European Dimension in education which contained some of the most specific objectives yet.

- strengthen in young people a sense of European identity and make clear to them the value of European civilization and of the foundations on which the European peoples intend to base their development today, that is in particular the safeguarding of the principles of democracy, social justice and respect for human rights.
- prepare young people to take part in the economic and social development of the Community and in making concrete progress towards European union, as stipulated in the Single European Act.
- make them aware of the advantages which the Community represents but also of the challenges it involves, in opening up an enlarge economic and social area to them.
- improve their knowledge of the Community and its Member States in their historical, cultural, economic and social aspects and bring home to them the significance of the cooperation of the Member States of the European Community with other countries of Europe and the world.
("Green Paper", p. 18)

The goal of these objectives was to encourage Member States to take actions such as integrating the European Dimension into the school curriculum, teaching materials and teacher training.

The sum of these efforts was the inclusion of the development of the European Dimension in education in the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. Article 126 of the Treaty dealt specifically with education and youth and became the legal basis for the Union's more

formal approach to education. The Treaty, however, continued to stress that there was still to be no harmonization of national systems, nor would there be a common policy for the creation of a European education system. It remained the intention of the Member States that education would not fall under the exclusive competence of the European Union, but it would belong to the complementary competences. This supported the principle of subsidiarity, which was the heart of the Maastricht Treaty and was intended to be an argument for regional and local solutions to problems, which might be similar throughout the Member States (European Commission, 2006, p.146).

More recently, the Union's interest in education has gained momentum since the Lisbon Strategy in 2000. The strategy acknowledged that knowledge and life-long learning were two of the EU's most valuable assets, "particularly in light of increasing global competition" ("Strategic Framework", 2010). To this end, the report from Lisbon recognized that not only was pre-primary, primary, secondary, higher and vocational education and training important to European success, but it also declared that lifelong learning needed to be a priority. Life-long learning was considered the "key to employment, economic success and allowing people to participate fully in society" ("Strategic Framework", 2010)."

The report, once again, acknowledged that each member state is responsible for its own education and training system. In support of this, Union-level policies have continued to be designed to support national actions and help address common challenges. The report does not limit itself to education in schools; rather, it addresses education in the context of the individual as a participant in a European society

throughout ones' life. Much in the ideas about education being generated by the EU today deals with lifelong learning, giving people the skills for employment, and making the citizen a full participant in society. It is believed that this can best be accomplished through Member States sharing experiences among themselves. Among the long-term strategic objectives of EU education and training policies that have been developed are:

- Making lifelong learning and mobility a reality;
 - Improving the quality and efficiency of education and training;
 - Promoting equity, social cohesion and active citizenship;
 - Enhancing creativity and innovation, including entrepreneurship at all levels of education and training
- (“Strategic Framework”, 2010).

To accomplish these goals, EU education policy suggests expanding learning by creating partnerships among educational and training institutions. It also continues to promote multilingualism, and the study of ICT (Information and Communication Technology) (“Strategic Framework, 2010).

Today, the European Commission supports the idea that schools should develop the concept of lifelong learning in their students in order to prepare them for the modern world. It is suggested that sound school systems train students so that they ensure, “open and democratic societies by training people in citizenship, solidarity and participative democracy (“School Education”, 2010).”

The European Commission recognizes that each EU Member State is responsible for the organization of its educational system. However, it also notes the advantages in working together where common issues can be identified. One area in which the EU coordinates efforts for nations to work together is the Comenius program. This project promotes school exchanges and development, among other things. Another area in which

the Commission invests effort is in working closely with national policy-makers to assist them in developing education policies and systems (“School Education”, 2010).

Another more recent attempt at involvement in education, which developed as part of the Lisbon Agenda, was participation in what is called ‘more open methods of coordination’. This includes additional cooperation not only in the area of shared objectives but also in means of measurement. The open method of coordination is intended to promote convergence of national policies, and it also supports the attainment of shared objectives. Given the division of powers included in the treaty, it is an attempt to assist Member States in formulating their own policies. It is based on identifying and defining shared objectives at the European level, jointly specified means of measurement, and comparative tools for cooperation. This information is intended to ultimately contribute to the mutual improvement of systems through sharing best practices, peer review and pilot projects (European Commission, 2006). Broad goals or benchmarks have been established since Lisbon with the hope that they would be achieved by 2010. Five quantified objectives or benchmarks were established and were to be obtained by the Union by 2010. These include:

1. EU average rate of early school leavers to be no more than 10%
 2. total number of graduates in mathematics, science, and technology in the EU to increase by 15%, with a decreased gender imbalance in these fields.
 3. At least 85% of 22-year-olds to have completed upper secondary education.
 4. Percentage of 15-year-olds who are low-achieving in reading to have decreased by at least 20% compared to the year 2000.
 5. Average participation in life-long education to be at least 12.5% of the adult working age population (25 – 64 age group)
- (European Commission, 2006, p. 218).

Because of concern that national education and training policies appeared to be disregarding the objectives, in 2003 “Education and Training 2010” was developed as a way to determine the progress of education and training. It was intended to be a central element in the formulation of national policies (European Commission, 2006). By 2006, Member States would be submitting reports every two years, which presented the actions they had taken towards the objectives established following the Lisbon Treaty.

The European Commission continues to assist national school systems by providing a venue for meeting with one another. Through this venue, the education ministers from Member States have established four areas on which to work to improve national school systems. Their priorities include teacher education; key competencies, language learning, ICT, math, science and technology; active citizenship; and social cohesion (“School Education”, 2010). What began as an economic system to promote European harmony after almost a century of war has expanded, at least in the area of education, to what Briand quipped was needed, “some sort of federal connection”.

European Union Education Programs

The European Union has endeavored to support national education systems through a variety of support programs, which are designed to promote the established EU ideal of lifelong learning for better employability and citizenship in Europe. The early programs were intended to encourage and enlarge the scale of cooperation and its potential for penetration into the various Member States. Some of the major programs developed through 1992 included Comett, Erasmus, PETRA, Lingua, FORCE and

Tempus, Erasmus, Comett, and Lingua were initially developed to promote cooperation among universities through a variety of study exchanges. More specifically, Comett was directed towards university enterprise cooperation. Lingua focused on languages in Europe, and Erasmus promoted student mobility and cooperation among universities. PETRA and FORCE were focused on initial and ongoing vocational training and youth exchanges. By 1992, PETRA was integrated into the Leonardo Program. This program was designed for young people involved in vocational training in addition to their full-time compulsory education. The program included one to two years of post compulsory education vocational training with part of the time spent in another Member State (European Commission, 2006).

Throughout their years of ever-increasing connection, the Member States tended to emphasize the importance of foreign languages. The Lingua program attempted to promote the teaching of foreign languages in schools and to facilitate the in-service training of language teachers. This included encouraging future language teachers to complete a significant portion of their training in the country whose language they were preparing to teach. The program also encouraged pupils to make educational visits to other Member States (European Commission, 2006).

After 1993 the variety of programs which had been developed earlier were streamlined. Socrates became the program which dealt with school education as well as with universities. Socrates included Erasmus and much of Lingua, but also included programs in school education, open and distance learning, and adult education. One

program, which is most germane to this study because it deals with school education, is the Comenius program (European Commission, 2006).

Comenius is part of the European Community's Lifelong Learning Program which, "seeks to promote cooperation and mobility, and to strengthen the European dimension in education (European Commission, 2008, p.11)." Comenius is specifically designed to address the area of school education. Its two major objectives are:

1. to develop knowledge and understanding among young people and education staff of the diversity of European cultures and languages, and the value of this diversity
2. to help young people to acquire basic life skills and competencies for their personal development, for future employment and for active European citizenship.

(European Commission, 2008, p.11)

The Comenius School Partnerships Handbook for Schools reported that up until 2008, around 25,000 schools across the EU member states had been involved in the program. A majority of teachers polled reported that they felt that pupils became more interested in other countries and cultures as a result of the program. They further indicated that their students tended to improve their knowledge about living and school life in partner countries, and it was reported that students showed more tolerance towards other cultures and people from other countries. More than 75% of the students showed greater motivation to learn foreign languages with 62% improving their English proficiency and 23% improving their skills in other languages. Other educational areas were enhanced as well and teachers self reported similar personal gains to what their students experienced. 79% of the teachers polled considered there to be a, "stronger

European dimension,” as a result of their schools’ participation in the program (European Commission, 2008).

The actual program is designed for students to experience cooperation among groups of pupils and teachers from different European countries not all of which must be members of the EU. Two to three schools are involved in a partnership, and the schools range from the elementary level through secondary. The experience gives the partner schools an opportunity to, “explore one another’s countries, cultures, and ways of thinking and living, and to understand and appreciate them better (European Commission, 2008, p.13).”

