EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 Introduction

Background to and goal of the study

At the Lisbon European Council in March 2000, a strategic goal was set for 2010 for the European Community 'to become the most competitive market and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion'. Investment in human resources is necessary in order to realise this goal. Active citizenship is a central issue in the Lisbon programme.

In the Communication 'Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality', the European Commission promoted three major pillars, one of which is 'learning for active citizenship'. In the 'Detailed work programme on the follow-up of education and training systems in Europe', the European Council formulated 13 objectives related to the Lisbon programme. Objective 2.3 is 'supporting active citizenship, equal opportunities and social cohesion'. The key issue mentioned in the work programme regarding active citizenship is 'to ensure that the learning of democratic values and democratic participation by all is effectively promoted in order to prepare people for active citizenship'.

The progress made in the Member States of the European Union regarding the promotion of active citizenship has to be monitored. To this end, indicators for active citizenship and citizenship education are needed. The European Commission, DG Education and Culture, decided to carry out a study in which key indicators would be identified and the availability of good quality data would be assessed.

In full, the objectives of this study were fourfold:

- To identify information needs and to propose indicators for on active citizenship and citizenship education.
- To assess data availability and identify key data gaps.
- To analyse existing data on selected indicators and describe current trends and figures.
- To make methodological proposals on new data to be collected.

2 Definition of active citizenship and identification of indicators

Active citizenship

The central element in the EU policy goals in the field of active citizenship is participation. Participation is therefore central in our definition of active citizenship. Different normative viewpoints of citizenship are found both in academic literature and in policy documents. The EU perspective on active citizenship was leading in the choice of a definition for this study. Thus, the description of active citizenship used in this study is by no means universal or value-free. There is a normative connotation to the kind of participation that, according to EU policy, should be promoted. It is characterized by tolerance, non-violence and the acknowledgement of the rule of law and of human rights.

Active citizenship is participation, but participation in what? Central in many publications on citizenship is civil society. Civil society is perceived as associational life, or all associations and networks between family and the state in which membership and activities are voluntary. The analysis of policy documents and literature on civil society and political participation resulted in the definition of active citizenship as:

> Political participation and participation in associational life characterized by tolerance and non-violence and the acknowledgement of the rule of law and human rights.

Indicators of active citizenship

Seven indicators for active citizenship were derived from this definition of active citizenship (figure 1). We refer to indicators of active citizenship as outcome indicators, since they are regarded as the outcome of citizenship education.

Figure 1 Indicators for active citizenship (outcome indicators)

Voluntary work in organisations and networks
Organising activities for the community
Voting in elections
Participation in political parties
Participation in interest groups
Participation in forms of peaceful protest
Participation in public debate

Indicators of citizenship education

In order to be able to participate, citizens have to acquire knowledge, attitudes, values and skills. These preconditions for active citizenship are ideally the results - or output - of citizenship education. Therefore, we have identified them as output indicators of citizenship education. In order to promote the acquisition or learning of these preconditions, citizenship

education has to transfer the knowledge, attitudes, values and skills concerned. Besides these educational attainment goals, the educational culture is very important for active citizenship education. An open classroom climate in which there is room for discussion, for instance, enhances civic knowledge and engagement. Also, if the school offers possibilities for learning by participating in school decision-making or in the wider community, this contributes to involvement and citizenship skills. Culture in education is not strictly input, but a pedagogical approach for the transfer of knowledge, attitudes, values and skills. The attainment goals and culture of education together are referred to as input indicators. The input and output indicators for active citizenship are presented in figure 2.

