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FOREWORD

This volume begins a series featuring examples of the best scholarship in comparative and international education. The series, *International Perspectives on Education and Society*, developed and published by Elsevier Science Ltd., is a revival of an annual review of scholarship in this field. We are pleased to have this collection of scholarship on comparative analysis of civic education as the new series’ inaugural edition.

The volume was undergoing final copy-editing as the world watched in horror the emergence of mass lethal political terrorism perpetrated in the attacks on New York City and Washington D.C. on 11 September 2001. Perhaps no aspect of education relates as directly to the passions and discussions raised in the aftermath of these attacks as the role of formal schooling in the education of a modern citizenry throughout the world. Widespread mass education is a major vehicle for political socialization within a complex global world. Understanding if, and how, schools across nations prepare adolescents to undertake the role of citizen is the dramatic, timely topic of this collection of studies.

The studies here also represent an exciting innovation in large-scale comparative studies of schooling outcomes and instructional processes. Following the recent trend toward blending both qualitative and quantitative data collections in multi-national studies, the IEA Civic Education Study incorporated 24 national case studies and published preliminary results from them. Illustrating the full utility of comparative case studies, this volume’s seven empirical chapters (2 to 8) present in-depth comparative analyses of these data. In providing this substantive service to the comparative field, these chapters are a rich example of comparative approaches to complex qualitative data for both theoretical knowledge and education policy analysis. Furthermore, the lead chapter by the editors is a tour de force review of methodological issues in comparative qualitative analysis. And the final chapter puts the broader trend of cross-national collection and analysis of qualitative data into an informative context both substantively and methodologically.

I want to thank the guest editors of this volume, as well as the IEA, for their efforts in providing comparative and international scholars with this groundbreaking collection of qualitative studies in civic education. As we have
1. INTRODUCTION: ISSUES AND INSIGHTS IN CROSS-NATIONAL ANALYSIS OF QUALITATIVE STUDIES

Gita Steiner-Khamsi, Judith Torney-Purta and John Schwille

What is this civic education when viewed across countries? What sense can be made of 24 national case studies of civic education analyzed cross-nationally? To put them in context and yet compare them: is that possible? In answering these questions, the authors of this volume have taken a dual approach to their presentations. First, they introduce new methodological approaches for analyzing qualitative data cross-nationally. Second, they provide a content-based exploration of these data that draws out the intricacies of civic education in the schools of 24 countries.

Cross-national educational research, country comparison, large-scale comparative studies, IEA-type or OECD-type studies – just a few of the terms used to denote this genre of comparative research – are most commonly associated with quantitative analysis. This approach emphasizes the relatively parsimonious identification of explanatory variables that are common and intended to be measured precisely and validly across countries. Such an approach has raised many doubts about the usefulness of such studies beyond and even for policy-related purposes. These concerns are by no means new.
We now have behind us two decades of growing interest in and skepticism about the place and purpose of large-scale international comparative studies.

While many policy analysts applaud studies that allow them to assess and rank the achievement and performance of their own educational system against those of other systems, many qualitatively oriented scholars condemn such studies as superficial and devoid of any cultural context. The polarization of the two camps seems to have reached a peak. The first camp is made up of supporters of standards-based and outcomes-based educational reform, as well as the other performance-based reform models that are presently spreading at breath-taking speed around the world. They have re-discovered international comparative studies as the herald of an era in global-wide school reform in which it matters a great deal how one educational system scores in relation to other systems.

Scholars in the other camp have waged a war against what they see as the absurdity of cross-national studies, because in their view concepts such as “civic education” mean something totally different in different contexts. So large and irreconcilable are these semantic differences for them that comparability per se is questionable. From their perspective, any comparison across cultural contexts is at the expense of understanding the complex realities of a particular context. Attacks against large-scale country comparisons are not singular incidents. They are, indeed, indicative of a visible qualitative and cultural turn in social science and educational research that demands smaller, multiple and more meaningful units of analysis than national educational systems. The group of authors presented in this volume attempt to seriously challenge the contention that those who compare are unable to understand, and those who understand are unable to compare.

In response to the critics of large-scale quantitative studies, the authors also shed light on the heatedly debated “blind spots” of country comparisons by asking, “What does civic education mean in different country contexts, and what does it entail for different communities and groups within a country?” As is customary for researchers in all types of empirical studies, the authors of this volume have had to make a series of methodological decisions in order to reduce the number of cases and observations that would allow for cross-national comparison. At the same time, in presenting their results to policy-makers, researchers and other audiences, they have been wary about retaining the context and “thick descriptions” that are characteristic of case studies. What are the specific methodological challenges of multiple case study analysis? How do they differ from those methodological challenges of data reduction, reliability and validity that are the norm in quantitative analysis? The authors have reflected on specific methodological challenges that relate to qualitative cross-national analysis. They present different solutions. Their responses suggest that there is a need for paving new methodological paths and formulating new paradigms that would allow for cross-national analyses of qualitative rather than quantitative data.

Content-wise, the authors of this volume attempt to illuminate the multiple layers of a construct that, at first sight, appears to be an empty shell. In stark contrast to mathematics, language, biology and other subject matters taught in schools, civic education cannot be confined to a particular time-slot in the curriculum of schools. In several countries civic education is taught as part of civics, government, social studies, legal studies, economic studies or moral education. More often, however, civic education is taught across the curriculum (including, for example, in history, literature, geography), reflected in school and class organization, and reinforced in extra-curricular activities and community service. Thus, at closer examination, civic education is not an empty shell but ubiquitous.

An investigation of civic education therefore needs to be more than a matter of simply accumulating content taught in civics-related subject matters (civics, government, social studies, and so on), and it needs to be less than a general examination of schools as educative sites for political culture. Civic education in this volume is studied as a construct with much potential variation in meaning and not a particular subject matter that presupposes some sort of international consensus on what it entails. To reach a common understanding of the construct across 24 national research teams, the core domains of civic education (that is, democracy, national identity and social cohesion/diversity) were defined only after initial more open-ended international and national data collection. Narrowing the definition of the construct, however, resolved only part of the problem. How do we, as researchers, deal with inconsistencies and contradictions in the case studies? How do we interpret, for example, the discrepancy between content and teaching methods, that is, the mismatch between what is taught in civic education (content) and how it is taught (method)? What does it mean, for example, when students are taught in, say, an authoritarian, dull and teacher-centered way about the importance of critical thinking, political participation and civil action for democracy? How do we analyze discrepancies between students’ political experience outside of school and what is being taught to them in schools? In qualitative cross-national analyses, such discrepancies are not quantité négligeable, that is, they are not “noise”, artifacts or outliers obscuring a more theoretically defensible underlying pattern or process. On the contrary, several authors purposefully tracked down discrepancies in order to understand the nature and status of civic education in various contexts. What comes across as a discrepancy is sometimes perfectly logical if captured in its own context. Following the traces
THE TWO-PHASE IEA CIVIC EDUCATION STUDY

The first and overarching goal of the IEA Civic Education Study has been to identify and examine within a comparative framework the ways in which nations prepare adolescents to undertake their role as citizens. A central focus of the study is the school, but without being restricted to any particular subject matter or to the formal curriculum. The study tried to obtain a picture of how adolescents are initiated into the various levels and types of political community in which they are likely to become members. IEA studies usually begin with an explication of the so-called “intended curriculum” as embodied in official or semi-official documents that specify desired learning outcomes in particular subject matters. In civic education, however, to rely so heavily on official documents that outline the intended curriculum is likely to be insufficient. Official documents have even less value in this regard in those areas of the world where governments have recently undergone profound transformations.

Across the world, we see many differences in the content and process of civic education. In societies undergoing rapid social and political change, and especially in those attempting to establish or re-establish democracies, attempts are being made to prepare adolescents for a political and economic order that is shifting. Even within societies with long democratic traditions, civic education differs from many other subjects in the extent of disagreement over the appropriate knowledge and attitude base.