Participating schools are encouraged to develop some type of European project as part of their regular curriculums. The projects are intended to be collaborative from choosing the topic throughout the entire process up to producing the end product. The process is intended to cause both students and teachers from the various countries to work together to solve the problems encountered in generating such a project. A valuable component of the program is an exchange experience for both teachers and students who are 12 and older in which the participants visit one another’s countries and are housed by families of the participating teachers and students respectively. Participation in this and other such programs is voluntary; however, it is encouraged by assistance with funding and support programs (European Commission, 2008).

4. CIVICS EDUCATION AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Specific course curricula continue to be determined by national and local school systems, and even by some individual schools. However, in 2006 the European Parliament recommended eight Key Competences for lifelong learning. The competences illustrate the emphases of the Union toward economic growth and social cohesion for Europe. The eight competences are:

1. Communication in the mother tongue;
 2. Communication in foreign languages;
 3. Mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology;
 4. Digital competence;
 5. Learning to learn;
 6. Social and civic competences;
 7. Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship;
 8. Cultural awareness and expression;
- (European Commission, 2007 p. 3)

These competences make clear the desire for Member States to help develop European citizens who not only know the civic basis and values for their own countries, but who also have knowledge of the civic principles that underpin the European Union.

Additionally, it is intended that students develop the social and civic attitudes and skills to be positive contributors to Europe and its economy.

Goals to achieve the European Dimension in education can be seen throughout this list, but competence number six specifically addresses social and civic competences. The specific goals for this competence include a variety of components, which are intended to develop the civic minded European citizen. All of the competences are broken down into three “essential” areas; knowledge, skills and attitudes. The goals for social and civic competences include:

Social:

Knowledge:

- understand the codes of conduct and manners generally accepted in different societies and environments, being aware of basic concepts relating to individuals, groups, work organizations, gender equality and non-discrimination, society and culture
- understand the multi-cultural and social-economic dimensions of European societies and how national cultural identity interacts with the European identity

Skills:

- communicate constructively in different environments
- show tolerance, express and understand different viewpoints
- negotiate with the ability to create confidence
- feel empathy
- cope with stress and frustration and express them in constructive ways
- distinguish between the personal and professional spheres

Attitude:

- show interest in socio-economic developments and intercultural communication
- value diversity
- respect others
- be prepared to overcome prejudices and to compromise

Civic:

Knowledge:

- understand concepts of democracy, justice, equality, citizenship, and civil rights including how they are expressed in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union and international declarations
- understand how these same concepts are applied by institutions at the local, regional, national, European and international levels
- know about contemporary events, main events and trends in national, European and world history
- develop an awareness of the aims, values and policies of social and political movements
- know about European integration and the EU's structures, main objectives and values
- be aware of the diversity and cultural identities in Europe

Skills:

- engage effectively with others in the public domain
- display solidarity and interest in solving problems affecting the local and wider community
- engage in critical and creative reflection and constructive participation, particularly through voting, in community or neighborhood activities as well as

decision making at all levels, from local to national and European

Attitude:

- display a sense of belonging to one's locality, country, the EU and Europe in general and to the world
 - display a willingness to participate in democratic decision-making at all levels
 - demonstrate a sense of responsibility and understanding of and respect for the shared values that are necessary to ensure community cohesion, specifically respect for democratic principles
 - engage in constructive participation in civic activities
 - support social diversity and cohesion and sustainable development
 - respect the values and privacy of others
- (European Commission, 2007 p. 9,10)

These goals are quite specific and EU designed programs and materials embrace them; however, it is the option of each Member State to include all, some, or none of these goals in its school curricula. Additionally, the manner in which the goals are included and presented to students is also determined locally. The next two sections will present the English and the German systems of school education and will show how each determines what goals and standards go into its respective curriculum.

5. EDUCATION IN ENGLAND

Control of education systems within the United Kingdom is divided separately among Scotland, Northern Ireland, Wales and England. While England and Wales are fairly similar in overall school programs, Scotland and Northern Ireland include differences both from each other and from England and Wales. To avoid multiple comparisons of fairly similar systems, for the purposes of this investigation, only the education system in England will be considered.

Schools in England are predominately publicly funded. In 2007/08, 92% of students attended public sector schools. Compulsory education in England includes children from ages 5 – 16, but in 2008, the Education and Skills Act was set to raise the age of both compulsory education and training. By 2015, young people will be required to stay in school or undertake work-based learning, training until age 18 (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009). The current structure is established as primary levels; ages 5 – 11 and secondary level; ages 11 – 16. Some areas have included separate middle schools for students around the ages of 8 – 13, and many secondary schools already provide for post-compulsory students, age 16 -18. The majority of secondary schools in England are comprehensive, which means that they accept pupils without regard to academic ability (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009).

Control

Governance of English schools flows from several levels; national, local and institutional. Primary responsibility for education lies at the national level and is coordinated by the Department for Education (DfE) and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) (“England Organization/Control”, 2010). The responsibilities of the DfE include planning and monitoring education services, ensuring the provision of integrated services for children, and bringing together policy relating to children and young people. The responsibilities of BIS include the areas of science and innovation skills (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009).

The responsibility for the organization of publicly funded schools is delegated to local authorities (LAs) such as communities, churches and other voluntary bodies (“England Organization/Control”, 2010). The LAs have the responsibility for areas such as quality assurance in the schools and for maintaining and promoting high standards for school aged pupils in their areas (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009). Most of the education systems are community schools, which have been established and funded by local authorities formed from among local citizenry.

Beyond the local authorities, individual institutions have their own governing bodies, which are responsible for the education specific to their school, and these bodies are made up of a variety of stakeholders. The maintained schools are divided into community, voluntary and foundation schools. While the majority are community based and fully funded by the LAs, foundation schools, while owned by their individual school governing bodies or charitable foundation, are also funded by LAs. Voluntary schools were initially founded by groups such as churches, which retain some measure of control over their management and are also largely funded by LAs. All maintained schools are given high levels of autonomy (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009).

Curriculum Standards

All publicly funded schools in England must comply with national statutory requirements for specific subjects. Beyond this, all schools are required to provide a “balanced and broadly-based curriculum” (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009, p.6), and they are free to develop that curriculum to reflect their individual institutional needs.

Currently, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), a non-departmental public body, advises the Government on all matters affecting curriculum. In May of 2010, the Secretary of State announced the Government intended to introduce legislation in the future that would close the QCA. At the time, there were no specific plans stipulating how the QCA's functions would continue to be carried out (European Commission-UK, 2010).

England has a Compulsory National Curriculum, which was established by the 1988 Education Act. Pring *et al.* (2009) asserts that in an effort to control what was taught in schools, the act was intentionally "detailed and prescriptive" (p.100). The act, in its original form, specified the specific curriculum and levels of attainment for each subject. The 1988 Act has been revised over the years, as a result of the Dearing Report in 1994 and subsequent reviews by the QCA in 1999/2000, and again in 2002. In all cases, the more recent trend has been toward greater freedom and flexibility for the local schools (Pring *et al.*, 2009).

Currently, development of the specifics of each school's curriculum is, to a degree, a combined effort between the Government and local authorities. The Government, advised by the QCA, decides on statutory requirements. It is left up to individual schools to determine how those requirements will be developed into specific curriculum goals and presented to the students (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009).

Curriculum for compulsory education is divided into four key stages (KS). The compulsory subjects for KS 1-3 include English, mathematics, science, design and information and communication technology (ICT), history, geography, art and design,

music and PE. At KS 3, which is ages 11 – 13, foreign language and citizenship are also compulsory. The compulsory subjects for KS 4 include English, mathematics, science ICT, PE, and citizenship. There are several statutory subjects, “curriculum entitlement areas,” in addition to compulsory subjects that schools have to make available as well. These include: the arts, design and technology, the humanities, and modern foreign languages (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009). It should be noted that modern foreign languages is currently included under the elective curriculum in KS 4. This was one of the changes in 2002 and one which has raised concern among teachers and policy-makers (Ping *et al.*, 2009).

Textbook Selection

One of the local curricular decisions made by schools in England is textbook selection. While specific texts are not generally required, in English schools at the secondary level certain prescribed texts, which must be studied in order to meet the examination requirements, are uniformly used. Beyond that, textbooks are not pre-approved by the Government, and are produced by commercial publishers. Teachers from individual schools are responsible for developing specific instructional methods and determining materials to be used in their respective schools and classrooms (Education Audiovisual-UK, 2009).

6. CIVICS EDUCATION IN ENGLAND

Civics or citizenship education, as it is usually called in England, is a course of study which contains characteristics unique to national interests, depending upon the country in which it is taught. Subjects considered by some to be of a more academic nature, such as math and science, can be expected to be presented in a rather generic fashion regardless of the nation in which they are taught. This section will consider the basis for civics education comparing how it is presented in both England and Germany with the policies and opportunities developed by the European Union.