Figure 2 Indicators for citizenship education (input and output indicators)

	Input indicators	Output indicators
Transfer of knowledge	Background knowledge Factual knowledge Functional knowledge	Background knowledge Factual knowledge Functional knowledge
Transfer of attitudes	Political efficacy Political trust Political interest	Political efficacy Political trust Political interest
Transfer of values	Tolerance Non-violence Acknowledging rule of law Acknowledging human rights	Tolerance Non-violence Acknowledging rule of law Acknowledging human rights
Transfer of skills	Critical reading skills Debating skills Writing skills Critical listening skills Empathic skills Social skills	Critical reading skills Debating skills Writing skills Critical listening skills Empathic skills Social skills
Culture in education	Classroom climate Teaching methods Assessment methods Opportunities to participate in and have an influence on school Opportunities to participate in the community through school	

Citizenship education is not something that is limited to formal and secondary education. The indicators identified also apply to non-formal or informal education, and to all levels of education including adult education. We assessed the extent to which existing data sources provide data to measure the indicators in a lifelong learning perspective. Most of the results regarding input and output indicators, however, focus on secondary education, because this is the subject of existing data sources.

The relation between input, output and outcome of citizenship education can be seen as a cycle model. Active citizenship (outcome) is important for the acquisition of skills (input). Indicators for active citizenship are therefore at the same time indicators for non-formal learning. However, for the sake of conceptual clarity, we discuss these indicators only as outcome indicators

3 International data sources on active citizenship: availability and quality

Five international datasets were selected for the study because they contain data that could be used to measure the identified indicators. They might also be used as survey vehicle and might adopt new instruments to measure indicators. These are the Civic Education Study (CivEd), the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) survey, the European Social Survey (ESS), the Eurobarometer surveys and the World Values Study (WVS). To assess their usefulness, the data sources were studied closely on such aspects as methodological quality (which is essential for international comparability) and country coverage.

Citizenship education and active citizenship should be monitored preferably in all the EU Member States, the acceding and candidate countries and the EEA/EFTA countries. Not all these countries are covered by each of the data sources that were selected. The CivEd study on 14-year-olds contains information from 21 of the relevant countries, while PISA covers 23 countries. The second and fourth waves of the World Values Study have a much better coverage than waves one and three of this survey. Of all 31 countries that we need to have data for, wave two covers 25 countries and wave four 28, as opposed to 14 countries in waves one and three. The European Social Survey covers 20 countries in its first round and 22 in its second round (third round participation is not available yet). The Standard Eurobarometer covers all the EU member states.

The quality of CivEd, the European Social Survey, the World Values Survey and especially PISA seems high, judged by the extensive procedures that were taken with regard to sampling, the development of instruments and translation, and response rates. With regard to the response rates in the World Values Survey, the results are somewhat problematic, since the response rate of six countries is unknown. The ESS data is preferred to the WVS data because of better overall response rates. Translation procedures in the World Values Survey are also less extensive and less meticulous than the translation procedures in CivEd and the ESS, and therefore could be improved. Because of the lack of technical information on the Eurobarometer surveys, it is not possible to judge the quality of this study.

Sampling procedures in CivEd could be improved by stratifying the sample in some countries according to school type. This refers to those countries in which students in the target population (14-year-olds) can be found in different school types. Random sampling instead of stratification can result in a sample of schools in which certain school types are underrepresented.

4 Operationalisation of indicators

Input indicators

Some of the input indicators of citizenship education we identified are not measured in the CivEd study of 1999. These are indicators for the transfer of values and attitudes, and indicators for the transfer of skills. Some of the indicators are covered in the CivEd questionnaire, but their operationalisation was judged not appropriate for monitoring active citizenship education as defined. This concerns indicators for the transfer of knowledge. Two input indicators of citizenship education are well operationalised by CivEd, namely classroom climate and teaching methods. Two other indicators are measured rather appropriately by CivEd, but their operationalisation could further be improved. These indicators are 'Assessment methods' and 'Opportunities for students to participate in and have an influence on their school'.

PISA and a report on citizenship education by the Eurydice network both measure some of the input indicators as well. For instance, in PISA we found questions related to the input indicators 'Classroom climate for discussion', 'Assessment methods' and 'Opportunities for students to participate in and have an influence on their school'. However, the input indicators for which data are not available in CivEd are not measured in any other existing international data source. Thus for these indicators, data gaps exist.

Output indicators

Political and civic knowledge is measured only in CivEd. The IEA civic knowledge test consists of items that refer to knowledge of content and items that refer to skills in interpretation. In other words, the indicators 'Background knowledge' and 'Critical reading skills' are combined in one scale. If it is preferred to measure these indicators separately, new scales would have to be developed.

