DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 006 SO 031 399

AUTHOR Tibbitts, Felisa
TITLE Prospects for Civics Education in Transitional Democracies: Results of an Impact Study in Romanian Classrooms.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (43rd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, April 14-18, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; Civics; Comparative Analysis; Foreign Countries; Grade 7; Grade 8; Instructional Effectiveness; Junior High Schools; Questionnaires; *Student Attitudes; *Student Reaction; Student Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Romania

ABSTRACT

An impact study was conducted in the 1994-95 and 1995-96 school years with a single cohort of Romanian students (n=109) who used experimental civics texts in the seventh and the eighth forms. The texts emphasized critical thinking, dialogue, and participatory methods of instruction. In addition to these "treatment" classrooms, comparison classroom students (attending the same school but receiving civics instruction using the official Ministry textbooks) were administered a student questionnaire. Closed-ended questions asked students to rate the importance of a series of proposed characteristics of a good citizen, as well as the importance of individual human rights listed in the survey. The two-page questionnaire included an open-ended question about what the students considered to be characteristics of a good citizen. Data from nearly 900 surveys were collected over the course of the study. Findings appear to confirm other studies that have shown a clear link between instructional methodology and the development of participatory attitudes, or "civic behavior" of students. (Contains 9 tables and 12 references.) (BT)

# Prospects for Civics Education in Transitional Democracies: Results of an Impact Study in Romanian Classrooms.

Tibbitts, Felisa

# Prospects for Civics Education in Transitional Democracies: Results of an Impact Study in Romanian Classrooms

Felisa Tibbitts
Human Rights Education Associates
P.O. Box 382396
Cambridge, MA 02238-2396 USA
(tel) +1 617 661 0278 (fax) +1 617 249 0278 (email) ftibbitts@hrea.org

*Paper presented at Comparative International Education Society Conference, 14-18 April, 1999, Toronto, Canada.*

## 1. Executive Summary.

An impact study was conducted in the 1994-5 and 1995-6 school years with a single cohort of Romanian students (n=109) who used an experimental civic texts in the 7th and then the 8th Forms. The text emphasized critical thinking, dialogue and participatory methods of instruction. In addition to these "treatment" classrooms, comparison classroom students (attending the same school but receiving civics instruction using the official Ministry textbook) were administered the student questionnaire.

One aspect of the study involved the administration of a questionnaire to students. Closed-ended questions asked students to rate the importance of a series of proposed characteristics of a good citizen, as well as the importance of individual human rights listed in the survey. The two-page questionnaire included an open-ended question about what the students considered to be characteristics of a good citizen. Data from nearly 900 surveys were collected over the course of the study.

For the treatment class, students demonstrated a statistically significant gain in their rating of those citizenship characteristics that might be considered "participatory":

- voting in most elections ($F=14.05, p<.0001$)
- trying to influence government decisions and policies ($F=21.87, p<.0001$)

Gains were significantly higher for females in the voting category. There were no statistically significant gains in these categories for students in the comparison classrooms. The coding of the open-ended questions for the treatment classrooms confirmed the increased valuing of the group for the participatory categories of "voting" and "trying to influence government/being active in the community."

Students in both the treatment and control classrooms consistently rated very high the importance of obeying the law, honoring one's country and not bringing dishonor to one's country. The coded question concerning students self-definition of a good citizen showed an increase of over 37% for both the control and treatment groups over the course of two years, in the number of students mentioning "respect for the law" as a

quality of a good citizen. Both the experimental and Ministry textbooks used followed the content guideline of the official curriculum, thus devoting a substantial portion of the materials to the Romanian political system, norms and laws, and formal concepts of democracy.

The study appears to confirm the results of others that have shown a clear link between instructional methodology and the development of participatory attitudes, or "civic behavior" in students. This relationship is evident even at such an early time in the post-totalitarian period. However, two years and considerable teacher support was necessary for this result. It would be interesting and important to see if these attitudes are sustained, and if students' participation in school and community life was actually demonstrated.

The study also shows that students in this age group generally become more aware of the role and rule of law, expanding their notions of citizenship beyond that of civility and good manners. This may well be a reflection both of the emphasis of the Romanian civic culture texts, as well as the emerging ability of students to grasp abstract concepts related to the State and governance.

## 2. Theories About Democratic Development and Notions of the "Good Citizen"

There appears to be little dispute about the importance of schooling for affecting norms, values and practices concerning democracy. However, policymakers must still clarify what specific ideas of the "good citizen" they have in mind. In countries undergoing rapid political and economic change, there may be many, even conflicting, emerging ideas of political identity among important groups.