Supporters of citizenship education around the world agree that it is a valuable component of a good education. Andrews and Mycock (2007) include findings from Torney et al. (2001), which indicate that cross-national comparisons have suggested that well-structured citizenship education is more likely to make young people become active citizens. They further indicate that, by contrast, a fractured or less intentional approach to citizenship education can alienate disaffected groups further, and could have the effect of deepening their sense of crisis regarding their political engagement. It would follow that individual nations would logically place different emphases on the areas of citizenship education to fit their particular situations in order to enable students to make significant contributions to their distinctive democratic cultures.

Andrews and Mycock (2007, p. 77) suggest the items which must be addressed successfully in citizenship education by presenting Kerr's (2000b) eight challenges faced by programs of citizenship education. These include:

- achieving a clear definition
- securing curriculum status

- teacher preparedness and training
- adopting suitable learning approaches
- resources and sustainability
- assessment arrangements
- developing and sharing good practice
- influencing young people's attitudes

England's Past Experiences

Civics education in England has had sporadic support both historically and in more recent times. As a political system gradually emerging into a constitutional monarchy, England has not always encouraged citizenship education of the populace at large. As the post-war consensus began to break apart, however, in the latter half of the twentieth century, concern grew over its inclusion in formal education. Private interest groups as well as the political elite began to advocate citizenship education as part of the national curriculum. In the 1970s, organizations such as the Politics Association and the Hansard Society advocated the teaching of political skills and knowledge in England's secondary schools. This push was distinctively English in nature, as Scotland had already begun a curriculum which included current affairs and the development of political literacy in the 1960s (Andrews & Mycock, 2007). In the 1990s policy was developed to include citizenship education in the statutory curriculum, and the Labour party produced a white paper, *Excellence in Schools*, in 1997, in which it pledged to strengthen the teaching of democracy (Andrews & Mycock, 2007). Parliament made citizenship education a statutory foundation subject in English secondary schools in 2002.

Yet, not all were in agreement with its inclusion in the curriculum. Andrews and Mycock (2007, p.81) cite Phillips (2006) and Ofsted (2006) discussing how, still in the

2005 general election, both the Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties had pledged to revise and, in some cases, disband citizenship education. Additionally, it is pointed out that the media reception for citizenship education remained hostile and many pupils and teachers were reported to be uncertain of its values and purposes. With its emphasis on providing educated workers, the marketization of education competed with civics education as well. Additionally, concerns were raised over how higher educational institutions would recognize achievement in citizenship education. Accreditation of citizenship education was a major challenge. None-the-less, Andrews and Mycock (2007, p.75) cite Faulks (2006) as concluding that a continuing motivation for the introduction of citizenship education remained the concern over the political engagement of young citizens.

Challenges

The development of specific national curricula for citizenship education was not without its challenges. While England is one of the world's great democracies, there is an absence of a codified constitutional framework. This presents greater challenges than in countries with more specifically developed ideas of civic-republicanism such as France and the United States. Secondly, England must contend with the need to understand and address increasingly diverse national, regional, religious and ethnic identities (Andrews/ & Mycock, 2007). As a result, one concept associated with citizenship which has received considerable attention is that of community. This has been especially important for the United Kingdom because of the interplay among culture, community and

democracy not only within England but also within all of the nations in the UK. In England citizenship education has been developed around three strands which promote social and moral responsibility, community involvement, and political literacy (Andrews & Mycock, 2007). The main purpose of qualifications which were developed in 2000 and beyond was to encourage, in particular, 14 to 19 years-olds to develop their key skills in these areas to higher levels (European Commission, 2002).

Citizenship Curriculum Goals

Individual schools have developed a variety of specific curriculum objectives and have adopted teaching methods and materials to meet those goals and objectives that are appropriate for their students. The goals of the national curriculum in England are much more broad and have been developed to revolve around the major concepts which are included in the area of citizenship. The broad goals for citizenship include equipping students to participate openly, thoughtfully, and responsibly in the democratic processes both in government and in society at large. The goals encourage the students to be respectful, critical and outward looking, not only locally, but also nationally, supranationally, and globally (UK Department for Educ., 2007). In 2007, the QCA broke down their broad goal statements for citizenship into three areas, Key Concepts, Key Processes, Range and Content, and Curriculum Opportunities. Following are the Key concepts with their sub-categories and specific objectives.

1. Key Concepts

1.1 Democracy and justice

- a. Participating actively in different kinds of decision-making and voting in order to influence public life.
- b. Weighing up what is fair and unfair in different situations, understanding that justice is fundamental to a democratic society and exploring the role of law in maintaining order and resolving conflict.
- c. Considering how democracy, justice, diversity, toleration, respect and freedom are valued by people with different beliefs, backgrounds and traditions within a changing democratic society.
- d. Understanding and exploring the roles of citizens and parliament in holding government and those in power to account.

1.2 Rights and responsibilities

- a. Exploring different kinds of rights and obligations and how these affect both individuals and communities.
- b. Understanding that individuals, organizations and governments have responsibilities to ensure that rights are balanced, supported and protected.
- c. Investigating ways in which rights can compete and conflict, and understanding that hard decisions have to be made to try to balance these.

1.3 Identities and diversity: living together in the UK

- a. Appreciating that identities are complex, can change over time and are informed by different understandings of what it means to be a citizen in the UK.
- b. Exploring the diverse national, regional, ethnic and religious cultures, groups and communities in the UK and the connections between them.
- c. Considering the interconnections between the UK and the rest of Europe and the wider world.
- d. Exploring community cohesion and the different forces that bring about change in communities over time.

2. Key processes

2.1 Critical thinking and enquiry

Pupils should be able to:

- a. engage with and reflect on different ideas, opinions, beliefs and values when exploring topical and controversial issues and problems.
- b. research, plan and undertake enquiries into issues and problems using a range of information and sources
- c. analyze and evaluate sources used, questioning different values, ideas and viewpoints and recognizing bias.

2.2 Advocacy and representation

Pupils should be able to:

- a. express and explain their own opinions to others through discussions, formal debates and voting.
- b. communicate an argument, taking account of different viewpoints and drawing on what they have learnt through research, action and debate.
- c. justify their argument, giving reasons to try to persuade others to think again, change or support them.
- d. represent the views of others, with which they may or may not agree.

2.3 Taking informed and responsible action

Pupils should be able to:

- a. explore creative approaches to taking action on problems and issues to achieve intended purposes.
- b. work individually and with others to negotiate, plan and take action on citizenship issues to try to influence others, bring about change or resist unwanted change, using time and resources appropriately.
- c. analyze the impact of their actions on communities and the wider world, now and in the future.
- d. reflect on the progress they have made, evaluating what they have learned, what went well, the difficulties encountered and what they would do differently.

3. Range and content

The study of citizenship should include:

- a. political, legal and human rights, and responsibilities of citizens.
- b. the roles of the law and the justice system and how they relate to the young people.
- c. key features of parliamentary democracy and government in the constituent parts of the UK and at local level, including voting and elections.
- d. freedom of speech and diversity of views, and the role of the media in informing and influencing public opinion and holding those in power to account.
- e. actions that individuals, groups and organizations can take to influence decisions affecting communities and the environment.
- f. strategies for handling local and national disagreements and conflicts.
- g. the needs of the local community and how these are met through public services and the voluntary sector.
- h. how economic decisions are made, including where public money comes from and who decides how it is spent.
- i. the changing nature of UK society, including the diversity of ideas, beliefs, cultures, identities, traditions, perspectives and values that are shared.
- j. migration to from and within the UK and the reasons for this.
- k. the UK's relations with the European Union and the rest of Europe, the

Commonwealth, the United Nations, and the world as a global community.

4. Curriculum opportunities

The curriculum should provide opportunities for pupils to:

- a. debate, in groups and whole-class discussions, topical and controversial issues, including those of concern to young people.
- b. develop citizenship knowledge and understanding while using and applying citizenship skills.
- c. work individually and in groups, taking on different roles and responsibilities.
- d. participate in both school-based and community-based citizenship activities.
- e. participate in different forms of individual and collective action, including decision-making and campaigning.
- f. work with a range of community partners, where possible.
- g. take into account legal, moral, economic, environmental, historical and social dimensions of different political problems and issues.
- h. take into account a range of contexts, such as school, local regional, national, European, international and global, as relevant to different topics.
- i. use and interpret different media and ICT both as sources of information and as a means of communicating ideas.
- j. make links between citizenship and work in other subjects and areas of the curriculum.

(UK Department for Educ., 2007,pp.28-34)

The actual topics presented in classes are affected by the spread and reach of today's world, reflecting its modernization and globalization. Expanded topics within civic and citizenship education include communications studies, international and global organizations as well as regional institutions and organizations such as the European Union. More recent topics that have been targeted are human rights, legal systems and courts, understanding different cultural and ethnic groups, parliament and government systems, voting and elections, the economy and economics, voluntary groups, resolving conflict, communications studies, the global community and international organizations, and the environment (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr & Losito, 2010).