In developing an overall design for the project, the group of national research teams examined the complexities of civic education at two levels: the policy or social level and the individual student level. At the societal level, the researchers needed to know about the complex array of factors that potentially affect the transmission of knowledge and learning about citizenship, government and political processes. Nearly all of the major social institutions are involved, including family, economy, religion and media as well as government. Political and social movements must be considered, as well as distinctive cultural and historical traditions. At the individual level, the need is to find out how adolescents respond to and understand these institutions and movements.

Introduction

Those who live within a given society internalize and act upon only part of what is present at the broader societal level. From the point of view of the individual, civic education consists of the process by which collective identifications are given private or personal meaning. The civic values that individuals internalize and act upon often differ substantially from those that the education system (and others) attempt to inculcate. Nor is the process entirely one way (Torney-Purta, 1992). The thoughts and actions of individuals can transform public political values and institutions.

The group of national research teams found that these levels could best be incorporated by organizing the study in two phases: one focusing on the social and political ecology in which civic education is embedded, and the other on the actual views and knowledge of young people coming of age in such a system. The former took the form of qualitative country case studies that are capable of capturing diverse interpretations and points of view about how adolescents should be prepared for political life. A summary of all 24 country case studies was published in Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project (Torney-Purta et al., 1999). The latter was implemented in a survey similar to those that IEA has conducted in the past (but also different because it puts primary emphasis on non-cognitive outcomes and because its questions are based on themes identified during the case study). The first international report summarizing major findings from the quantitative phase was released in 2001 and is titled Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen (Torney-Purta et al., 2001).

The authors of this present volume have based their cross-national analyses on data from the first, qualitative phase of the IEA Civic Education Study. The authors make use of the already published country-by-country analyses of the 24 national case studies (Torney-Purta et al., 1999). In addition, most of the cross-national authors have drawn on the international database, which includes the complete set of case study materials produced by national research teams in 24 countries. The international database was posted on a Web-site of the Department of Human Development, University of Maryland, College Park (the international coordinating center for the first phase of the IEA Civic Education Study).

The Theoretical Framework of the Qualitative Phase

During preliminary discussions in 1993–1994, many IEA member countries expressed interest in the study but were wary about assessing their students according to definitions and expectations developed in other countries rather
than in terms of their own objectives. Consequently, starting with country-based case studies of what is understood about civic education from existing theory, policy and practice rather than with the development of a test and survey had substantial appeal. Furthermore, some countries that had recently experienced major transitions saw in the case study a process valuable in itself to help stimulate new thinking about these aims and programs on the part of educators and the public. In other words, each country saw the case study as a chance to examine its own situation and learn from other countries as they collected the Phase 1 information. The fact that this information would then be used to develop the framework for the Phase 2 test and survey was also attractive.

Identifying a single best approach to civic education in a democracy has never been the goal of this international study. Rather the study was premised on the assumption that definitions of and approaches to civic education will be understood best by considering them within the contexts in which they are found. Common dimensions or domains of interest could then be identified (see also Janoski, 1998). Efforts were made not to choose prematurely a conceptual model that would privilege certain schools of thought or limited sets of variables. Instead, we wanted a model that would invite the expression and analysis of the many points of view that significant actors and thinkers see as being relevant to civic education in democracy. It was only after much preliminary work and after each national research team had submitted proposals for the case study that it was possible to reach an agreement on an overall approach and a graphic schema to represent it.

Although this model was inspired in part by psychological theories, namely Bronfenbrenner's views (1988) on the ecological approach to studying development and the situated cognition theories of Lave and Wenger (1991), it is equally well suited to the incorporation of other views and perspectives (for example, Conover & Searing, 1994). From its schematic shape, the model became known as the octagon model (Fig. 1).

The model captures the individual and societal levels discussed earlier. In the center is the individual student, surrounded by public discourse or discussion of the goals, values and practices with relevance to civic education. This discussion is presumed to influence the individual student through face-to-face contact with a set of "carriers". These include the family (parents, siblings and sometimes extended family), the school (teachers, intended curriculum and participation opportunities), peer group (which functions both in and out of school), and neighbors (including those with whom the adolescent works or meets in youth organizations). In addition to these face-to-face relationships, there is also the impact of television and other media. Theories such as that of Bronfenbrenner would call most of these carriers part of the "microsystem." Previous work on political socialization has usually referred to them as agents of socialization. The main (though not exclusive) emphases of the Civic Education Study have been the school and the peer group (especially as it functions in schools, school organizations and classrooms).

The outer octagon that circumscribes these processes includes what would be called the "macrosystem" in theories such as that of Bronfenbrenner. This includes institutions, processes and values in domains such as politics, economics, education and religion. It also includes a country's position internationally, the canonized symbols or narratives deemed important at the national or local level and the social stratification system (including not only
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commonly regarded as irreconcilable. Phase 1 of the IEA Civic Education Study is an exemplar of how researchers from two traditionally opposing research traditions can remain in dialogue throughout a research process. The area studies and content specialists kept the need for comparability in mind when preparing their country case studies. The authors of this volume, in turn, committed themselves to cross-national comparison without losing sight of the "thick descriptions" provided by the aforementioned specialists.

THE COUNTRY CASE STUDY DATA

The term "country case studies" is used throughout this volume. The authors have drawn their data either from short versions of country case studies (published as chapters in Torney-Purta et al., 1999), the full but incompletely analyzed versions (posted on the worldwide web), or a combination of both (short versions and full versions). The full versions of the case studies posted on the restricted-access Web site allowed the authors conducting the cross-national analyses of these studies to access the data from locations anywhere in the world. The database for each case study included the following six documents that were prepared by the 24 national research teams:

(1) The research proposal prepared by each national research coordinator to specify the design and methods of the case study for his or her country.
(2) The review of the existing national research literature organized around 15 policy questions. National research teams consulted informants among persons with responsibility for civic education, such as current or former officials in ministries responsible for relevant subject matters, educational policy-makers, political leaders, inspectors, curriculum development officers, members of government commissions, representatives of teachers' or students' organizations, leaders of youth organizations, and media representatives.

Examples of policy questions: What is the status of citizenship education as an explicit goal for schools? What are the priorities within formal education programs that attempt to provide preparation for citizenship? How are programs of civic education organized?
(3) Responses to the 18 original international framing questions. As a first step, each country was asked to respond to 18 questions in terms of each question's importance within the country; whether its topic had been addressed in the official curriculum goals of the country; what sort of public discussion or controversy (if any) there had been relating to the topic of the question; what organizations had taken an interest in the

social class but also the way in which opportunities are shaped by ethnic and gender membership). The action of carriers is thus embedded in a cultural and institutional context as represented by these eight "dimensions."

The approach that we selected to operationalize this model is one of coordinated, structured case studies similar to the approach suggested by Miles (1990), that is, pre-structured case studies carried out consecutively in different settings (in Miles's case, different schools; in our case, different countries). This approach poses the question of how much structure to impose on the individual cases. The aims of Phase 1 created a tension between two competing principles. The first is the principle of inclusiveness, which allowed the participating countries to include whatever they thought relevant and important when analyzing civic education in their countries. The second principle is that of methodological rigor, which provides guidelines and structure to elicit the systematic and rigorous design, data collection and analysis needed for comparative purposes. This tension has been managed over the course of four years by a participatory, iterative process in which an international planning committee and national project representatives were the main (although not the only) actors.

The national case studies themselves took shape in response to the design decisions, and were also progressively revised and reshaped after feedback from external reviewers. This methodological approach does not fit neatly into any qualitative research paradigm. Rather, as the authors in this volume argue, the distinction between comparative studies that seek general theories and qualitative studies that argue for "cases" has become somewhat obsolete and needs to be seriously reconsidered. The debate over "variable-oriented" versus "case-oriented", or Big-N (big sample size) versus Small-N (small sample size), research is not new. Teune (1997) points out that this debate surfaced in anthropology in the 1940s as "emics" and "ethics"; in sociology and political science in the 1960s as area and comparative studies; as historical sociology in the 1970s; and as case studies in the 1980s. Similar debates have occurred in psychology. Greenfield (1997), for example, contrasts "cultural psychology" (in which insiders views of phenomena influencing adolescents' development are sought using methods chosen for their meaningfulness within a country rather than for straightforward cross-cultural similarity) with the approach of "cross-cultural psychology" (in which the outsiders' views predominate to make comparisons using a common set of instruments).