Concepts of citizenship are closely linked with ideas about democratic development. Those countries experiencing new constitutional regimes face many, sometimes unanswerable questions, regarding civic education approaches: Should civic education be oriented towards enduring social or political values, towards rights and principles that might guide future development, or instead move towards support for current institutions and stable political order? (Torney-Purta, Schwille, Amadeo, 1999, p.14)

The idea of "democratic development" itself has a variety of interpretations. For some, democracy is gauged primarily in public, formal terms, for example through the creation of fair institutions, the ability of people to elect officials, and the existence of rules to promote the accountability of political authorities. Education for citizenship within this definitional world would largely be focused on knowledge and respect for political institutions, citizenship responsibilities (such as voting) and perhaps ways to contribute to the sustenance and reform of political and legal practices. This approach is consistent with the "contractual vision of citizenship," rooted in liberal political philosophy, which understands political activity as primarily private and instrumental, as a means of furthering one's private interests (Conover and Searing, 1994, p. 35).

For others, "democratic development" involves a much broader array of concerns, both institutional and cultural in perspective. John Dewey, Paulo Friere and others have promoted the idea of "democracy as a way of life," emphasizing the personal relationships that constitute and undergird the political culture of a country. Friere's idea of 'education for liberation' linked methodological issues with their ideological contexts, so that the learner could see the link between sociopolitical structures and the act of learning and knowing (Friere and Macedo, 1998, p. 3).

Education for citizenship within this broader framework might focus on building democratic processes and related principles in everyday life, such as democratic forms of decisionmaking or conflict resolution. This approach is somewhat consistent with the "communal view of citizenship," which sees civic activity as a source of personal development and a contribution to the general well being of the community (Conover and Searing, 1994, p. 35).

A person's (and educational system's) idea of citizenship is likely to be a combination of both the communal and contractual visions, according to Conover and Searing. In many ways "the good citizen" presents something like a "citizenship profile", with different possible emphases on loyalty, civic virtue, tolerance, political self-development, civic memory, political participation and civic behavior (including civility, public service, and a potentially critical view when examining political information).

The first IEA study in 1976 demonstrated that, in practice, good citizenship was multidimensional, and systems promoted different versions. For example, one finding of this 1976 study was that students high in democratic values (e.g., support for tolerance, anti-authoritarianism, and equality) did not necessarily have a high interest in civic participation. (Torney-Purta and Schwille, 1986). Similarly an USAID-sponsored study on civic education programs in Poland and the Dominican Republic found, among other things, that:

> The programs that succeeded in generating higher levels of participation were not necessarily those that had the greatest impact on democratic values; participation could increase without value changes, at least in the short term (Sabatini, Bevis and Finkel, 1998, p.51).

## 3. Background for the Study

### 3.1. Romania: A Country in Transition

Romania is a country located in the southeastern region of Europe, boarded by Hungary, Moldova, Ukraine and Bulgaria. In 1992, the population was over 22 million.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the successful revolutions that ensued, schools within Central and Eastern Europe were left with a particular legacy in the field of political

education. Schools had been overtly used as the main instrument for converting children to the communist cause (Fischer-Galati, 1952) and those teachers specializing in the social sciences (who were still working in the schools) had self-selected into an area that was highly ideologized.

The approach that was absent was that of inquiry, since student self-expression, a plurality of perspectives and critical analysis directly threatened an ideologically homogenous and collectivized worldview. This had direct implications for the ways that classrooms were organized. Students and teachers alike were rewarded for assent to the 'correct view', a general didactic orientation that was reinforced, no doubt, by a historically traditional, teacher-centered approach in the classroom. Open-ended discussions, experimental content and instructional practices were all impeded within a highly centralized curriculum controlled by the ministry of education, in conjunction with the communist party.

This was the context in which the experimental civic education program was introduced in 1994 in a small number of Romanian classrooms. In fact, the 1996 case study developed in Romania for Phase I of the International Civic Education Study confirmed the lingering vestiges of the totalitarian period and the contradictions that teachers must content with within the political education domain.

> The shortcomings in the organization of the formal explicit teaching (in classes) and the implicit teaching (the school and family climate, the relationship of teachers and parents to students, the role of mass media) limits the dialogue on controversial social problems, participation in decisionmaking, the training of attitudes of confidence and cooperation, of participation to common social projects – leading to listlessness, civic indifference...and the failure to assume freedom and responsibility (Bunescu, Stan, Albu, Badea and Oprica, 1999).