Delivery

It is around such goals as these that the schools and teachers develop more specific programs of instruction for students. As already indicated, England has a national education system; however, within that structure, there is left room for individual institutions and their teachers to mold the national curriculum to the needs of their respective situations. Hahn (2010, p.10) sites Keating, Kerr, Lopes, Featherstone and Benton (2009) as describing the citizenship legislation as deliberately leaving it up to each school to decide how to implement the subject. The result is that there is a rather wide range of delivery models and practices in schools around the country.

By 2008, most schools reported the use of specific lessons to teach citizenship education. These lessons were either part of a structured Citizen Education course or were part of personal social and health education courses. Additionally, some schools integrate citizenship education into several subjects in a cross-curricular fashion, use assemblies and special events, or provide extra-curricular activities, or other specific classroom experiences (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr & Losito, 2010).

More specifically, Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr and Losito, (2010, p 65) report the following approaches to teaching civic and citizenship education. Students in England receive instruction in citizenship education in one or a combination of these ways.

- 42%- civics instruction as a separate subject by teachers of civic-and citizenship-related subjects.
- 61%- civics instruction taught by teachers of subjects related to human social sciences.
- 63%- civics instruction integrated into all subjects taught at school.
- 22%- civics instruction as an extra-curricular activity

- 73%- civics instruction considered the result of school experience as a whole.
- 9%- civics instruction not considered a part of the school curriculum.

An important component of communicating the goals of citizenship education is the individual teacher. This is especially the case in a system such as England's, which allows the individual institutions to determine the manner in which it will implement the national standards. Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr and Losito (2010, p 67) compiled teachers' ratings of the most important aims of civic and citizenship education. Ten important areas were reported as follows.

- 64%- promoting students' critical and independent thinking.
- 50%- promoting knowledge of citizens' rights and responsibilities.
- 35%- promoting respect for and safeguard of the environment.
- 31%- developing students' skills and competencies in conflict resolution.
- 27%- promoting knowledge of social, political and civic institutions.
- 27%- promoting students' participation in the local community.
- 23%- supporting the development of effective strategies for the fight against racism and xenophobia.
- 22%- promoting students' participation in school life.
- 13%- promoting the capacity to defend one's own point of view.
- 6%- preparing students for future political participation.

Finally, teacher preparation and attitude can have a great impact the effectiveness of civics instruction. Based on responses to the teachers' survey from the 1999 IEA Civic Education Study, Torney-Putra, Barber, & Richardson (2005) generalized three components or dimensions of successful preparation for teaching civics. These components include: professional development, confidence in teaching, and attitudes towards civic education. In the 1999 survey, 88% of teachers in England who taught civic related classes reported having a degree in a civic related discipline and 47% of this group reported having participated in some type of civic-related in-service training.

Thus, in the first component, teachers of civics in England appear to be qualified in terms of their pre and in-service development. The survey further indicated: however, that English teachers lacked confidence in teaching about some political topics such as the constitution or the judicial system (Torney-Putra, Barber, & Richardson , 2005). When compared to teachers from other nations in the study, teachers from England lacked both confidence in their own abilities in these areas and belief in the value of civic education. Finally, the teachers were questioned regarding their views on the source of what was being taught, in other words, the established standards as the accepted guide in deciding what to teach about civic-related topics. When compared to the other teachers in the survey, established standards were considerably less likely to be considered important by teachers from England (Torney-Putra, Barber, & Richardson., 2005).

It appears that civic education teachers in England were, overall, adequately trained, but that they lacked confidence both in themselves and in the standards from which they were to develop lessons. This lack of confidence could likely impact the ability of these teachers to successfully communicate the topic to their students.

Preliminary Results for England

One of the most extensive measures of the effect of civics or citizenship education can be obtained from the International Civics and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) in 2009. A similar study, CIVED, was conducted in 1999 so some

comparisons might be made. ICCS was a large-scale study of pupils and teachers across 38 countries worldwide. The study examined pupil knowledge and understanding, dispositions and attitudes about civics related topics. England and many other EU members participated. After having participated in CIVED in 1999, Germany withdrew from the ICCS study in 2009. The results of the inventory are only somewhat revealing in England's case as the instrument was administered early in the secondary experience to Year 9 pupils. In 2009, it was administered later; 160 schools and 1,544 teachers were surveyed (Nelson, Wade, and Kerr, 2010).

The results from 2009 reveal some positive results; however, they also indicate that the English schools at the upper secondary level have some ground to make up, particularly in attitudes and knowledge about Europe. The Key Findings for English students follow:

- Students scored significantly above average in the international test of civic knowledge and understanding compared to all participating countries.
- Compared to their European counterparts, their performance was average.
- Knowledge of the European Union was significantly below other pupils in Europe.
- Across many questions, students' awareness of the European Union was the lowest of all 24 participating European countries.
- Students have comparatively greater knowledge of topics such as civic participation, civic identity and civic society than of civic principles such as freedom, equity and social cohesion.
- There is a decrease in civic knowledge between 1999 and 2009; however, this is also the case in many of the other participating. Additionally, England has a large difference in pupil age (about 6 months) between the two testing periods, meaning that these results should be 'treated with caution'.
- Students' views and attitudes are broadly democratic and tolerant.
- Students' tolerance of immigration is well below the international average and their view of European migration is particularly critical.
- There is a high level of trust in the police, the armed forces, schools and national government.

- There are low levels of trust in politicians and political, EU institutions and the media.
 - Students have strong sense of national identity.
 - Students demonstrate a degree of European identity, although, their sense of British identity outweighs this.
 - Compared to pupils in other countries, students in England have low levels of interest in social and political issues.
 - Students are much more likely to participate within their schools than they are to take part in community activities, which is similar to other students.
 - A large proportion of students expect to exercise their democratic right to vote in the future, but most do not anticipate taking part in higher intensity forms of civic engagement.
- (Nelson, Wade, and Kerr, 2010).

Integration of EU Policy

The various institutions of the English school system have the ability to determine how they will implement the national standards. Given the range of approaches to presenting civics or citizenship education as well as the variety of emphases teachers feel should be given to the different components of the curriculum, it becomes apparent that the emphasis given to the policies promoted by the European Union are dependent upon the individual institution and beyond that on the teacher. In fact, the EU receives quite little attention in the standards. It is mentioned in the Citizenship, Programme of Study for key stage 3 attainment targets; however, it is included with other global entities and international groups as they apply to relations with the United Kingdom. "...the study of citizenship should include:...the UK's relations with the European Union and the rest of Europe, the Commonwealth, the United Nations and the world as a global community (UK Department for Educ., 2007, p.33)."

The ‘Explanatory Notes’ for the Key State 3 attainment targets leave emphasis on the EU as a more optional item, “A European dimension can be incorporated when exploring many topical issues, including human rights, the environment, immigration, trade and economic issues, diversity and identities (Citizenship, Programme of Study, 2007, page 33).”

7. EDUCATION IN GERMANY

Germany also has both public and private sector schools; however, as in England, the vast majority of general education students attend public sector schools. Germany’s national education standards (*Bildungsstandards*) apply to both public and private sector schools. Full-time education is compulsory from age 6 to 15/16 depending on the state (Eurydice, 2009). The levels and types of schools within the system are more complex than those of England.

Primary education is the *Grundschule*, which includes students ages 6 – 10 (12 in Berlin and Brandenburg). Lower secondary is *Orientierungsstufe* comprised of students ages 10 – 12. It is an orientation phase within the different lower secondary school types. Following this, students attend one of a variety of lower secondary schools depending on student ability and or interest. These schools include the *Gymnasium*, *Realschule*, *Hauptschule*, or the *Gesamtschule*. Students attend these from ages 12 – 15/16. This ends the compulsory education, but students may attend *Gymnasiale Oberstufe*, upper secondary schools, from ages 15/16 through 18/19. The school year varies between 188

and 208 days of either five or six day weeks depending on the *Land*, in a school year that runs from August to July (Eurydice, 2009).

Control

The constitution of Germany guarantees the cultural sovereignty of each state. Therefore, each *Land* has its own ministry of education, and the responsibility for education lies with state and local authorities. The federal role is limited primarily to the regulation of education and training assistance (“Introduction”, 1999). This is not to say, that Germany’s federal government does not exercise oversight or give input into educational matters. The system is designed in such a way that the *Länder* cooperate with the federal government under the *Kultusministerkonferenz* (KMK), the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the *Länder* in the Federal Republic of Germany. The KMK includes representation from each of the states’ ministries. The result of this design is that Germany has developed a set of *de facto* national standards and guidelines, which include agreements on common curriculum (“Introduction”, 1999). Once KMK policy resolutions are developed by state governmental structures as policy, they become legally binding state laws and regulations (Ashwill, 1999).