Within the long history of heated debate over area studies versus comparative studies, qualitative versus quantitative studies, case-orientation versus variable-orientation and cultural psychology versus cross-cultural psychology, the IEA Civic Education Study is a milestone. It bridges two research paradigms
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include reports on primary data collected in many countries especially for this purpose and including material obtained from interviews with key informants, from focus groups and from special questionnaire surveys.

(6) A report summarizing and reflecting on the methods used in the Phase 1 data collection and analysis.

Two central features of the data collection design deserve special mention. First, the design of the case studies reflects the iterative process of data collection. After each stage of data collection, the national research teams and the international steering committee of the IEA Civic Education Study reflected on emerging themes that appeared to be relevant to the various contexts. As a result of this process, the participating researchers agreed to focus on the three domains of civic education identified as central to each context: democracy, national identity, and civic social cohesion. This focus on three domains or topics enhanced comparability. Second, the multi-level approach to collecting data was maintained throughout each stage of data collection. In each iteration, the national research teams identified multiple perspectives on a given domain or topic (policy perspective; perspective of teachers, students, organizations, administrators, etc.) and used multiple sources (interviews, analysis of policy documents, textbook analysis, research literature, surveys, etc.). The Civic Education Study researchers departed from the method of triangulation that uses multiple sources of information, and which allows researchers to obtain robust and reliable data by concentrating on the overlapping “sets” of information that emerge from these different sources. They did not use their multiple sources of information for purposes of data reduction, reliability or validity. Rather, throughout the data collection process, they maintained a multi-level approach to studying civic education and stressed divergent views on civic education, thereby acknowledging that what should be taught in civic education in a given context is contested.

ISSUES OF METHOD AND SUBSTANCE IN THE CHAPTERS OF THIS VOLUME

A lively debate exists among qualitative social scientists about the strengths and weaknesses of “case-oriented” methodologies that are associated with “small N, many variables” (Goldthorpe, 1997; Ragin, 1997; Tilly, 1997). How representative can a small sample be? What is a case? Who speaks in a case: the case study author or the informants? Qualitative researchers in comparative education are not alone in having to deal with the issue of representation. They share similar problems with colleagues in comparative (macro-)sociology,
comparative political science, comparative economics, and comparative history, where the number of societies, political systems, economic systems or nation-states in the world restricts the “universe of cases”. Small sample size is only part of the problem. Comparative qualitative researchers need to ask themselves these questions: How can we understand other contexts? How do we know that we understood other contexts? Who are we to interpret other contexts on behalf of those from other contexts?

In terms of the IEA Civic Education Study, moreover, the authors of this volume have had to deal not only with a massive amount of information (variables), but also with a sample \( (N=24) \) that is relatively large for a qualitative multiple-case study analysis. It is therefore not surprising that most of the authors (the exceptions being Lee Wing On, John Schwille and Jo-Ann Amadeo) developed contextual sampling criteria that allowed them to concentrate on a few cases only. Another common concern among the authors was to reduce the information in ways that would retain the internal validity, “texture” and “thick descriptions” of each case. Most authors reduced content by focusing either on specific core domains of civic education (democracy, national identity, or diversity/social cohesion) or levels of analysis (policy, practice, curriculum). Another method for narrowing the radius of the analysis was informed by reviewing the controversies surrounding theories of citizenship and civic education. A few authors developed interpretive frameworks based on such literature reviews. These frameworks have been fundamental for anchoring cross-national comparison within particular concepts of citizenship, which already are well documented by other scholars in the field. The purpose of this type of cross-national analysis is to examine whether the cases match the theoretical model. Finally, one author (Gerald LeTendre) engaged in a meta-level methodological analysis, by reflecting on how the qualitative data was collected and how that process differed from other studies in qualitative research or comparative education.

What the authors of this volume found with regard to the development, nature and status of civic education in various countries of the world is as intriguing as how they found it. Accordingly, we will now briefly summarize and reflect on a few of the methodological strategies that the authors of this volume employed.

Lee Wing On works with the full body of case studies, that is, all 24 of them, and with all three major content domains (democracy, national identity, diversity and social cohesion) that each case study addresses. His study advances a meta-qualitative approach to analyzing qualitative data cross-nationally, in which he draws from quantitative measures to first identify patterns, subsequently analyze these patterns contextually, and finally to generate theories. It is his integration of quantitative and qualitative methods as well as empirical and theoretical analyses that makes Lee’s contribution to this volume quite remarkable.

More specifically, in the first step of his study, Lee identifies the key words and key concepts that cut across all three domains and that therefore seem to offer meaning on how citizenship and civic education are understood in various contexts. His search for frequently mentioned key words and key concepts allows him to map the semantic fields of citizenship. It is striking that cross-national differences surfaced during the very first step of his content analysis. For example, the use of concepts that denote a de-politicization and de-ideologization of civic education is restricted to case studies from post-socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

As a second step, Lee examines each of the three domains separately and identifies clusters of concepts associated with a particular domain. Focusing on those 24 semantic fields that overlap, he empirically establishes a set of “external dimensions”, in comparative research referred to as a *tertium comparationis*, against which each case can subsequently be compared. It is important to bear in mind that the design of the IEA Civic Education Study has already determined a set of “external dimensions” by asking national research teams to respond to a set of specific questions. Lee draws from these pre-determined sets of *tertium comparationis* and specifies them in more detail. An essential aspect of Lee’s accomplishment is his ability to fine-tune the underlying common external dimensions for each domain empirically by conducting a content analysis. For the domain “national identity”, for example, he finds for all 24 cases three clusters that consist of frequently mentioned key concepts. The first cluster contains concepts that describe national identity in terms of “self”, “self-definition”, “self-determination”, “self-realization”, “self-perception” and “collective and individual identity”. A second cluster of concepts hints at the changing boundaries of national identity, in most instances extending the territorial space associated with citizenship into a larger geo-political unit, such as the European Community or the European Union. Correspondingly, a new type of citizenship, denoted by “the European citizen”, is repeatedly discussed in country case studies from European countries.

A strong finding of Lee’s content analysis, emerging in all domains and described in various contexts, is the predominance of notions of supranational citizenship and global citizenship, both of which clearly challenge conventional notions of citizenship defined by the nation-state. It is on the basis of this strong finding that Lee formulates his research question: How do civic education curricula justify and incorporate the territorial extension of citizenship? Using a sequence of methodological steps similar to that proposed in grounded theory
(see, for example, Strauss & Corbin, 1990), where data are reviewed in great detail, with research questions and explanations gradually emerging as a result of that review. Lee postulates that there exist, in particular, two supranational developments that account for a territorial extension of citizenship concepts in civic education curricula. On the one hand, civics-related curricula tend to emphasize the need for recognition of universal human rights. On the other hand, they need to adapt to the realities of a supranational or global market economy.

In his third step, Lee interprets what he found in the first and second steps, thereby concluding the description-analysis-interpretation cycle that marks any type of solid empirical inquiry. Thus, in his study, Lee starts out with cross-national description by conducting a content analysis (step 1), then moves on to a cross-national analysis by using grounded theory methods (step 2), and concludes with interpretation by placing his descriptions and analyses in a larger theoretical framework. Affirmed by his observation that new, universalistic and economic notions of citizenship are emerging in civics-related curricula, Lee reflects in the third step on the impact of the "post-national model of membership" (Soysal, 1996, 1998) on citizenship education. In contrast to the first and second methodological steps in which he provided contextual meaning to his quantitative findings, he explores in the final step the theoretical meaning of his findings. As a corollary, his study concludes with a review of existing theories that are able to conceptualize his empirical cross-national descriptions and analyses in a larger theoretical context, that is, in an ongoing debate on changing notions of citizenship in the social sciences.