All the indicators with regard to attitudes are measured in CivEd. For the adult education level, data from the ESS and the Eurobarometer surveys can be used to measure the attitudinal indicators.

CivEd contains no questions on the values that we have identified as output indicators, but the World Values Study and the Eurobarometer surveys offer data to measure tolerance among adults. However, only tolerance towards people or groups is measured and not tolerance of ideas.

Hardly any output indicators related to skills are covered by the CivEd study. As described above, the only skills that CivEd has questions on are 'critical reading skills'. These questions seem useful as an operationalisation of this indicator. PISA does offer material that could be used for the measurement of other skills as well (writing and debating skills), but it is questionable if data on particular tasks in PISA can be used separate from the other tasks that together measure reading ability. The studies that contain data on adults do not measure skills.

Availability of data from a lifelong learning perspective

Monitoring citizenship education has to take place in the framework of lifelong learning, because the EU wants to monitor citizenship education at different levels of formal education as well as non-formal and informal learning. For some output indicators, the European Social Survey, the World Values Study and the Eurobarometer surveys offer data on adults, particularly on such attitudes as political interest and trust. Other than secondary education, no other educational level is covered by any data source.

With CivEd being the main source of international data on indicators for citizenship education, no international data are available for input indicators on citizenship education in primary education, vocational education, tertiary education or adult learning. Nor are international data available on non-formal or informal learning (except in the case of learning through participation, for which the ESS, WVS and Eurobarometer contain data. These are discussed below).

Indicators for active citizenship

The indicators for active citizenship identified in this study are to a large extent covered by existing survey vehicles, namely the European Social Survey (ESS), the World Values Study (WVS) and the Eurobarometer surveys. However, two indicators for active citizenship are not covered by any of them: 'Organising for the community' and 'Participation in public debate'.

No dataset is available that covers all indicators for active citizenship, although the ESS is more complete than the others. With regard to the operationalisation of indicators, the ESS performs better than the WVS or the Eurobarometer surveys, whereas the methodological quality of both the WVS and the ESS is high. In order to function as the sole dataset for the

EU with indicators on active citizenship, the ESS would have to be improved on some points (provided the EC can influence the decisions taken on the ESS). The indicators for voluntary work and membership of interest groups should be included in the core part of the questionnaire instead of the optional part, and the two missing indicators for active citizenship mentioned above would have to be added.

5 Monitoring input and output of citizenship education in the future

We have concluded that for active citizenship, good quality data are available even though some adjustments might be worthwhile. The monitoring of citizenship education is more problematic. For output indicators, there are data on adults available in ESS, WVS and the Eurobarometer surveys. For young people data on only a limited number of output indicators are available through CivEd. For a even smaller number of input indicators at the level of formal education there are data available. What is available is mainly collected by CivEd.
It is important to stress the fact that there is a lack of knowledge about the causal relationship between active citizenship and citizenship education. Therefore it is difficult to judge the relevance of good input and output indicators. Good indicators for citizenship education would give a picture of the extent to which active citizenship is effectively promoted by citizenship education. Many elements of citizenship education are thought to have an impact on active citizenship but there is little empirical evidence for this. Since only some of the identified indicators for citizenship education could provide the EC with information on the extent to which active citizenship is effectively promoted, the value of monitoring citizenship education can be questioned.

If the EC decides to monitor citizenship education anyway, there are three ways to do so: a monitor for citizenship education by an adaptation of CivEd, a completely new monitor for citizenship education, or monitoring citizenship education among young adults through an extension of the ESS. The last option involves an oversample of young people in the ESS survey. We have analysed the advantages and disadvantages of these three options.