The authorities within each *Land* are responsible for their own school systems. At this level, they exercise supervision over academic, legal and staff supervision. Funding formulas attempt to guarantee that schools within each state receive approximately equal funding (“Executive Summary”, 1999). On the local school level, individual institutions

have teachers' councils, which are responsible for education matters, and school councils, which make decisions on school regulations and disciplinary rules. These councils are made up of teachers, parents and pupils (Eurydice, 2009).

Curriculum Standards

The KMK is not designed to overtly set a national curriculum. Its resolutions, however, which are the product of the agreement of the various state ministers, ensure a high degree of comparability in both the academic process and the implementation of standards throughout Germany. The Conference has developed a set of voluntary standards and guidelines for the different school forms, a common curriculum, and mutual recognition of school completion qualifications. The KMK standards for all *Abitur*, secondary examinations, are perhaps the most obvious examples of state-adopted national standards ("Executive Summary", 1999). The structure of the system is vulnerable to political change, and it has, indeed, changed from time to time. Ashwill (1999) states that the periodic political realignments influence curriculum development as well as other aspects of the education system.

Each *Land* education ministry makes the specific decisions on curriculum which implement the national education standards adopted by the KMK . The state ministries recommend teaching methods and approve textbooks as well.

The core subjects in primary education generally include reading, writing, arithmetic, introduction to natural and social sciences, art, music, sport and religious education. There are a variety of secondary school levels, and the specific curricula

depend on the type of institution. However, the primary core subjects are usually continued in all of the levels and include at least one foreign language as well as natural and social sciences (Eurydice, 2009).

Ultimately, it is the teachers in the individual schools who make decisions regarding how to best achieve the goals established in the curriculum. Individual teachers, along with their colleagues, determine how much time a topic will receive and how it will be taught. As an example, in Central State, Ashwill (1999) points out that the teachers in the *Gymnasium* exercise a high degree of flexibility in determining what to cover in a subject area within the course of a year.

Textbook Selection

Textbook selection in Germany's schools is an avenue of ensuring standardized curriculum. Schools within each state get to choose which textbooks they use; however, textbooks are regulated by the *Länder*. Ministries of education publish lists of approved texts as well as regulations for their approval, introduction and use (Eurydice, 2009). The role of the KMK would seem to be minimal in this process; however, its resolutions for textbook usage stipulate that textbooks may be approved only, "...if they are consistent with federal laws and the constitution and meet the prevailing content, didactic and methodological demands of the respective state Ministry of Education (Ashwill, 1999, p.25)." Textbooks must meet curriculum guidelines of the state's ministry to be placed on a published list of approved texts. Schools within each state choose their textbooks from these approved lists. Textbooks become an important basis for curriculum

decisions on the local level. “Many *Grundschule* and lower secondary-level teachers said that they base their course curriculum on the textbooks, since they know they conform to the state’s curriculum guidelines (“Executive Summary”, 1999, p.xix).” Ashwill (1999) quoted one teacher as indicating that 70% of her instruction in most subjects was based on these textbooks because they are seen as reflecting the curriculum guidelines.

Textbook publishers also list the states in which their textbooks are approved. Schools are then able to choose from these prepared lists thus creating a degree of interstate consistency. Some teachers view this as the textbooks driving the individual school curriculum, and this is not always appropriate for all types of students. Ashwill (1999) cites a teacher of English and civics who complained about textbooks containing characters with whom the students could not identify and in which the material was presented in contrived situations.

8. CIVICS EDUCATION IN GERMANY

As in other states, civics education in Germany has been influenced by both past and current political and social systems. Since its inception as a nation in the 19th century, Germany has experienced a number of political regimes as well as evolving social systems. Händle (2002) recaps five education systems which coincide with both the current and past political regimes in Germany; the authoritarian monarchy, the Weimar Republic, the National-Socialist regime, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. Händle describes education systems, prior to the current one, which were highly centralized and which were heavily affected by different

forms of hierarchy. The historical cases, which were preludes for today's system, were structured socially, culturally, and curricularly to both reflect and promote the order the state desired. The objectives for civics education were greatly affected in each case through these more centralized systems.

Some of the physical structures of the past school systems continue to be in use today such as the academically segregated secondary school; however, there is an increasing emergence of more general schools on this level. Possibly the largest change during the current regime has been the placement of education systems within each state under the direct direction of the individual states. Each state is given a large degree of autonomy over its education system with the federal government offering basic guidelines to give the states assistance and to encourage some standards, which would allow students to transfer among the systems without too much disruption.

Decisions on curricula among the states differ, but the core academic subjects are not significantly different. Because civics education can be manipulated by regimes, and because determining the specific curriculum for it is up to the states, there is potential for a wider range of curricular options. Händle (2002) argues that as a result of 'dictatorial and manipulative' traditions of past civic education, the current regime harbors reservations towards including politics in schools for fear of the politicization of school. Up through the 1960s, civic education at school was presented in an apolitical manner as social learning or acquiring formal knowledge of the new democratic institutions and procedures (Händle, 2002). More current approaches incorporate the idea that democracy should not only be studied and promoted as a form of government, but also as

a way of life (Lang, 2008). Broadening of the concepts in civic education has been accompanied by the *Bund-Länder Kommission* (Federal-State Commission) initiation of pilot projects such as Learning and Living Democracy. Additionally, over the years the states have discussed more uniform educational standards (European Commission, 2002).

Challenges

The autonomy of the individual states to determine education policy and curriculum is, in itself, not necessarily a challenge, but it can have a challenging effect in terms of developing some kind of national consistency in civics education curriculum. Currently, there is no official national civics curriculum as there is in the United Kingdom, not even a voluntary, recommended one (Himmelmann, 2004). Civics education is encouraged, to be taught in a cross-curricular manner as well as in a formal class setting; however, even when it is presented as a specific subject, there appears to be little continuity among the states, or even sometimes among the schools within a state. This is reflected in the fact that the subject is given a variety of titles: Händle (2002) lists examples such as *Gegenwartskunde*, *Gemeinschaftskunde*, *Sozialkunde*, *Gesellschaftskunde*, *Politische Weltkunde*. As of 2004, there were a total of 23 different names for the study of civics, each of which suggests a slightly different emphasis for the subject. In the curricula of the various states, students are presented with various combinations of politics, history and geography, of politics and law, and of society and economy, or politics and environmental studies. Even within the states, the terms vary according to type of school and the grade in which classes are offered. There are over

160 separate textbooks used, each accompanied by a variety of commercially prepared teacher helps (Himmelmann, 2004, p.8).

As disconnected as this appears, Lange (2008) describes a system in which the individual states continue to attempt to balance the teaching of civics education between an academic approach to the subject and that which teaches the students how to recognize socio-political reality along with how to judge and influence it. Even under the various approaches, the goal for many systems has become to train the socio-political consciousness of students in such a way that allows them to develop autonomy and political maturity.

Who Creates the Curriculum

As has been previously stated, the Federal government, for the most part, leaves education to the German states. The KMK or Standing Conference of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs, however, has been established to research and recommend primary aims for general education. Additionally, the federal government has developed the “*Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung*” (Federal Center for Political Education) the purpose of which is to develop and present a variety of books on the subject of civics education, organize events and fund conferences (Himmelmann, 2004). To address specific concerns, various federal commissions such as the *Bund-Länder Kommission*, (Federation-Länder Commission), which initiated a number of projects including *Demokratie lernen und leben* (Learning and living democracy) have been created as well (European Commission, 2002).

Also included in the considerations of education standards and actual curriculum development are social groups including churches, students and apprentices, and international groups such as UNESCO, the Council of Europe and, of course, the educational agencies of the European Union. At the core level, though, each state's curricula is determined by its *Land* ministry, and even this varies among the types of upper secondary education and training, and the teachers at the individual schools.

This autonomy for the *Länder* and even for the individual schools in determining curriculum has caused some concern. The results for Germany on the 2000 PISA assessment were far below expectations. In all areas of math, science and reading, German students' mean scores fell below the average mean score of the OECD as a whole (Baljit, 2001). Edelgard Bulmahn (2002) the German Federal Minister for Education and Research suggested a number of remedies. In addition to more money being allocated to education, he included renewed efforts in early childhood education, teacher training, and a strong suggestion that full-day schooling be established throughout Germany. His argument for this was that all-day schooling would prevent social exclusion, improve language competence and foster individual talents. Interestingly, he also argued for greater, not less, autonomy for schools.

In a subsequent effort to achieve some amount of uniformity among the states and to raise educational quality across Germany, the *Länder* acting through the Standing Conference, agreed to introduce uniform education standards by 2004. These standards would initially be confined to core subjects such as German, mathematics and the first

foreign language, with the understanding that additional standards would be added later, both in areas of formal and informal education (European Commission, 2002).

The national education standards specify the broad goals for the various areas of education but the local curricula describe and structure the manner in which these goals will be achieved. While attending to the goals of the national standards, each state develops its own curricula. The *Länder* ministries continue to determine the curriculum, including the core subjects, recommend teaching methods and approve textbooks (European Commission-Germany, 2010).