Heinrich Mintrop's comparative study starts out with a poignant summary of the two fundamental assumptions that guide cross-national curriculum studies in the area of civic education:

First, across countries, definitions of what constitutes civic education diverge: boundaries circumscribing the field of civic education are blurry, and the instructional arrangements provided in schools for what gets defined as civic education vary widely by country. Second, conditions, goals, methods and outcomes of civic education are highly sensitive to the macro-political cultures of nations and the micro-political cultures of schools within those nations.

Keeping in mind these assumptions regarding the "fuzziness" of the research topic and the vast cultural and institutional differences that exist across and within countries, Mintrop compares teacher characteristics (preparation, qualification and support of civic education teachers), student perceptions of civic education, and curricular provisions for the teaching of civic education in the following seven countries: Chinese Taipei, the Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Hong Kong, Italy and the United States. His sampling criteria, in taking account of geographical and cultural distribution as well as the completeness and quality of available data, gives the following sampling outcome: four country case studies from Europe (two Central European and two Western European countries), and two from Asia. For the Americas, Mintrop restricts his analysis to the United States case study because other available data sets did not sufficiently explore that particular field of study.

Mintrop's multi-level investigation, contrasting perspectives of teachers, students and schools, reveals all kinds of contradictions and discrepancies that are fundamental to understanding the complexity of civic education. For example, although policy-makers in the seven case study countries strongly believe in the importance of citizenship education, in all countries (except Finland) the concept or curriculum of civic education is not clearly defined. There is no canon, no "codified body of knowledge", constituting civic education and no subject-specific preparation in teacher education. Mintrop remarks that in most countries civic education teachers rely on "informal personal knowledge, on-the-job craft knowledge, and life experience". If a clearly defined intended curriculum for civic education exists at all, the gaps between it and the implemented curriculum are likely to be substantial. How students perceive the teaching of civic education in their classroom is quite different from how teachers envision their own teaching. Mintrop sketches a "modal civic education classroom" that captures the commonalities of civic education teaching that he found across all seven cases:

In this [modal civic education] classroom, students are not all that interested in the content, the teacher is not particularly well trained, and civic education as a subject, if at all distinguished from the subject of history, is of secondary concern for that teacher. The type of knowledge dispersed is heavily weighted towards facts and the common every-day wisdom of the instructor. With the exception of a few activities, most notably mock elections, class discussions and perhaps a rare simulation, the instructional format is teacher-centered. The atmosphere in the class is on the dull side due to the students' lack of interest and the teacher's uncertainty over the advisability of holding discussions on lively and controversial topics.

Referring to numerous examples, Mintrop illustrates that civic education is culturally sensitive as well as "institutionally ill defined", lacking a clear definition, curriculum and provision in schools. He also dismantles a powerful myth related to qualitative data, namely that qualitative and exploratory methods of data collection per se are culturally more sensitive and generate more accurate descriptions of how insiders (that is, individuals who are familiar with the context) view and define civic education. His study reminds us that the case studies have been developed by experts and therefore provide an accurate description of how experts worldwide talk about civic education but do not necessarily represent actual school realities. As a corollary, it becomes methodologically indispensable to think in terms of multiple country contexts rather
than presuming a singular country context. Clearly identifying the authors and informants of a case study is central to determining the communities or groups to which a case study has been culturally sensitive. To some extent, of course, the design of the IEA Civic Education Study attempted to “control” biases in representation by requesting that each national research team appoint a panel of experts that would represent divergent views on civic education. These expert panels were in charge of reviewing the case study material and providing their interpretation of the material. In addition, several national research teams conducted interviews and surveys of students, teachers and other groups that were closely involved in civic education in order to expand their base of informants. Nevertheless, Mintrop’s critical comment is valid. It helps us to tackle the widespread belief among qualitative researchers that exploratory methods are, by design, “closer to the people” and culturally more sensitive than paper-and-pencil tests and surveys. These methods are only as culturally sensitive as we design them to be.

Zsuzsa Mátrai provides us with a fascinating account of how she resolved the two fundamental methodological challenges of empirical research (including qualitative empirical research), namely, how to reduce the number of cases and how to reduce the number of variables in a responsible manner. Her intention during this exercise was not to compromise on the strength of qualitative data, but to preserve the “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1983) of case studies that allow the researcher to understand what is meant by civic education in a given context.

In terms of the first challenge, reducing the sample size from 24 to five cases, Mátrai takes several features of case study research into consideration. Because she was charged with developing the Hungarian case study, she realized that her access to contextual information would be unbalanced in that she knew much more about the context of civic education in Hungary than in other countries. When analyzing the data, she therefore keeps reminding herself that, for her, some “descriptions” are “thicker” than others, and that she needs to watch out for the methodological biases that result from differences between self-reported data (the Hungarian case study) and other data.

Mátrai also has to contend with unequal weighting of information. In contrast to researchers engaged in quantitative data collection, where questions and answer categories are highly structured and therefore comparable, case study researchers tend to elaborate in detail on issues that they find relevant for understanding their specific context and only briefly reply to questions that they consider marginal. It is an outstanding feature and strength of qualitative data collection methods that informants, and not the outside researchers, prioritize content with regard to (perceived) centrality. Unequal weighting of information of case study questions is an issue for all authors in this volume, and has determined to various degrees their sampling procedures. In comparative social research, this particular problem is referred to as homogeneity. As Berg-Schlosser (2002) points out, “[C]ases must ‘parallel each other sufficiently’ and be comparable along certain specified dimensions.” Mátrai resolves the homogeneity problem by selecting those cases that deal with her research topic – national identity and civic education – not only in the greatest detail but also in similar detail to one another.

Variance with regard to political context also informs Mátrai’s sample selection. According to Przeworski’s categorization (Przeworski & Teune, 1970; Przeworski, 1987), Mátrai pursues the “most different” sampling design by contrasting political systems that, in her view, are most different from one another. Using as a basis the three sampling criteria summarized in this section – access to information, sufficient and comparable weighting of information, variance of context – Mátrai selected the following cases: Germany, Greece, Hong Kong, Hungary and Israel.

The second set of challenges delineating the focus of Mátrai’s analysis is reduction of information or “reduction of variables”. In line with the practice of other authors in this volume (notably Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides and Steiner-Khamsi), she “externally validates” her frame of reference by drawing from research literature in political science and political sociology. Using her review of literature as a base, she develops two sets of binary constructs, “political nation/cultural nation” and “national majority/national minorities”, and then examines how the selected five cases are situated in that particular conceptual space. She expects to find, and, indeed, does find, that they vary considerably with regard to these two dimensions of national identity.

John Schwille and Jo-Anne Amadeo start out by observing that civic education is ubiquitous – potentially everywhere in schools – with students learning civic knowledge, disposition and skills from various courses, extracurricular activities, hidden curricula, peers, and relations between teachers and students more generally.

Keeping a policy perspective in mind, the authors conclude that any civic education reform needs to involve multiple levels of interventions, such as change in curricula, examinations, teaching methods, school organization, school-community relations and so on. They identify five key policy areas where comprehensive civic education reform is needed:

1. civic education as a problem of curriculum development,
2. civic education as a problem of pedagogy and student participation,
3. civic education as a problem of school organization and student rights,
4. civic education as a problem of school response to factors outside the school,
5. civic education as a problem of systemic reform.
For each of these five policy areas, they identify clusters of cases that are similar with regard to specific policy options. For example, the first policy area (civic education as a problem of curriculum development) is divided into three different policy options:

- The non-existence of civics as a separate subject (for example, Australia, Bulgaria, England).
- Civics as a separate subject matter (for example, Cyprus, Romania, the Netherlands).
- Civic education in other established school subjects such as history (for example, Hungary, Lithuania), or in a combination of subject matters, most typically, history, religion, language and literature, and geography (for example, Greece).