Phase I of the 1994 IEA Civics Study, which focused on national case studies, confirmed that civic education is deeply embedded in a political and historical context unique to each country (and in some cases to particular groups or areas within each country). The study also revealed special challenges for civic education in countries undergoing significant political or cultural transitions.

In countries undergoing transition, cultural and educational processes can lag behind. Members of the older generation in these transitional societies -- including teachers, family members and others influencing the context for civic education – often hold onto memories and beliefs from the past. Moreover,

> [T]he school as an institution adapts slowly to transitions. This is particularly true when not only the content of education changes but also new pedagogical methods are prescribed and new decentralized structures are being implemented, in most cases without sufficient economic resources for the retraining of educational personnel. Further, expectations about democratic teaching styles and power devolving to students within schools has touched deep cords of uncertainty

among those who are responsible for civic education in developed as well as developing democracies. (Torney-Purta, Schwille, Amadeo, 1999, p. 31).

Other political educators have noted these same trends. Whereas in developed democracies, concern is for political apathy, decreasing voter turnout, political cynicism and shrinking party affiliation, in developing democracies the focus is often on the foundation of the democratic institutions themselves (Ichilov, 1990).

Policymakers in transitional democracies are therefore especially challenged to account for the social and political ecology of civics education as well as the lessons that can be drawn from research and other evidence of successful programming.

### 3.2. Civic Education Project

Civic Culture "Cultura civica" was introduced in 1991/2 and is required one hour per week in Romanian lower secondary schools, grades 7 and 8 (ages 13-14). Prior to this, schools had offered "The Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Romania." The core curricula covers the following topics:

7th grade:
- Life in society (the person, family, relationships, the community, the state)
- the Romanian political system (Constitution, democratic institutions, democratic practices)

8th grade:
- Basic values and concepts of democracy: authority, liberty, responsibility, justice, equality, property, pluralism, patriotism

Dakmara Georgescu, a leading Romanian civic education specialist, rated the skills of democratic citizenship emphasized by the civic education curriculum on a scale of 1 (very important) to 5 (unimportant). At the time of the Civic Education Project, rated as most important "5" was knowledge; rated as a "4" were communication skills, as a "3" critical thinking, democratic attitudes and participatory skills; and as a "4" critical literacy (Georgescu, 1997, p.5).

Dakmara Georgescu of the Institute of Educational Sciences developed the experimental civic culture texts for the 7th and 8th Forms. Until the mid-1990s, there was one official textbook for every grade, sanctioned by the Ministry of Education. The Institute of Educational Sciences, the quasi-governmental agency responsible for curricular innovation and research, developed an experimental textbook for the Civic Culture classes. The books were developed within a Netherlands Helsinki Committee-organized program on human rights education[i].

The texts were unique for Romania at the time they were introduced, including an instructional methodology that emphasized dialogue, critical reflection, and individual and group work. Fundamental democratic values and practices, human rights, and the

right of the child were key themes for the materials. Students were encouraged to learn not only concepts, but to analyze their social and political worlds, and to prepare to become active members of their communities. The cooperating teachers in the experimental classrooms participated in three, two-and-a half-day trainings focusing on interactive methodologies and the teaching of citizenship and human rights education.

The text developer wrestled with many initial dilemmas in 1994. One was the challenge to present concepts, such as individualism, democracy and human rights, which were poorly recognized or understood in the socio-political environment of Romania.

Dakmara recognized the necessity of introducing 'more learner centered' instructional techniques. However, the teaching approaches suggested could not be too radical for the Romanian teacher. She, therefore, opted to make various changes in lesson format, leaving some choices in methodology up to the teacher. These changes included a listing of specific attitudinal and skill-related goals for students, a reduction in the amount of text, examples from other countries, questions that promoted critical and independent thinking and paired and group work (Tibbitts, 1994). The ultimate goal was to encourage pluralistic and critical thinking, self-expression and dialogue in the classroom, as a tool for an "organic" form of long-term democratic transition (Nodia, 1996, p.18).

## 4. Research Methods

The impact study was conducted in the 1994-5 and 1995-6 school years with a single cohort of Romanian students who used the experimental texts in the 7th and then the 8th Forms. Four classrooms, including one hundred and nine students were intensively studied, in Bucharest (capitol city), Timisoara (large town bordering Hungary), and Sascut (village). In addition to these "treatment" classrooms, comparison classroom students (attending the same school but receiving civics instruction using the official Ministry textbook) were administered the student questionnaire.