Civics Curriculum Goals

An examination of some of the broader purposes for civics education in Germany suggests a link between civics education and a major focus of school education in a wider sense. Händle (2002) states that the objective of civic education in Germany has historically been, and currently is, the development of the politically mature citizen. According to the Key Competencies reported by Eurydice, Germany's Standing Conference had set, as a main aim of general education at the lower secondary level, strengthening the capacity of young people to undertake vocational training or higher education studies (European Commission, 2002). The Standing Conference included a list of work-relevant competencies such as; the capacity to cooperate and work in a team, the independent organization of learning, problem-solving skills, the ability to handle money matters, a good grasp of economic principle, the ability to give an account of one's own activities, and basic knowledge of and ability to use technical constructs.

Assuming the core academic subjects give students the skills to be good workers, it could follow that civics education is intended to educate them on how to use these skill in a productive way in their respective communities. Händle (2002) describes how in the German system, beyond simply imparting knowledge, civics education is intended to provide social learning and the development of critical and reflective thinking. She further suggests that some newer reform pedagogy has the intention to change conditions in the schools in order to facilitate more integrative social and participatory learning with the goal of developing ‘new persons for a new society’. Within the reform-pedagogical approach of civic education, democracy is not only a type of government but also a lifestyle (Händle, 2002).

Expanding the realm of civics education further into the general education of children, the Standing Conference and the German Commission for UNESCO, in 2007, adopted a joint recommendation, which had as its focus the larger society. The objective of the recommendation was to promote students’ understanding of the connection between globalization, economic development, consumption, environmental pollution, population development, health and social conditions. Additionally, that year the Standing Conference and the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development published a “Cross-Curricular Framework for Global Development Education” which was designed to prepare students to deal more effectively with questions involving global development and which could be used as a basis for development of curricula (Education Audiovisual, 2008/09).

The curricula of the states are based on the national standards and the broad goals and objectives communicated to the states through the Standing Conference. Since the states are represented in the Standing Conference, it is difficult to determine if the state curricula reflect the standards of the Standing Conference or if the Standing Conference simply represents best practices by the states. In either case, there are some similarities among the states, but when it comes to specific subject curriculum objectives there is a wide variety.

The general objectives vary at the different levels. In 2006 the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the *Länder* developed the following standards for lower secondary education. These are not specific civics education objectives; however, they reflect a civics emphasis. The general objectives for lower secondary education are:

- furthering the overall intellectual, emotional and physical development of pupils, teaching them to be independent, make decisions and bear their share of personal, social and political responsibility;
 - providing instruction based on the state of academic knowledge that takes the pupils' age-related conceptual faculties into account in its organization and in the demands made on them;
 - gradually increasing the degree of specialization in line with each pupil's activities and inclinations;
 - maintaining an open system allowing transfer from one type of school to the other after an orientation stage
- (Education Audiovisual, 2008/09, p.98).

The general objectives on the national level for upper secondary education, general education and vocational schools appear much more pragmatic seeking to prepare the students in their specific fields of study whether that be vocational or further formal education.

As the states develop their civics education curricula, there appear to be some common points, which are reflected in their work. Himmelmann (2004, p.9) sites the *Gesellschaft für Politikdidaktik (Society for Teaching Politics)* (2004, p.13) as identifying the most general single shared goal to be political self-mindedness. Three central competence levels are stressed in this goal: 1.) knowledge- the ability for political judgment, issue centered learning, problem solving. 2.) conflict regulating- the capability for political action. 3.) participatory skills- practical skills, methodological skills of learning. Additionally, Himmelmann (2004) reports the following shared approaches in the field of political learning.

- development of a “democratic self” in behavior, commitments, ethics, values and habits-down from the bottom of grade 4 up to the top grades
 - the promotion of social awareness by social learning to foster non-violent, cooperative, empathetic and community orientated behavior and civic skills
 - the development of political awareness and of “democratic-political” knowledge, intercultural attitude and global learning in a broader sense, including the political system of democracy, national and international institutions and environment issues
- (Himmelmann, 2004, p.11).

Finally, research on the civics education curriculum content in 16 states revealed four main areas of teaching;

1. way of life and shaping social relations (family, school, communities, local government including media)
 2. political-governmental-democratic system (with relevant sub-subjects including international affairs)
 3. law and judicial system (human rights, rule of law, constitution of state, law in every-day-life, youth and law)
 4. social-market-economy, labor market, vocational education
- (Himmelmann, 2004, p. 9)

Delivery

The manner in which civics education is presented is of major concern to the German government and its people. As has been discussed earlier, Germany's past regimes have incorporated ideological and state-centered approaches in this area. Since the end of World War II, there has been a conscious effort to introduce a pragmatic approach to democratic and social education in citizenship education. One result of this concern was the Beutelsbacher consensus, which was developed by experts in teacher training in 1977. The common formula for teaching citizenship education included the following:

1. prohibits educators from overwhelming students with political opinions, attitudes, or values. Every form of indoctrination is inherently irreconcilable with citizenship education as a whole.
 2. educators are bidden to reflect on the variety of perspectives and plurality of interests that problems represent. If a topic is controversial in science, politics or society in general, then citizenship education must also treat it as controversial.
 3. the third postulate states that students are to be taught to analyze their own political interests.
- (Lange, 2008, p.90)

The actual instruction that occurs in schools in Germany is governed by a variety of regulations set by each state. The curricula include guidelines on the manner of presentation for the various topics of instruction, the distribution of materials and even the various didactic approaches that should be used. The importance of interdisciplinary coordination of both material and objectives has been increasingly stressed. This has included interdisciplinary activities in areas such as health education, vocational orientation, computer literacy, environmental education and the treatment of European topics (Eurydice, 2009/10).

National level agreements and policy statements like the Beutelsbacher consensus and highly developed, standardized state curricula may appear as a paradox. The first establishes an environment which supports an open exchange of political ideas, yet the highly structured nature of the state curricula and even, to a degree, the content and its educational context, seem to present a more structured approach to teaching civics education. Himmelmann (2004) found that civics education tends to deal with political institutions and questions, with communication, debating, problem solving or conflict solutions, but the approach is often state-centered and issue-centered and it tends to neglect the social, moral, ethical and civic basis of behavior, habits, attitudes of the pupils themselves.

Civics education in Germany is scheduled to be taught on all levels, but it is a compulsory subject mostly from grade 7/8 on. On the secondary level, grades 11 – 13, it is given more attention and is scheduled mostly for two lessons, two hours, a week. Händle (2002), however, sites Trommer (1999) as describing a different reality. Civics education is presented in most grades only about one hour per week. This lack of scheduled class time contradicts the relatively high demands and requirements of the formal curriculum. As a result, teachers must make decisions and the differences between the classroom experiences for students varies not only among states, but also across types of schools and even in different classes within the same school. This being the situation, Händle (2002) discusses the importance of the hidden curriculum on civics education. She suggests that this can be negative or positive and that such practices as the old hierarchical system, which separated children after age 10, still in place in many

school systems, may send a negative message about citizenship. She also suggests that the traditional half-day school day limits the opportunities that teachers have to use teaching methods across the curriculum which model a more democratic approach.

The limited amount of time available for the formal instruction of civics education means that instructors must make decisions regarding which objectives are emphasized. Of the democratic competencies presented at the secondary level, the least emphasis is given to democracy as a form of living including the concepts of self-learning, self-competence and to democracy as a global project. Those competencies that tend to receive middle level emphasis include democracy as a form of society including the concepts of social learning and social competence. The highest level of emphasis is given to democracy as a form of governance including political learning and democratic competence (Himmelmann, 2004, p.18).

The curriculum chosen or assigned, as the case may be, the time allotted in the school schedule for specific courses, and the opportunities to incorporate civics education in a cross-curricular manner all affect the curricular goals and objectives. A component, however, which bears additional consideration, is the teacher. Teacher training and teacher attitude towards the subject can also affect the outcomes. Teachers for both primary and secondary schools are trained at universities and colleges of art and music and must pass state examinations in usually two subjects as well as in educational science. Secondary teachers must be subject specialists. The *Länder* adopt the standards for teacher education. In 2008, the Standing Conference adopted content requirements for the subject areas and methods (European Commission-Germany, 2010).

The reality in most German schools is civic education is often taught by teachers without specialist subject knowledge. Händle (2002) reports that teachers of other subjects have opportunities to obtain the teaching qualification for civics education on the job through additional study courses. This is sometimes done for pragmatic reasons rather than because the teacher has developed an interest in teaching the subject. Even for those who studied politics in university, there is a cleavage between what was studied and the demands of teaching civics education in the schools. In the field, teachers often develop and use their own methods. There is evidence to suggest a gap between what teachers have been trained to teach in the area of civics education and what appears to be practical for the situations in which their students find themselves. The reality is that teacher directed programs are being developed to deal with social concerns like prevention of violence, drug-abuse, and concerns over xenophobia (Himmelmann, 2004).