It is important to point out here that the authors do not attempt to quantify the various policy solutions by counting how many cases fall into which category, but are instead interested in fleshing out the context of each policy solution. Their point is to explain, not to count the frequency of occurrences. This choice makes perfect methodological sense because the sample of 24 country case studies is by no means representative of political, educational or social systems across the world. Rather, the authors explain why in one context a policy solution is selected over another. As pointed out by scholars in the social sciences, such as Tilly (1984) and Ragin (1987; see also Ragin & Becker, 1992), or in educational research (Merriam, 1988), the strength of case studies lies in their explanatory power. In Tilly’s words (1997, p. 50), case study researchers need to construct “causal stories”, that is, stories that are verifiable, “resting on different chains of cause-effect relations, relations whose efficacy can be demonstrated independently of those stories.” Schwille and Amadeo’s cross-national “causal stories” (which, in turn, are based on many different “causal stories” written down in country case studies) follow a common thread. They discuss civic education in 22 countries with regard to its position in educational policy and school practice.

In addition it is remarkable that Schwille and Amadeo operate with a relatively large sample size – 22 of the 24 case studies. They explicitly do not opt for “purposeful sampling”, the sampling procedure applied by most of the other authors in this volume in order to reduce the sample size. These other authors tended to select their cases with regard to type of political system, stability of political system (“new democracies” versus “old democracies”), or geographical or cultural distribution. Instead, Schwille and Amadeo identify the emergent themes from the case studies according to a policy framework, and they provide examples of specific countries to illustrate different types of policy solutions.

Schwille and Amadeo conclude that civic education in school is not only ubiquitous, having yet to find “a secure and major place in the curriculum as a formal subject-matter” and being treated marginally in other non-curricular policy areas, but also elusive. They argue that unless civic education reform is embedded in overall school reform, it is likely to remain both marginal and ineffective.

The study of Georgia Kontagiannopoulou-Polydorides stands out for its non-traditional definition of “case” and her systematic application of an interpretive framework.

She begins by selecting a fascinating sampling design that will be presented in more detail in the next section of this chapter. She distinguishes between three clusters of political systems – ex-communist countries, capitalist countries with a politically active citizenry, and capitalist countries with a politically apathetic or passive citizenry. In contrasting these divergent systems, she expects to find vast differences or outcomes between them (“most different systems and most different outcomes” design). She also establishes sub-groups for each of the three clusters, assuming that variations will be evident within clusters of political systems. The first cluster of ex-communist countries contains case studies that relate to Bulgaria, Hungary, and the eastern part of Germany; the second cluster consists of Mediterranean countries with an established history of western-type democracies and with a politically active citizenry. In this second cluster the case studies of Greece, Italy and Portugal are subject to scrutiny. A third cluster comprises case studies from countries that are regarded, like the second cluster, as western-type democracies but (self-)reportedly deal with a politically apathetic or passive citizenry. The case studies of the Netherlands, the United States and Western Germany fall into this category of political system. Kontagiannopoulou-Polydorides’ selection of cases for each of the three clusters accords with the “most similar systems” design. It is this mixed-design sampling procedure, “most different systems design” for establishing three heterogeneous clusters and “most similar systems design” for establishing a homogeneous group within each cluster, that makes her study particularly complex and interesting.

Kontagiannopoulou-Polydorides’ second step is to expand the conceptual framework of the IEA Civic Education Study. After reviewing the case study material, she finds, as does Lee and also Steiner-Khamsi, that a concentration on three major domains (democracy, national identity, diversity/social cohesion) is too narrow. It is noteworthy that Lee, Kontagiannopoulou-Polydorides and Steiner-Khamsi independently found that case study authors frequently refer to the economy when describing citizenship concepts and civic education in their country. In addition, Lee and Kontagiannopoulou-Polydorides found a clear
indication that supranational identity (European citizenship) is considered a major challenge in the civic education curricula of European case studies.

As her third step, Kontagianopolou-Polydorides provides theoretical explanations for the need to engage in multi-level qualitative analysis. She focuses on two levels of analysis, which constitute two different educative sites for political education. The first level is school, more precisely, civic education curriculum, and the second level is students’ everyday political experience outside of schools. Her study traces discrepancies between these two levels, identifying contradictions, “silences” and discrepancies between what is taught to students in civic education with regard to four selected topics (democracy, citizenship, disenfranchised minorities, free-market economy) and what they experience with regard to these four areas of political life outside of schools. In concert with other scholars who contend that citizenship education in schools is sometimes irrational, the author explores how schools legitimize teaching practices that are socially disruptive and contradict other principles, such as social cohesion, diversity and democracy, that are taught in schools.

Steiner-Khamisi applies a hypothesis-driven design. Determined not to codify or quantify the rich qualitative data, nor to use the cases studies merely as anecdotal evidence to make a case, she first elaborates a theoretical model. The model draws from theories of citizenship in political science, sociology and political philosophy. In reference to Hannah Arendt’s (1958) spherical conception of citizenship, she labels that model “spheres of citizenship.” By modifying and extending Arendt’s model to suit the international framework of the IEA Civic Education Study, Steiner-Khamisi produces a theoretical model that distinguishes four different spheres of citizenship (constitutional, economic, civic and moral) that political systems pursue with differing degrees of emphasis. She tests her model against the data from the IEA Civic Education Study.

Steiner-Khamisi selects those cases that appear to be prototypical for each of the conceptions of citizenship and formulates the following three hypotheses. First, educational programs in Asian countries manifest a strong commitment to moral aspects of citizenship education. Steiner-Khamisi therefore expects civic education in Hong Kong, the only complete case study from the Asian region, to display a high commitment to moral aspects of citizenship. Second, the United States is the country with a state ideology that most visibly promotes anti-statism, more precisely, advocates an ideology of small government administration and strong civic associations, and a global free-market economy. She predicts that economic and civic aspects of citizenship education are more stressed in the United States case than in other cases. Third, countries undergoing political transformation are more likely to emphasize constitutional aspects of citizenship because they have recently established new constitutions and political systems. Here, Steiner-Khamisi includes the Romanian case as representative of a country that has recently undergone political transformation. She also considers the German case in more depth, because of its relatively recent transformation process.

For Steiner-Khamisi, a case is more than merely a bounded system and more than a unit of analysis. As such, her reduction of N from 24 to four was guided by the question of which country case studies would allow her to make a case for a particular spherical model of citizenship. In accordance with Walton’s contention that “[c]ases come wrapped in theories”, functioning as hypotheses that “embody causal processes operating in a microcosm” (1992, p. 122), she attempts to read and understand the theory (chain of causal relations) of each of the four cases, that is, the theories of how concepts of citizenship are related to civic education curricula. In her design, the four selected cases stand for different political systems that weigh the major indicators of citizenship (constitutional, economic, civic and moral) to various degrees. As a corollary, her selected cases are prototypes or ideal typical cases of different citizenship conceptions.

Her predictions failed. The theoretical model was not able to nest the data from the IEA Civic Education Study. She concludes that:

Civic education curricula in Hong Kong are not particularly moralistic, German and Romanian curricula emphasize constitutional aspects no more than other countries, and civic education programs in the United States do not place a particularly high priority on teaching about the economy nor do they engage students in civic actions. Moreover, in all four examined case studies, the political and economic spheres are inextricably linked.

Her unexpected finding of the discrepancy between theories of citizenship and practices of civic education in various contexts calls for further investigation. She finds more similarities than differences than a spherical model of citizenship or, for that matter, any other multidimensional model of civic education would have predicted. What is needed, says Steiner-Khamisi, is a different theoretical model, one that is based on a multi-level qualitative analysis and that considers the complexity of civic education. The study of civic education is complex because civic literacy spans different educational sites, operates at different policy levels (talk, action, implementation) and crosses national boundaries.