This report focuses on the results of a questionnaire administered to pupils four times over the course of two school years: Fall 1994, Spring 1995, Fall 1995 and Spring 1996. Questionnaires were administered to a total of 222 students in both treatment and comparison classrooms. The instrument investigated two primary questions:

- Student's rating of importance of 10 pre-determined qualities of a good citizen (covering a range of qualities related to citizenship responsibilities/participation, democratic forms of decisionmaking, civic virtue and civil behavior). A Likert-type scale using a five-point system was used. Students were also asked to write their own definition of what constituted a good citizen.

- Student's rating of the importance of nine pre-selected Articles from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. ). A Likert-type scale using a five-point system was used. (These rights represented a range of civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights which appeared to be topical for Romania at that time, including, for

example, the right to leave and return to your country; the right to own property.) Both the experimental and Ministry texts included human rights content, consistent with the National Civic Curriculum.

This paper summarizes the results of these student questionnaires. In interpreting these results, the author has taken into account not only the content of the experimental civic textbooks, but other data also included in the impact study, but not directly related here. Triangulation is provided by: focus group interviews with students in the treatment classrooms, which took place in the 1994-6 school years; classroom observations; four interviews with teachers over the course of the two-year experimentation; and the review of teacher lesson feedback forms. Observations and teacher-based information helped document the degree and kinds of participatory methods and open dialogue that the experimental teachers were carrying out in their classrooms. Student focus groups helped to further clarify the answers that were provided in the written survey.

## 4. Results

### I. Description of Data Set

Table 1 below presents the number of treatment and control students per classroom. The same educators – Anca and Emilia, taught two of the control classrooms.

Table 1: Breakdown of Control and Treatment for Classrooms[1]

| Classroom | Control | | Treatment | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Count | % | Count | % | |
| Class 1- Anca | 31 | 47.7% | 34 | 52.3% | 65 |
| Class 2–Emilia | 33 | 52.4% | 30 | 47.6% | 63 |
| Class 3-Elena | 25 | 44.6% | 31 | 55.4% | 56 |
| Class 4-Geta | 20 | 52.6% | 18 | 47.4% | 38 |
| Total | 109 | 48.6% | 113 | 51.4% | 222 |

Of the 222 students for whom gender was reported, 98 (44%) were male and 124 (56%) were female.

### II. Section 1: Qualities of a Good Citizen.

The first analysis of the scaled data investigated whether there were significant differences between the treatment and control groups in the mean difference between their initial and final ratings of the importance of the ten potential qualities constituting a good citizen. At each measurement, students were asked to rate the importance of each quality on a scale of 1 (Not at All Important) to 5 (Extremely Important). Table 2 below lists these mean differences and indicates significance if any.

[1] The statistical analysis was carried out by Chris Cavanaugh, Research Associate for HREA. The author would like to acknowledge her appreciation for his assistance.

Table 2: Importance of Making a Good Citizen – Treatment vs. Control
1st and 4th Administration

| Quality | N | Mean Difference for Treatment | Mean Difference for Control | F | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Voting in Most Elections | 169 | .77 | -.03 | 14.05 | .000*** |
| Obeying the Law | 169 | .04 | .30 | 3.72 | .055 |
| Honoring One's Country | 169 | -.23 | -.05 | 1.60 | .207 |
| Working Hard | 167 | -.06 | -.12 | .085 | .772 |
| Being a Good Human Being | 168 | -.10 | -.15 | .096 | .757 |
| Being Helpful and Friendly to Others | 167 | -.06 | -.26 | 1.15 | .285 |
| Volunteering for Service in the Local Community | 168 | .44 | .14 | 2.22 | .139 |
| Not Bringing Dishonor to the Country | 168 | -.06 | .03 | .247 | .620 |
| Trying to Influence Government Decisions and Policies | 168 | .95 | -.07 | 21.87 | .000*** |
| Keeping Informed about Public Affairs | 169 | .47 | .14 | 2.05 | .154 |

The treatment group showed significant gains over the comparison group in two qualities: voting in most elections and trying to influence government decisions and policies. The treatment and control groups' ratings of the importance of several values actually fell, although not significantly: honor one's country, working hard, being a good human being, being helpful and friendly to others, and not bringing dishonor to the country. In all but one item, the decrease in importance was higher for the control classrooms than for the treatment classes. Both the treatment and control groups showed increases – although not significant – in the following categories: obeying the law, volunteering for service, and keeping informed.

Similar analyses were conducted to discern whether there were significant differences in importance changes between male and female students, regardless of treatment or comparison group. Table 3 below presents these results.