Teachers generally view civics education in a positive light. Händle (2002) sites Torney-Purta,(2001) as indicating that civics education teachers specifically request more lessons to be scheduled and that more opportunities be made available to conduct projects. In fact, the majority of teachers questioned in the study “Civic Education” were in favor of a more opportunities for civics education, through everyday school life as evidenced as a teaching principle in other subjects as well as through additional specific civics education courses.

Preliminary Results for Germany

Some type of common international civics evaluation administered multiple times over a period of years would allow not only the assessment of Germany's students but also a comparison between Germany and other participating nations, in this case England. As was previously stated, such a tool does, in fact, exist. In 2009 an assessment was conducted under the guidance of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) through the International Civics and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS). While Germany participated in earlier evaluations, known as CIVED, for reasons not made public, it opted out of the 2009 inventory. One can only speculate as to why Germany chose to opt out of participation in 2009. Possibly, the lower than expected results from the PISA scores in the early part of the 2000s left the educational leaders wary of such international inventories.

In the 1970s German students participated in an eight country comparative study of civic knowledge by the IEA. German students were outperformed only by the Netherlands, and they surpassed scores by students in Finland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, and the United States (Händle & Henkenborg, 2003). By 1999 the results had changed. The IEA evaluation, CIVED, indicated that German students were no longer the frontrunners in civic knowledge. They had scored below average in a number of domains of civics education. Students in Germany scored below the international mean on three of the four scales measuring civic engagements. Additionally, they scored below the mean on the scales which assessed attitudes towards immigrant and national

identification. The students did exceed the mean in their support for the rights of women and their experience of an open instructional climate (Händle & Henkenborg, 2003).

More recent results for attainment of the objectives in civics are more difficult to obtain, but in an article for the Committee for Political Education in Baden-Württemberg, Michael Wehner cites evidence that formal knowledge based on some discreet civics related facts continues to be lacking. In his article “The Future of Civic Education in the 21st Century”, Wehner cites the following statistics:

- 88% of all Germans don't know how many member states the EU has.
 - 40% of all Germans have never heard anything about the Lisbon Treaty.
 - 40% of all East-Germans are convinced of not having anything to do with the election of the Members of the European Parliament.
 - 53.5% of all Germans don't know how many deferral states Germany consists of.
 - 52.3% of all Germans are unable to allocate which one of the two votes of the elections for the Bundestag is more important.
 - 66% of all West German pupils approve the statement, The German Democratic Republic (DDR) was not a dictatorship, people just had to adapt themselves like anywhere else.
 - 30% of all West German pupils knew the government of the DDR erected the Berlin Wall. Most of the pupils had no idea who did so. Many of them guessed it had been the Federal Republic of Germany or the Allied Powers.
- (Wehner, 2008, pp. 2,3)

Integration of EU Policy

Because of the local nature of the German school curricula, it is difficult to see where and how exactly the European Union is included in the study of civic education. There is evidence, however, to conclude that it is a likely topic for at least some objectives or that its education policies have at least some voice in the German curricula. As the Standing Conference seeks out assistance in developing policy and programs, it

has been noted that a variety of groups; political, social, and international are included. They have at times included such groups as UNESCO, the Council of Europe and the European Union.

Two major focuses of education for the European Union are the concept of lifelong learning and European integration. The German Standing Conference has engaged in a variety of activities with the EU in these areas. Since the 1990s international cooperation in education and culture have become more intensive. This has spurred public debate over education policy and foreign culture. The fall of the Communist states in Europe and unification along with the recent emphasis on globalization have been the catalysts for a change in perspective in these areas. Education and foreign cultural policy are beginning to be viewed in terms of their ability to assist in preventing crises, protecting human rights and promoting democracy (Education Audiovisual, 2008/09).

The EU has promoted the concept of a shared European identity that is comprised of European cultures. Germany has begun to promote cultural exchange, mobility in school education, higher education and research, and the German language abroad as well as learning European foreign languages. The goal is to create the conditions for the development of this shared identity. In this pursuit, the *Länder* are represented on the Council of the European Union keeping them directly involved in any cooperation in education among Member States of the EU (Education Audiovisual, 2008/09).

The second major area of concern, lifelong learning, has also been addressed through the German education establishment. In 2004, the Federation and the *Länder*

adopted a joint strategy for lifelong learning. The intent was to demonstrate how learning can be encouraged and supported for all citizens, at all ages, through both formal and informal learning (European Commission-Germany, 2010). In 2008, the concept for Lifelong Learning was approved and included:

- Measures to improve educational opportunities for children under six years of age,
 - An extensive raft of measures to improve the training situation
 - Facilitating the transition from school to higher education,
 - Creating more than 90,000 additional places for first-year students by 2010 under the pact for higher education,
 - Drawing more attention to technology and the natural sciences and
 - Improving opportunities for women
- (European Commission-Germany, 2010,p. 9).

Finally, in 2007 the Federation and the *Länder*, along with educational institutions created a joint task force to develop a German Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning, *Deutscher Qualifikationsrahmen für Lebenslanges Lernen-DQR*, which was designed to present a comprehensive profile of the skills taught in Germany. The instrument is intended to examine all formal qualifications within the German education system, including school, vocational training, higher education and continuing education (European Commission-Germany, 2010).

The German *Länder* are represented at the EU level to ensure an amount of cultural sovereignty so it is not clear to what extent the EU is influencing the *Länder* or to what extent the local German policies are influencing the EU policies. What is clear is that the two are working together and this will likely continue to be the case as long as certain conditions remain in place. “The Standing conference has expressed support to European cooperation in education, science and culture affairs in a Europe that

safeguards its cultural wealth and the diversity of education systems (Educational Audiovisual, 2008/09,p268).”

9. CONCLUSIONS

From its very beginnings, the various developmental stages of today’s European Union have all pursued some level of education goals. Since this was an economic union, initial education considerations were with vocational training, followed by foreign languages, higher education, and then school education. Early on in its history, input was specifically sought from education representatives from Member States illustrating the line the Community walked between adherence to supranational authority of the Community and respecting national sovereignty. The evolution of education policy in the EU was based on the premise of the development of the people of Europe beyond simply being economic actors. European Union education policy has been an attempt to develop a knowledge society comprised of lifelong learners who would conduct themselves not only as citizens of their respective nations, but also as European citizens. Education as promoted by the EU has come to be presented through a uniquely European dimension.

To date, the result is an array of Union programs across a variety of school levels, which promote cross-national participation not only by students, but also by teachers. Programs have been established to develop teaching practices in a variety of academic areas. One of the most common and far reaching of these programs for school education is the Comenius Program. While this program is not designed to meet specific civics

objectives, the very nature of its structure and its suggested teaching methodology reinforce a more socially and culturally open European citizen. Finally, rather specific curricular goals have been created, most notably for the purposes of this paper, in the area of civics. However, only nominal evidence of them can be found in national curriculum goals. As Soysal has suggested, the European Union, as well as other actors, has indeed developed ever-growing participation in developing educational materials, programs and practices which are designed to develop a sense of Europe in today's students.

Has civics instruction promoted a greater sense of European identity in students? The extent to which this goal is being attained may be a matter of interest for those who would like to see a stronger sense of European identity. Using only cursory results from the two nations examined, it appears that the students, in general, are not developing a greater working knowledge of the mechanics and physical structures of the European Union. This does not mean that they do not have a heightened sense of being European. It just means they have not developed the skills to understand the workings of the European Union as a political entity.

The evidence suggests possible reasons for this. Both in England, which is a national system, and in Germany, which has more state based education systems, curriculum goals which specifically address the European Union are few, and the final decision regarding the civics curriculum often lies at the school level, and in some cases at the level of the teacher. It has been shown that not all teachers are specifically trained in civics and that in many cases the required class time for civics is much less than it is for the core subjects.

Ultimately, it may take experiences beyond the structured school curriculum to change students' sense of civic self. Political socialization occurs both inside and outside the classroom through experiences as a result of the hidden curriculum, which may or may not be intentional, as well as a variety of personal experiences outside of school. These experiences are affected by such things, as the political culture of the country or locality, the media, discussions with parents and others as well as through individual participation in social, and political organizations. In recent years, Germany has cooperated with the EU in planning and participation in programs intended to promote the conditions for the development of a more shared European identity. The German education establishment has also worked to adopt strategies for an emphasis on lifelong learning.

In an effort to obtain greater understanding of how education plays a role in this topic, further study could include investigation of the curriculum of specific representative schools in order to determine exactly how each school plans to incorporate civics instruction and what specific objectives they have developed regarding the EU as well as the concept of the European citizen. Additionally, more long-term studies could be carried out in these schools through observations and quantitative research, with the goal of determining how and to what extent the curricular objectives are actually being carried out. Additionally, the schools could be studied for evidence of hidden curriculum which may affect students' attitudes in this area.