David Kerr explores the nature and status of citizenship education developments in nine countries by using three different sources of information. He triangulates nine case studies from the IEA Civic Education Study with data from expert reviews as well as data from the INCA Archive. The archive comprises a description of the educational aims, structure and organization, and curriculum and assessment framework in each country that was involved in the International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks (IRCAF).
Project. All three data sources - the IEA Civic Education Study, the IRCAF Project, and the expert reviews - were collected in the same time period, the mid to late 1990s. The author selects all the country case studies from the IEA Civic Education Study that overlap with cases from the other two comparative studies. The countries are Australia, Canada, England, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United States. Drawing from three different sources of data, Kerr is able to identify similarities and differences with regard to the nature and status of citizenship education in these countries.

The author anchors his cross-national analysis in three sets of conceptual frameworks. The first acknowledges a "continuum of citizenship" (McLaughlin, 1992), with conceptions of civic education being placed at one end (minimal conception) of the continuum and conceptions of citizenship education at the other (maximal conception). His second frame of reference, which he constructed on the basis of peer review, distinguishes between education about citizenship, education through citizenship and education for citizenship. Finally, he distinguishes between citizenship education that is "values-explicit" as opposed to "values-neutral", a distinction that is part of a broader debate about the balance between the "public" and "private" dimensions of citizenship, leading to what the educational philosopher McLaughlin (1992) has termed "thick" and "thin" citizenship education.

In keeping with the other authors in this volume who pursue a policy perspective, notably Lee, Mistrop and Schille and Amadeo, Kerr focuses on key aspects of citizenship education in a larger school reform perspective. Using a multi-level qualitative approach, he applies his three sets of conceptual frameworks to each of the following layers of civic education: curriculum aims, organization and structure; teaching and learning approaches; teacher specialization and teacher training; and use of textbooks and other resources.

His triangulation of civics-related information reveals a strong congruence among the three different data sources and many similarities across the nine country contexts. In all nine countries, there is, for example, a move away from a narrow, knowledge-based approach to citizenship education, to a broader approach encompassing knowledge and understanding, active experiences and the development of students' values, dispositions, skills and aptitudes. Also, there is agreement among experts from all the selected countries on the centrality of the teacher, who, in most countries is ill prepared for teaching civics-related subjects.

Gerald LeTendre's piece on "cross-national studies and the analysis of comparative qualitative research" differs markedly from the other chapters in this volume in that it focuses exclusively on methodological aspects of the IEA Civic Education Study. What we gain from his study is an intriguing reflection on the process of data collection and an insightful dialogue between quantita-

Introduction

tively oriented comparativists and qualitative researchers. Having been closely involved in both the TIMSS (Third International Mathematics and Science Study) Case Study Project and the Civic Education Study (Phase 1) of IEA, LeTendre observes that these kinds of qualitatively oriented study mark a new era in large-scale country comparison, an era in which the importance of considering culture in cross-national analyses has re-emerged.

Before TIMSS and before the Civic Education Study of IEA, the camps of comparativists (since the 1960s those who are, by self-definition, mostly quantitatively oriented) and qualitative researchers seemed far removed from each other. Whenever the case study format was used in large-scale comparative studies, it was done so in order to obtain a "typical" or "average" picture of a given topic that would ensure that the subsequently developed standardized test would be sensitive to national differences. In most instances, this first phase was exclusively regarded as a preparatory measure for the "real phase", the second phase, of comparative studies. It helped to legitimate the development of international survey instruments. Usually, little attention was paid to analyzing country case studies cross-nationally. Country case studies were considered non-comparable and non-interpretable from a strict quantitatively oriented perspective. Qualitative researchers, in turn, had their own good reasons for staying away from comparativists and borrowing from other disciplines. As LeTendre points out,

qualitative studies that have a comparative or international orientation have been more influenced by studies from the anthropology of education or studies in psychological anthropology than by articles in Comparative Education Review or Compare.

Although comparative education in its early days, at the turn of the last century, was associated with historiography, when predominantly area study experts conducted qualitative case studies, the field of comparative education subsequently distanced itself from its qualitative past. The "quantitative turn" in comparative education (Paulston, 1993, p. 104), which was triggered four decades ago by psychologists, sociologists, political scientists and economists joining and soon numerically dominating and shaping the paradigms of the field, left comparative education with a void with regard to qualitative approaches to comparative education. By the early 1990s, the situation had changed considerably. The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), by many scholars regarded as an institutional fortress of quantitative comparative research, started to include case study format, and not only in preparation for and prior to the "real, quantitative" phase. TIMSS, for example, developed not only tests and surveys but also videos and qualitative components amalgamating "comparative methods" and "qualitative methods."
The IEA Civic Education Study, in turn, has used ethnographic case studies that are focused in terms of guiding research questions. Similar in nature to traditional ethnographies of schooling or education that tend to focus on specific schools or communities, the “mini-ethnographies” provided in the country case studies explore conflicting viewpoints and alternative interpretations in a bounded system. LeTendre provides a detailed historical account of how the IEA Civic Education Study has ensured the maintenance of conflicting viewpoints and alternative interpretations throughout the different stages of the data collection and data analysis process.

The appearance of works by such researchers as Crossley and Vulliamy (1997), Paulston (1996) and Arnowe and Torres (1999) indicate the growing interest in the use of qualitative methods as well as theoretical foundations in comparative education.

SMALL N, GREAT CHALLENGES

We now turn to the question of how the authors of this volume addressed the challenges of qualitative cross-national analysis. In particular, how did they deal with the relatively large (in qualitative terms) sample of 24 country cases, the massive amount of data collected for each case, and the general problem of comparability of data?

Comparability

The issue of comparability is not restricted to qualitative comparative research. In fact, many would agree that nothing per se is comparable. Unless the researcher identifies a commonality, or more accurately constructs a specific dimension against which two or more cases can be compared, comparison is ruled out (apple and oranges can only be compared if there is an agreement on the construct “fruit”). Given that the Civic Education Study was conceived as an international comparative study, the issue of comparability among the case studies has been continuously addressed, from the study’s beginning in 1993 to its end in 2001.

Throughout the IEA Civic Education Study, the community of participating researchers has engaged in ongoing dialogue and reached (social) agreements on how to conceptualize civic education or citizenship education. As mentioned before, there was early consensus that an international study of civic education needed to stay away from any one singular model of democracy, citizenship or civic education, which meant that none of the participating researchers could promote American, European, Chinese or other context-specific criteria of comparison. Rather, the 24 national research teams and the international steering committee agreed on a set of questions (framing questions, core domains, policy issues) to address in each case study. Thus, what they succeeded in achieving was the establishment of a set of tertium comparationis, that is, a set of specific dimensions (for example, policy issues, levels of analysis) and constructs (democracy, national identity, and so on) that are context-sensitive and allow for comparison (see, for example, Hilker, 1964, p. 225). It cannot be overstated how important it was to discuss and sometimes argue at length about differences in the meaning of such concepts as “democracy”, “minority”, “national identity”, “human rights” and the many other politically and socially highly charged terms that are indispensable for describing civic education. There was a considerable amount of perseverance in discussing and reflecting on a set of tertium comparationis that would be relevant and applicable across contexts.

Moreover, although the participants and informants for this study were encouraged to propose and discuss multiple, competing concepts of democracy, it is important to note that the study was done by a more or less self-selected group of countries, research institutions and researchers, all of whom brought to the study their own beliefs about what democracy does and does not entail. The participants turned out to have a shared operational definition of democracy as requiring in some measure certain individual and group political rights, certain mechanisms for holding political élites accountable to a broader citizenry, and certain assumptions about what practices do and do not conform to the rule of law. In essence, researchers in this study did not proceed to design the study in a manner that would accept as valid the concept of democracy as “dictatorship of the proletariat” as institutionalized in the Leninist, Stalinist and post-Stalinist Soviet Union and other formerly communist countries. (In contrast, the participants did disagree over the extent to which democracy also involves social welfare rights for individuals or groups.) This agreement on some form of representative democracy as imperfectly institutionalized in the participating countries and as conceptualized by political scientists was further reinforced by a methodological consideration. It would have been ethically and practically impossible to conduct either the qualitative or the quantitative phase of the study in the countries where it is impossible to ensure a certain minimal freedom of expression to respondents and informants when their views are contrary to those of ruling élites and other dominant groups.