Table 3: Importance of Making a Good Citizen – Male vs. Female

| Quality | N | Mean Difference for Males | Mean Difference for Females | F | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Voting in Most Elections | 169 | .68 | .22 | 4.56 | .034* |
| Obeying the Law | 169 | .002 | .25 | 2.87 | .092 |
| Honoring One's Country | 169 | -.18 | -.14 | .091 | .763 |
| Working Hard | 167 | -.27 | -.04 | 2.30 | .131 |
| Being a Good Human Being | 168 | -.10 | -.14 | .041 | .839 |
| Being Helpful and Friendly to Others | 167 | -.08 | -.20 | .426 | .515 |
| Volunteering for Service in the Local Community | 168 | .29 | .32 | .023 | .880 |
| Not Bringing Dishonor to the | 168 | -.18 | -.09 | 2.27 | .134 |

| Country | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Trying to Influence Government Decisions and Policies | 168 | .36 | .60 | .998 | .319 |
| Keeping Informed about Public Affairs | 169 | .45 | .22 | .880 | .350 |

Interestingly, only one significant difference appeared in the above analysis as male students showed an increase in the importance of voting in elections compared to female students.

Correlation analyses were also run on the mean gains in this category between the first and final administration for the treatment group only. Table 4 below presents only the significant correlations for gains in the importance of qualities for good citizens for the treatment group.

Table 4. Correlation Matrix for Increases in Importance of Qualities for Good Citizenship

| | Vote | Obey | Honor | Work | Good | Help | Volun | NoDis | Govt. | Infor |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vote | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Obey | .00 | 1.0 | | | | | | | | |
| Honor | .02 | .17 | 1.0 | | | | | | | |
| Work | .24* | .22* | .19 | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| Good | .19 | .19 | .06 | .30** | 1.0 | | | | | |
| Help | .25 | .03 | .05 | .30** | .51** | 1.0 | | | | |
| Volun | .23* | -.01 | .04 | .43** | .16 | .32** | 1.0 | | | |
| NoDis | -.10 | .16 | .09 | -.02 | .31** | -.00 | .06 | 1.0 | | |
| Govt. | .24* | .00 | .18 | .25* | .16 | .14 | .30** | .18 | 1.0 | |
| Infor | .18 | .03 | .21* | .13 | .07 | .17 | .32** | .04 | .36** | 1.0 |

(*= significance <.05, **=significance<.01)

Prior to rating the importance of the 10 pre-determined qualities of a good citizen, pupils were asked to write their own definition of what they thought constituted a good citizen. Sixteen coding categories were developed on this basis, and applied to the answers provided in the first (Fall 1994) and fourth administrations (Spring 1996). Multiple responses were possible for each answer. Tables 5 and 6 present the results for the Treatment and Control Groups.

Table 5. Qualities of a Good Citizen (open-ended): Percentage difference between Initial and Final Administration for Treatment Group

| Qualities of a Good Citizen (open-ended) | First Administratn | Final Administratn | % Chng |
|---|---|---|---|
| Respect laws, not break laws | 32% (32) | 71% (71) | **+39%** |
| Behave well, be polite, friendly | 55% (55) | 32% (33) | **-23%** |
| Be loyal to country, be patriot | 20% (20) | 29% (30) | +9% |
| Protect the environment | 19% (19) | 25% (26) | +6% |
| Help those in need | 15% (15) | 10% (10) | -5% |
| Know, respect, enjoy human rts | 13% (13) | 16% (17) | +3% |
| Vote, participate in ruling of country | 7% (7) | 30% (31) | **+20%** |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Be honest | 9% (9) | 5% (5) | - 4% |
| Solve problems cooperatively | 9% (9) | 1% (1) | - 8% |
| Be involved in public life, be active in the community | 7% (7) | 22% (23) | + 15% |
| Be well educated, smart | 6% (6) | 6% (6) | -- |
| Be tolerant | 5% (5) | 4% (4) | - 1% |
| Work hard, have a job | 4% (4) | 7% (7) | + 3% |
| Be interested, informed about public affairs | 1% (1) | 9% (9) | + 8% |
| Other | 8% (8) | 1% (1) | - 7% |
| Don't know, no answer | 1% (1) | 1% (1) | -- |