Overall, the European Union, as well as other entities, is developing and promoting programs and materials, which teach a wider sense of Europe. However, the

EU continues to recognize national sovereignty in matters of education, and as long as national governments control how their education systems are organized, and as long as teachers retain a certain amount of school and classroom autonomy, the effectiveness of such efforts may be blunted by the continuing local nature of education.

References

- Andrews, R., & Mycock, A. (2007). Citizenship education in the uk: divergence within a multi-national state. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), Retrieved from <http://www.citized.int/ejournal/./Andrew%20Mycock.pdf>.
- Ashwill, Mark A. (1999). The development and implementation of education standards in Germany. In M. Ashwill (Ed.), *The educational system in Germany: case study findings* (pp. 19-80). U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/GermanCaseStudy/GermanCaseStudy/title.html>
- Baljit, G. National Statistics - UK, (2001). *International student assessment results for england 2000* London: National Statistics. Retrieved from www.statistics.gov.uk/pdfdir/isae1201.pdf
- Bulmahn, E. (2002, may). *Pisa: the consequences for germany*. Retrieved from [www.oecdobserver.org/./PISA: The consequences for Germany.html](http://www.oecdobserver.org/./PISA:_The_consequences_for_Germany.html)
- Commission of the European Communities, (1993). *Green paper on the European dimension of education*. Brussels: European Communities.
- Education Audiovisual & Culture, Executive Agency, Eurydice. (2008/09). *Organization of the education system in germany* European Commission. Retrieved from http://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/eurybase_en.php#germany
- Education Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency, Eurydice. (2009). *National summary sheets on education systems in europe and ongoing reforms-united kingdom* European Commission. Retrieved from http://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/eurybase/national_summary_sheets/047_

Education Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency, Eurydice. (2009). *National summary sheets on education systems in europe and ongoing reforms-united kingdom* European Commission. Retrieved from http://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/eurybase/national_summary_sheets/047_England:organisation/control_of_education_systems. (2010, September 13). Retrieved from <http://www.inca.org.uk/england-organisation-mainstream.html>

European Commission, (2006). *The history of european cooperation in education and training, europe in the making-an example* Belgium: European Communities. Retrieved from http://www.ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/public/.../education/history_en.pdf

European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture, Eurydice. (2002). *Key competencies, a developing concept in general compulsory education* Eurydice. Retrieved from <http://www.Eurydice.org>

European Commission, Education and Culture DG. (2008). *Comenius School Partnerships Handbook for Schools* Belgium: European Communities.

European Commission, Education and Culture DG. (2007). *Key competences for lifelong learning-european framework* Belgium: European Communities. Retrieved from http://www.ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/.../ll-learning/Keycom_en.pdf

European Commission, Eurydice. (2010). *National system overviews on education systems in europe and ongoing reforms-germany* European Commission. Retrieved from http://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/eurybase_en.php#germany

- European Commission, Eurydice. (2010). *National system overviews on education systems in europe and ongoing reforms-germany* European Commission. Retrieved from http://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/eurybase_en.php#germany
- European Commission, Eurydice. (2010). *National systems overviews on education systems in europe and ongoing reforms-united kingdom-england* European Commission. Retrieved from http://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/national_summary_sheets/047_UK_ENG_EN.pdf
- Eurydice, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency. (2009). *National summary sheets on education systems in Europe and ongoing reforms-Germany* European Communities. Retrieved from http://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/./national_summary_sheets/047_BD_EN.pdf
- Eurydice-Informationsstelle beim Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung . European Commission, Eurydice. (2009/10). *Structures of education and training systems in europe-germany*. European Commission. Retrieved from http://www.eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/eurybase_en.php#germany
- Executive summary. (1999). In M. Ashwill (Ed.), *The educational system in Germany: case study findings* (pp. xix-xxv). U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/GermanCaseStudy/GermanCaseStudy/title.html>
- Faulks, D. (2006). Education for citizenship in england's secondary schools: a critique of current principle and practice. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21 (1), 59-74

French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (n.d.). *The schuman declaration* Retrieved from https://pastel.diplomatie.gouv.fr/editorial/archives.gb/dossiers/schuman/module01_2.html

GPJE (Gesellschaft für Politikdidaktik und politische Jugend-und Erwachsenenbildung):
Natioinale Bildungsstandards für den Fachunterricht in der politischen Bildung an
Schulen-ein Entwurf. Schwalback/Ts. 2004

Hahn, C. (2010). Comparative civic education research: what we know and what we need to know. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 6(1), Retrieved from www.intellectbooks.co.uk/File:download,id=934/CTL.6.1.5.pdf doi: 10.1286/ctl.6.1.5_1

Händle, Christa. (2002). The burdenn of history? civic education at german schools. *Online journal for social sciences and their didactics*, 2-2002. Retrieved from http://www.sowi-onlinejournal.de/2002-2/germany_haendle.htm

Händle, Christa, & Henkenborg, Peter. (2003). Civic education around the world; how can partipation in civic activities be improved?. *Journal of Social Science Education*, (1), Retrieved from http://www.sowi-onlinejournal.de/2003-1/reports_haendleundhen..

Himmelman, Gerhard. (2004). Citizenship education in germany, the uk and the us. *Proceedings of the Being intercultural and being an intercultural citizen, school of education, university of durham, england* (pp. 1-18). <http://www.learningmigration.com/files/assignment/5/Himmelman.pdf>.

- Introduction. (1999). In M. Ashwill (Ed.), *The educational system in germany: case study findings* (pp. 1-17). U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/GermanCaseStudy/GermanCaseStudy/title.html>
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Lopes, J., Featherstone, G. and Benton, T. (2009). *Embedding citizenship education (CE) in secondary schools in England (2002-08). citizenship education longitudinal study (CELS):seventh annual report*, DCSF Research Report 172, October, London: Department for Children, Schools and Families.
- Kerr, D. (2001b). Citizenship education: an international comparison. In D. Lawton J. Cairns & R. Gardner (Eds.), *Education for Citizenship*. London: Continuum.
- Lange, Dirk. (2008). *Citizenship education in germany*. Retrieved from http://www.bpb.de/veranstaltungen/8R71MS,0,0Citizenship_Education_in_Europe.html
- Nelson, J., Wade, P., & Kerr, D. National foundation for Education Research, (2010). *Young people's civic attitudes and practices: england's outcomes from the iea international civic and citizenship education study (iccs)* Retrieved from www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/ICCX01/
- Ofsted (2006). *Towards Consensus: Citizenship in secondary schools*: HMI 2666. London, Ofsted.
- Phillips, M. (2006). *The Permanent Citizen's Revolution*. Daily Mail, 29th September 2006.

- Ping, R., Hayward, G., Hodgson, A., Johnson, J., & Keep, E. (2009). *Education for all; the future of education and training for 14-19 year olds*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Ping, R., Hayward, G., Hodgson, A., Johnson, J., & Keep, E. (2009). *Education for all; the future of education and training for 14-19 year olds*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- School education: equipping a new generation*. (2010, June 16). Retrieved from http://www.ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc64_en.html
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, (2010). *Initial findings from the IEA international civic and citizenship education study* Christchurch, New Zealand: Paula Wagemaker Editorial Services. Retrieved from www.iea.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/ICCS/ICCS_2010_Initial_Findings.pdf
- Soysal, Y.N. (2002). Locating europe. *European Societies*, 4(3), Retrieved from <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/14616696.asp> doi: 0.1080/1461669022000013586
- Strategic framework for education and training*. (2010, June 11). Retrieved from http://www.ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc28_en.htm
- The Brussels Treaty 17 March 1948. (2006). *European navigator*. Retrieved March 14, 2011, from http://www.ena.lu/brussels_treaty_17_march_1948-020302282.html

- Torney-Purta, J, Barber, C, & Richardson, W. (2005). *How teachers' preparation relates to students' civic knowledge and engagement in the united states: analysis from the IEA Civic Education Study?*. Informally published manuscript, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. Retrieved from www.civicyouth.org
- Torney-Purta, J. et al. (2001) *Citizenship and education in the twenty-eight countries. Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Eburon Press, Delft 2001
- Treaty basis*. (2010, April 27). Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc30_htm
- Treaty of Maastricht*. (2010, January 10). Retrieved from <http://www.civitas.org.uk/eufacts/FSTREAT/TR3.htm>
- Trommer, L. (1999) *Eine Analyse der Lehrpläne*. In: Händle, C./Oesterreich, D./Trommer, L. (Hg.): *Aufgaben politischer Bildung in der Sekundarstufe I*. Opladen, s. 69-129.
- UK Department of Education, Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. (2007). *Citizenship; programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target Crown*. Retrieved from www.qca.org.uk/curriculum
- Wehner, Dr. M. (2008). *The future of civic education in the 21st century: what challenges face civic educators in the coming five, ten, and twenty years?*. *Proceedings of the German-american conference*, http://www.civiced.org/index.php/page=papers_speeches