Selection of Cases

Except for Lee and Schwille and Amadeo, all other authors in this volume focus on a few selected cases for which they clearly state their sampling criteria.
When reviewing their sampling procedures, it becomes obvious that their definition of “what is a case?” (see Ragin & Becker, 1992) varies substantially. Several authors (Lee, Schville & Amadeo, Mintrop, Kerr) utilize the country case studies as units of analysis for cross-national comparison, whereas others (Steiner-Khamsi, Mâtraï) regard the country case studies as bounded systems that represent different models of citizenship or civic education. As a result, the latter group of authors uses the “causal web” (Tilly, 1997, p. 49) of a case study “to make a case” for or against particular theoretical models of citizenship or civic education.

What is also remarkable is that most authors use sampling criteria that clearly reflect the design of contrastive analysis (Berg-Schlesser, 2002). The cases they select are those that they perceive to be “most different” from each other with regard to political system, educational system, or other criteria. However, most qualitative cross-national researchers tend to choose studies of “concomitant variation,” thus selecting systems or cases that they perceive to be similar. The “most similar systems” design, elaborated in more detail by Przeworski and Teune (1970, p. 32 ff.), would have led to naming only those “most similar systems” that were numerically well represented in the IEA Civic Education Study, such as the post-communist countries or Western European cases. The purpose of the “most similar systems” design is to explain different outcomes in systems that are otherwise similar. In other words, it is easier to posit the effects of particular independent variables in a “most similar systems” cross-national analysis design where the contexts are similar except for the variable(s) in question. Nevertheless, all authors of this volume opt for the “most different systems” design, a design resulting perhaps from a temptation to make use of the international scope of the IEA Civic Education Study, which generated case studies from all continents except Africa. Berg-Schlesser (2002) provides a useful overview of comparative qualitative research designs. The $2 \times 2$ matrix, presented in Fig. 2, distinguishes between similarity of systems (cases) and predictions with regard to outcomes (variables).

All of the authors in this volume who reduced the sample of cases (Mintrop, Mâtraï, Kontogiannopoulos-Polydorides, Steiner-Khamsi) apply a contrastive method based on the “most different systems and different outcomes” design. Steiner-Khamsi, for example, selects the Hong Kong, Romanian and United States cases because they appeared to differ, as based on a prior literature review, with regard to their conceptions of citizenship. Furthermore, she expects to find different outcomes with regard to civic education curricula.

Two of the authors (Kontogiannopoulos-Polydorides, Mintrop) utilize a fascinating mixed-sampling design. Kontogiannopoulos-Polydorides selects a two-step approach to reducing the sample size and the number of variables. In a first step, she distinguishes between political systems that are most different: ex-communist countries, capitalist countries with a politically active citizenry, and capitalist countries with a politically apathetic or passive citizenry. She expects to find vast differences or outcomes between these groups of countries. This first procedure of her sampling design reflects the “most different cases with different outcomes” design (MDDO). In addition, she establishes sub-groups for each of the three clusters on the assumption that variations exist within clusters of political systems. Thus, the second sampling procedure is one of “most similar cases with different outcomes” (MSDO). The result of her two-step sampling procedure is as follows:

- **Cluster 1**: Ex-communist countries: Bulgaria, Hungary and the eastern part of Germany.
- **Cluster 2**: Western-type democracies with a politically active citizenry: Greece, Italy and Portugal.
- **Cluster 3**: Western-type democracies with a politically apathetic or passive citizenry: the western part of Germany, the Netherlands and the United States.

One could assert that the second procedural step is unnecessary and risks encountering problems of “over-determination” because it is assumed that each case that has already been selected in the first step is, per definition of “case”, representative of other cases in the same group. It is common to assume that different cases within a larger political system, for example, ex-communist countries, are methodologically homogeneous, that is, constitute “most similar cases with similar outcomes” (MSSO). Kontogiannopoulos-Polydorides, however, rejects from the outset that assumption of homogeneity or essentialism and makes a case for examining within-system or intra-system variations as well. Because of her specific definition of case as a unit of analysis rather than in terms of the methodological sense, where a case is regarded as representative of other similar contexts, her cross-national analysis is, by necessity, much more extensive and longer than the other studies presented in this volume.

![Fig. 2. Sampling Design in Research Using the Case Study Format.](image-url)
Also deserving of particular mention here is that Mintrop, for different reasons, applies a similar sampling design that generates double-occupancy for three of the four “cases” or contexts. For him, the “cases” (in the sense of case study methodology) are “clusters” of one or two country case studies. Thus, the country case studies are not “cases” but rather units of analysis. He selects four clusters of countries based on geographical and cultural distribution as well as the completeness and quality of data: two Asian case studies, two Eastern European case studies, two Western European case studies, and one American case study. Except for the Americas, in which he had to restrict himself to the United States case study because of insufficient data from the other case study from the region, he selects two case studies for each context (“case”), thereby following a MDSO (“most different cases and most similar outcomes”) design. Unlike Kontagianpoulou-Polydorides, however, Mintrop pursues the double-occupancy for the Asian, Eastern European and Western European “cases” for purposes of reliability and robustness of his interpretations.

Multilevel Qualitative Analysis

Civic education lends itself to multilevel qualitative analysis because it is a ubiquitous, multi-layered concept that cuts across different subject matters, is located in both formal and non-formal education, and is offered within formal education in curricular and extra-curricular programs. Furthermore, it is defined by many stakeholders (governmental organizations, political organizations, social movements, non-governmental organizations, churches, businesses), who continuously contest one another’s views on what constitutes good citizenship and valuable civic knowledge, and on which civic-related knowledge, skills and attitudes should be taught in schools. The Octagon Model (Fig. 1) illustrates this multilevel nature of civic education.

In analyzing different layers or levels of civic education, the authors of this volume expected to find either “conflicting viewpoints and alternative interpretations” among the various actors of civic education (see, for example, LeTendre, Mintrop, Kontagianpoulou-Polydorides), or different weight and status attributed to civic education at the various levels of an educational system (see, for example, Schwille & Amadeo, Kerr). We would like to highlight Kerr’s cross-national analysis as an example of multilevel qualitative analysis. Kerr first applies three sets of interpretive frameworks to analyze four layers of civic education policy, and then applies this analysis to nine different contexts or countries (“cases”). The three sets of interpretive frameworks, as based on his review of literature, comprise the following.

**Interpretative framework:**

(A) Continuum of citizenship: From minimal conception (civic education) to maximal conception (citizenship education).

(B) Education about citizenship, education through citizenship, and education for citizenship.

(C) Values-explicit versus values-neutral citizenship.

In the terminology of comparative studies, we refer to the three sets of interpretative frameworks as three sets of tertium comparationis than enable Kerr to compare different contexts/cases.

**Layers of civic education policy:** Kerr uses these three interpretive frameworks as a lens through which to examine the following four layers of civic education policy:

(1) Curriculum aims, organization and structure.
(2) Teaching and learning approaches.
(3) Teacher specialization and teacher training.
(4) Use of textbooks and other resources.

**Context/cases:** The third dimension relates to the nine contexts (cases): Australia, Canada, England, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United States.

Kerr’s design can best be illustrated with reference to Bray and Thomas’s (1995) three-dimensional graphical presentation of a multi-level analysis design (see Fig. 3). Figure 4 displays Kerr’s triangulation method, which allows him to apply, the same multi-level analysis design (see the cube in the figure) for the three different sources of data. In his text, Kerr analyses and discusses congruence and incongruence between his three multi-level data analyses.