1st Adm. N=101, 4th Adm. N=104

Table 6. Qualities of a Good Citizen (open-ended): Percentage difference between Initial and Final Administration for Control Group

| Qualities of a Good Citizen (open-ended) | First Administratn | Final Administratn | % Chng |
|---|---|---|---|
| Respect laws, not break laws | 37% (38) | 73% (74) | + 37% |
| Behave well, be polite, friendly | 72% (73) | 54% (55) | - 17% |
| Be loyal to country, be patriot | 32% (33) | 36% (37) | + 5% |
| Protect the environment | 4% (4) | 10% (10) | + 6% |
| Help those in need | 21% (21) | 14% (14) | - 7% |
| Know, respect, enjoy human rts | 3% (3) | 4% (4) | + 1% |
| Vote, participate in ruling of country | 3% (3) | 11% (11) | + 7% |
| Be honest | 24% (24) | 9% (9) | - 15% |
| Solve problems cooperatively | 4% (4) | 1% (1) | - 3% |
| Be involved in public life, be active in the community | 1% (1) | 7% (23) | + 6% |
| Be well educated, smart | 11% (11) | 3% (6) | - 8% |
| Be tolerant | 0% (0) | 3% (4) | + 3% |
| Work hard, have a job | 29% (28) | 14% (7) | - 14% |
| Be interested, informed about public affairs | 1% (1) | 2% (2) | + 1% |
| Other | 4% (4) | 3% (1) | - 1% |
| Don't know, no answer | 0% (0) | 2% (2) | + 2% |

st Adm. N=102, 4th Adm. N=98

Although the statistical analysis in the previous section had not revealed any statistically significant gains between the treatment and control groups for the item "obey the law," the qualitative coding shows that the groups had parallel increases in the valuing of this item over the two-year period. Each group showed at least a 37% increase between the first and fourth administration of the survey. Both groups also showed a decrease in valuing of overall civility (behaving nicely, etc).

For several other categories, however, the treatment and control groups showed strikingly different kinds of shifts in the content of citizenship definitions. Consistent with the statistical analyses, the treatment group showed increases in voting (+20%) and participation in public life (+15%). For the control group, there were decreases in being honest (-15%) and working hard (14%).

## II. Section 2: The Relative Importance of Individual Human Rights.

Similar to Section 1, Section 2 asked students to rate the importance of nine of the Articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on a scale from 1 (Not at all Important) to 5 (Very Important). Table 7 below shows the mean difference between initial and final ratings for treatment and control groups.

Table 7: Difference between Initial and Final Difference in Rating Importance of Human Rights – Treatment vs. Control

| Human Right | N | Mean Difference for Treatment | Mean Difference for Control | F | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Equality before the Law** | 169 | .04 | .57 | 13.1 | .000*** |
| **Freedom of Opinion and Expression** | 168 | .29 | .59 | 4.51 | .035* |
| **Freedom of Religion** | 166 | .25 | .27 | .027 | .870 |
| **Freedom from Torture or Cruel and Degrading Punishment** | 166 | .04 | .64 | 7.41 | .007** |
| **The Right to Own Property** | 166 | .22 | .16 | .078 | .781 |
| **The Right to a Job** | 166 | .20 | -.05 | 4.10 | .044* |
| **The Right to Have Basic Needs Met** | 166 | -.06 | .11 | 2.87 | .092 |
| **The Right to Education** | 166 | .10 | .03 | .252 | .616 |
| **The Right to Leave Any Country and Return** | 164 | .71 | .24 | 4.16 | .043* |

Interesting, the control group showed significant increases in their ratings of the importance of three human rights in the civil and political category: equality before the law, freedom of opinion and expression, and freedom from torture and cruel and degrading punishment. The treatment group showed significantly larger increases in their ratings of the importance of two human rights: the right to a job and the right to leave any country and return.

A similar analysis was run to examine any difference between male and female students in their rating of the importance of these nine human rights, regardless of control or treatment group. Table 8 below presents the differences according to gender.

Table 8: Difference between Initial and Final Difference in Rating Importance of Human Rights – Male vs. Female

| Human Right | N | Mean Difference for Female | Mean Difference for Male | F | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Equality before the Law** | 169 | .30 | .21 | .335 | .56 |
| **Freedom of Opinion and Expression** | 168 | .53 | .29 | 2.94 | .088 |
| **Freedom of Religion** | 166 | .29 | .22 | .191 | .663 |
| **Freedom from Torture or Cruel and Degrading Punishment** | 166 | .43 | .14 | 1.67 | .198 |
| **The Right to Own Property** | 166 | .32 | .02 | 2.60 | .109 |
| **The Right to a Job** | 166 | .19 | -.05 | 3.93 | .049* |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **The Right to Have Basic Needs Met** | 166 | .11 | -.11 | 4.52 | .035* |
| **The Right to Education** | 166 | .17 | -.07 | 3.02 | .084 |
| **The Right to Leave Any Country and Return** | 164 | .44 | .58 | .342 | .560 |

Only two significant differences appear in this comparison as female students showed increases in the importance of the right to a job and the right to have basic needs met, compared with decreases for male students in these same categories.