Our main focus in the discussion below is on solutions for the lack on data at the level of formal education. Data collection in each of the three options presented can be combined with monitoring through existing data. Output indicators are measured at the adult level in ESS, WVS and the Eurobarometer surveys, so it is relatively easy to use these. Furthermore, if efforts are made to develop a special module in ESS measuring input and output indicators among young people, the same could be done to measure non-formal and informal learning and adults. These data could even be combined with data resulting from an adapted IEA study on citizenship education. This would however involve an effort to have two survey

vehicles adapted to EC needs. Another possibility would be to try to develop a survey among young people in ESS (the last option in figure 3) and combine it with a) data collection on non-formal and informal learning and adults in the same survey vehicle and b) existing data already collected in ESS on output indicators among adults.

Expected costs

We cannot give an indication with regard to the absolute costs for each of the options presented. We do have expectations about the relative costs, though. A new monitor would definitely be the most expensive, because it would require the development not only of a completely new instrument but also of an infrastructure for the implementation of the study (unless such an infrastructure could be found). ESS and IEA already have this infrastructure. A monitor by the IEA would cost least since it already contains operationalisations for some of the indicators. Furthermore, the additional costs for the new monitor and the new module in ESS are determined by the fact that data have to be collected. The size of the sample in each of these options has to be about 500 students or youngsters in each country.

Involved levels of education

The new monitor will focus on upper secondary education, the new IEA study would focus on lower secondary education. In the ESS study, also students with other levels of education will be involved, for instance vocational education or tertiary education. In that respect, a study performed by the ESS is preferable. The least preferable in this respect is the IEA, since it focuses on students from lower secondary education.

Burden to collect data for EU countries

Studies like those from the OECD or IEA need national coordination to be implemented. The burden for member states and other countries involved in monitoring active citizenship education should be as limited as possible. To have a new monitor through which additional data are being collected, increases the burden for countries. Therefore, existing survey vehicles are preferable also from the perspective of work load and the need for coordination by countries. The third option, an youth sample in ESS, does involve new data collection but since schools are not involved in the sample, we expect that no state involvement is necessary in this option.

Expected influence of EC on coverage of indicators of citizenship education

The possibilities for having an impact on the input indicators in the monitor for citizenship education would be the most limited in the case of a monitor performed by the ESS. The possibilities would be limited because the sample of this monitor would not contain teachers. Apart from this, the EC could only make proposals for what it would like to include, like in the case of an IEA monitor or an adaptation of CivEd. A regional module for Europe, which will probably be developed in the new IEA study on citizenship en civics, might allow the EC to have more influence, possibly even on the content of the questionnaire. The decision on what to include in the studies of both the ESS and the IEA would be made by an independent board. When developing a new monitor, of course, the decisions on the content of the monitor would be made by the EC.

The effort for the EC

The development of a new monitor would demand a lot of effort from the EC. The efforts that the EC would have to make to have a monitor developed by the IEA or within the ESS are hard to determine. It would to a large extent depend on the contacts that exist between the EU and these organisations.

Expected representativeness of the samples

Since the sampling procedures for a monitor performed by the IEA and those for a new monitor would include the sampling of schools, these samples would probably be more representative of students than the samples that would be produced by the ESS. The sampling procedures used to get a representative sample of the population as a whole do not necessarily provide samples that are representative of students from different school types or levels.

The advantages and disadvantages of each of the monitoring options are summarised in figure 3.

Figure 3 Advantages and disadvantages of the different monitoring options

Aspects of monitoring	*Adaptation of IEA*	*New monitor*	*New module in ESS*
Measurement of input indicators	Limited	Full	Partial
Measurement of output indicators	Partial	Full	Almost full
Expected costs	Low	High	intermediate
Effort for the EC	Intermediate	High	Intermediate
Availability of new data	In medium term	In long term	In medium/long term
Frequency of measurement	Low or uncertain*	As required (every three or four years)	Higher than required
Involved levels of education	Lower secondary formal	Secondary and higher, formal and non/informal	Secondary and higher, formal and non/informal
Target population	14 year olds in lower secondary education,	16- and 17 year olds in upper secondary education	Cross section of 18-year olds
Burden for EU countries	No additional burden	Additional burden to collect data	No additional burden
Expected impact of EC on indicators	Possible	NA	Possible
Representativeness of sample	High	High	Limited