**Toward an Initial Integration of the Two Phases**

Now that data have been collected and published for both phases of the IEA Civic Education Study – the qualitative first phase and quantitative second phase – it is possible to move toward a synthesis that will show more precisely how the two phases complement each other. The qualitative phase proved essential for developing international survey instruments for Phase 2. In addition, without denying that the first phase stands on its own, study researchers have also intended that it should provide a context in which to situate and explain further the findings of the second phase. The second phase, in turn, permits a more precise assessment of the extent to which certain findings of the first phase can
be generalized to the countries in question and, in particular, to the national samples of their students and teachers. In many cases this comparison will enable researchers to quantify variation among countries that is evident but not precisely measured in Phase 1. As Mintrop points out in this volume, despite efforts to examine all major competing points of view in the case studies, these studies still largely represent the views of chosen experts in civic education. In certain cases, it is not clear that experts representing opposition movements were as well represented in the expert panels and the findings of the studies as was desired. For all these reasons, it is important to examine the Phase 2 analyses (Torney-Purta et al., 2001).

One example that can be mentioned is gender. Gender receives little mention in the case studies. As is usual in such cases, lack of mention raises the question of whether researchers ignored the issue or whether that issue turned out to be less important than might have been expected. Two points favor the latter conclusion. One is that relationship of gender to civic education was the focus of one of the original 18 framing questions that all countries had to address initially in their first case study responses. But more convincing is the
fact that in the Phase 2 data, gender differences are few and generally modest
in size (for example, in the civic knowledge scores).

To provide another example of the relation between Phase 1 and 2 findings,
one can use Phase 2 data on the extent to which teachers and students agree
that patriotism and national loyalty are learned in school. Written before the
Phase 2 data were available, Schwille and Amadeo’s chapter in this volume
emphasizes variation among countries with respect to the school’s role in
national identity formation. The authors reported:

Responses to questions about national identity among case study countries are extremely
varied and reflect a myriad of national needs, concerns and issues (both historical and
contemporary). They range from viewing the promotion of national identity as a key aspect
of civic education to seeing it as something to be cautiously treated or even avoided in
school. At the extreme, national identity has become a problematical, even negative concept.

In that chapter, Germany and Italy are cited as examples of the avoidance
tendency, and in Switzerland the experts consulted for the case study ques-
tioned and opposed use of the term “national identity” altogether.

The Phase 2 data clearly reflect a similar variation in views concerning
national identity. In 14 countries a very high percentage of weighted teacher
responses agree that students learn patriotism and national loyalty in school.
Forty-eight percent or more of students in each of these countries also agree.
But in five countries less than half the weighted teacher responses and less than
half of the students agree with this item. These countries include Germany and
Switzerland. In Italy the situation was mixed, with students tending to agree
with and teachers to disagree with this item.

A similar comparison with a more nuanced conclusion can be made for a
central finding of Phase 1, namely, that the experts and stakeholders interviewed
largely agreed that civic education should go beyond knowledge acquisition to
a participatory and experiential learning of democracy that emphasizes critical
thinking by an active citizenry. In Phase 2 data collected from teachers and
students there is also much support for this point of view. However, Phase 2
data also show considerable support for more traditional aspects of civic education.
In fact, on the basis of the first Phase 2 analyses, this latter tendency
appears somewhat stronger than one might have predicted from the qualitative
case studies. The traditional aspects of civic education that are salient in Phase 2
include the following:

- the already mentioned belief in most of the countries that patriotism and
  national loyalty are learned in school;
- the strong curriculum emphasis on the centrality of national history to the
  teaching of civic education;
- the fact that the courts and the police are, across countries, the most trusted
  government-related institutions; and
- substantial support in many countries for serving in the military and working
  hard as attributes of citizenship.

This discrepancy is not surprising given the role of experts in Phase 1 to try
to move the field toward the more participatory and experiential approach.
Again, this role was somewhat more predominant than would have been the
case if all major competing points of view had been adequately represented in
each of the cases.

Much more needs to be done to provide a more adequate synthesis of Phases
1 and 2. The point here is that the cross-national analyses of Phase 1 reported
in this volume contain insights, make claims, offer hypotheses and raise ques-
tions that, if considered in the further analysis of Phase 2, will greatly enrich
the analyses and the impact of the study as a whole.

THE INTERPLAY OF CONSTRUCTS AND DATA:
TOWARD THEORIES OF CIVIC EDUCATION

Ragin’s assertion that “[s]everal basic features of the comparative approach make
it a good strategy for advancing theory” (1994, p. 111) might be related to two
kinds of experiences that several of the authors had when preparing their analysis.

First, most of the authors found it indispensable to identify an interpretive
framework for anchoring their cross-national analyses. They depended on
a framework, in most cases developed from a review of literature in political
science, sociology or political philosophy, that allowed them to focus on particular
aspects or “chains of causality” contained in the various cases. Without a theoreti-
cal foundation, they would have drowned in an ocean of data, descriptions or
“variables.” It appears that qualitative comparative research forces us to explicitly
state the interpretive framework from which we are operating.

Second, in qualitative cross-national analysis, there is room for dealing with
surprises, that is, unexpected findings that can subsequently be used to re-frame
a research question. In short, the case study material “talked back.” As
mentioned in the previous section, while reviewing the qualitative database,
three of the authors (Lee, Kontogiannopoulos-Polydorides and Steiner-Khamsi),
for example, found the original conceptual framework of the IEA Civic
Education Study too narrow. On the basis of their independently conducted case
study analyses, they suggested extending the original conceptual framework by
including economic and supranational aspects of citizenship. They noticed that
although the case studies were supposed to “speak” exclusively to the three
specific domains of citizenship (democracy, national identity, diversity/social cohesion) previously identified (in international meetings with all national research teams) as relevant for all country contexts, many case studies “talked back”. The case studies also addressed other topics and domains that were not among the three major domains of the framing questions of the study. For example, most case studies stressed the economic dimension of civic education curricula (free market economy, unemployment/right to work, global economy, external trade, and the like). In addition, the European cases reflected the relatively recent debate about new, supranational models of citizenship such as “European citizenship”. Thus, although these two domains did not fit the original conceptual framework of the IEA Civic Education Study, they were brought into focus when qualitative data from the case studies were reviewed.

In many regards, qualitative researchers experience the same methodological challenges of cross-national data analysis that quantitative researchers in comparative education experience. Both need to deal, to various degrees, with problems of sampling, reducing data, validity and reliability, to list but a few of the most obvious tasks. However, there is one additional challenge that qualitative comparative researchers face. When they analyze their case study material cross-nationally, they must ensure that the “texture” of the case study material is not harmed. The material needs a different treatment than, for example, open-ended questions in a survey. Case studies are coherent stories, wrapped in theory. They tell us something about causal relations in a bounded system and are much more contextual than are all open-ended questions combined in a survey. Not losing sight of contextuality, that is, not diluting “thick descriptions” so that they become “thin descriptions”, during the process of comparison, appears to be a challenge that only qualitative comparative researchers are privileged to have.
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INTRODUCTION

The IEA Civic Education Study, launched in 1995, was designed as a two-phase study. The first phase adopted a qualitative study approach, which served the role of obtaining contextual information on citizenship education in the participating countries. The information obtained in the first phase was expected to facilitate the development of survey instruments in the second phase of the study. In the first phase of the study, all participating countries provided background information on recent political, economic and social situations, the education system, civic education curricula, and the obstacles and challenges to civic education development, as well as the findings of textbook analyses and interviews with various stakeholders. Information to be obtained in relation to citizenship focused on three major domains of questions: democracy, national identity, and social cohesion and diversity. A fourth domain covered three additional questions of which the country could choose one, that is, environmental issues, mass media or economic mechanisms.

The first product of the first phase study was a collection of country reports with an introductory overview by the editors (Torney-Putra et al., 1999). Further analyses of the country reports are being conducted, and this chapter represents