Table 9 below shows the correlations between the increases in the importance of the nine human rights for the treatment group only.

Table 9. Correlation Matrix for Increases in Importance of Qualities for Human Rights for Treatment Group

| | Equal | Opin | Rel | Tortur | Prop | Job | Needs | Educ | Leave |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Equal** | 1.0 | | | | | | | | |
| **Opin** | .24* | 1.0 | | | | | | | |
| **Rel** | .19 | .35** | 1.0 | | | | | | |
| **Tortur** | .30** | .35** | .07 | 1.0 | | | | | |
| **Prop** | .33** | .18 | -.09 | .34** | 1.0 | | | | |
| **Job** | .20 | .16 | .14 | .25* | .30** | 1.0 | | | |
| **Needs** | .14 | .15 | .22* | .15 | .13 | .25* | 1.0 | | |
| **Educ** | .43 | .36** | .31** | .32** | .18 | .32** | .17 | 1.0 | |
| **Leave** | .13 | .19 | .32** | .13 | -.07 | .-.02 | .00 | .22* | 1.0 |

(*= significance <.05, **=significance<.01)

## 5. Discussion

**5.1.** The Romanian study appears to confirm the results of others that have shown a clear link between instructional methodology and the development of participatory attitudes, or "civic behavior" in students. This relationship is evident even at such an early time in the post-totalitarian period. This result provides room for optimism, given the political context and traditional teaching methods in which the experimental lessons took place. Another 1995 survey of 400 students from four Romanian towns found that young people endorsed the following basic values: social order, politeness, national security, peace, respect for tradition, faith in God and harmony with nature. The survey also demonstrated that collectivist values were predominant (sense of belonging, participation, social mobilization, co-operation) and that they actually stood in the way of individualist values (freedom, independence, critical spirit) (Gábor and Balog, 1995).

The study is small, of course, and necessarily raises questions. It would be interesting and important to see if the participatory attitudes for the treatment group are sustained, and if students' participation in school and community life was actually demonstrated.

**5.2.** The Romanian study also shows that students in this age group generally become more aware of the role and rule of law, expanding their notions of citizenship beyond that of civility and good manners. This is reflected in increases for both groups in the valuing of the respect for law, as well as the decrease in valuing of good behavior. This may well be a reflection both of the emphasis of the Romanian civic culture texts and developments related to political socialization and early adolescents.

**5.3.** The results also demonstrate what is almost commonsensical: that students hold multiple ideas, values, and predispositions in the area of citizenship education. This is consistent with the IEA Civic Education Study, as well as others. A 1996-7 impact evaluation of USAID civic education programs in Poland and the Dominican Republic showed that the more participatory methods used in the classroom, the greater the civic program impact. Second, programs that succeeded in generating higher rates of participation were not necessarily those that had the greatest impact on democratic values. Generally speaking, in comparing the results of civic education in promoting civic competence, democratic values, and participation, the effects in one domain were not necessarily correlated with another (Sabatini, Bevis and Finkel, 1998, p. 51).

The Romanian study does suggest that a textbook methodology can influence a particular domain of citizenship education; it also shows that a textbook using more conventional teaching methods can influence the valuing dimensions. In some ways, we are brought back to the original question: what is the idea of the ideal citizen in the minds of educational policymakers and their constituents?

**5.4.** A disappointing aspect of the study were the results in the human rights education area. There was no clear pattern in terms of higher valuing of human rights overall (for either group).

Both the experimental and Ministry textbooks devote only a modest amount of attention to human rights issues as a content area, although the methodology used in the experimental book was seen as supportive of skills that would be conducive to the respect and promotion of human rights values. The experimental civic textbook touches upon the concept of human rights, and leaves it to the teacher to facilitate classroom discussion on human rights topics of interest to the class. This instructional approach (which contrasts with the traditional, content-oriented approach to human rights) might explain in part the increased valuing of "the right to a job" and "right to have basic needs met" for the treatment group. These economic rights issues are a strong concern in Romania and this statistical result suggests that human rights topics were discussed in very concrete terms in the experimental classrooms.

**5.5.** An implicit result of the study is that two years and considerable teacher support was necessary for this result. The study supports the idea that classroom innovation is possible when sustained technical support is provided and teachers are open to change. However, even under such circumstances, changes in student attitudes do not happen so quickly; statistically significant increases in students' valuing of more participatory forms of citizenship did not emerge until two years' into the program.

**5.6.** Finally, the Romanian study showed that students' increased valuing of these participatory dimensions of citizenship does not automatically reduce their loyalty and sense of affiliation with the State. Patriotism held its ground with the treatment group in both the quantitative and qualitative areas and, in fact, more strongly than with the control group. This last result should be reassuring for those who believe that the introduction of more student-centered approaches to instruction, and human rights themes, will automatically lead to anti-authoritarianism impulses and disaffection among students. However, the study would need to be replicated on a larger scale, and perhaps in different transitional democracies, in order to see if these, and other findings, prevail.

## References


Bunescu, Gheorghe, Emil Stan, Gabriel Albu, Dan Badea, and Octavian Oprica (1999). Cohesion and Diversity in National Identity: Civic Education in Romania. In Torney-Purta, J., John Schwille and Jo-Ann Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: 24 National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*, Amsterdam: IEA, pp. 505-521.

Capita, Laura (1992). *Post-War History and Unification of Europe in Textbooks: The Romanian Experience.* Paper presented at the European seminar, Post-War History and Unification of Europe in Textbooks: Prospects After the End of the Cold War, Berlin, June, p. 7.

Conover, Pamela Johnston and Donald D. Searing (1994). "Democracy, Citizenship and the Study of Political Socialization" in Budge, Ian and David McKay, *Developing Democracy*, London: Sage Publications.

Fischer-Galati, Stephen A. (1952). Communist Indoctrination in Romanian Elementary Schools, *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. XXII, No. 3, p. 193.

Friere, Ana Maria and Donald Macedo (Eds.) (1998). *The Paulo Friere Reader.* New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.

Gábor, K. And Balog, I. (1995). "The Impact of Consumer Culture on Eastern and Central European Youth" in *Educatio,* Budapest, no. 2, pp. 311-26.

Georgescu, Dakmara-Ana (1997), Questionnaire prepared for "Learning and Teaching for Democratic citizenship: A Critical Analysis of the Media in Civic Education" 8-12 October, 1997 in Budapest.

Haret, Spiru (ed.)(1994). *Psychopedagogy*, p. 83 as quoted in Bunescu et al.

Nodia, Ghia (1996). "How Different are Postcommunist Traditions?" *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 7, No. 4, October, pp. 15-29.

Sabatini, Christopher A., Gwendolyn G. Bevis and Stephen E. Finkel (1998). *The Impact of Civic Education Programs on Political Participation and Democratic Attitudes.* Prepared for U.S. Agency for International Development.

Tibbitts, Felisa (1994). "Human Rights Education in Schools in the Post-Communist Context" in *European Journal of Education,* Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 363-376.

Torney-Purta, Judith, John Schwille and Jo-Ann Amadeo (1999). "Mapping the Distinctive and Common Features of Civic Education in Twenty-Four Countries," in Torney-Purta, Judith, John Schwille and Jo-Ann Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies for the IEA Civic Education Project.* Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Education Achievement.

**U.S. Department of Education**
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*
*National Library of Education (NLE)*
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

| | |
|---|---|
| Title: Prospects for Civics Education in Transitional Democracies: Results of an Impact Study in Romanian Classrooms | |
| Author(s): Felisa Tibbitts | |
| Corporate Source: | Publication Date: April 1999 |

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

| The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents |
|---|---|---|
| PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>1 | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>2A | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY<br>Sample<br>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)<br>2B |
| Level 1 | Level 2A | Level 2B |
| ☑ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy. | Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only | Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only |

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, → please**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Signature: | Printed Name/Position/Title: Felisa Tibbitts, Director | |
| Organization/Address: Human Rights Education Associates (HREA) | Telephone: 617 661 0278 | FAX: 617 249 0278 |
| | E-Mail Address: ftibbitts@hrea.org | Date: Nov. 16, 1999 |

(over)

## III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| |
|---|
| Publisher/Distributor: |
| Address: |
| Price: |

## IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| |
|---|
| Name: |
| Address: |

## V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

[illegible]
2[illegible] Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**
**1100 West Street, 2nd Floor**
**Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598**

**Telephone: 301-497-4080**
**Toll Free: 800-799-3742**
**FAX: 301-953-0263**
**e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov**
**WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com**


088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.