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ICCS

• Preparing young people to undertake their roles as citizens

• Two dimensions of civics & citizenship
  – Student knowledge and understanding
  – Attitudes, perceptions and activities

• Focus of ICCS reporting
  – International comparisons
  – Variations within countries
  – Factors explaining variation
Study development

- 2006: Development of assessment framework
- 2006-2007: Instrument development
- 2007: International field trial
- 2008: Final revision of instruments
- 2008-2009: Main survey data collection
- 2010-2011: Reporting phase
ICCS Assessment Framework

Data collection

• Southern Hemisphere school calendar
  – October 2008 - December 2008

• Northern Hemisphere school calendar
  – February - May 2009

• Three countries on SH school calendar tested at beginning of new school year
  – Results were annotated in reporting tables
How data were gathered

• Random samples
  – Schools
  – Teachers
  – Students

• Students
  – A test of knowledge and understanding
  – A questionnaire about attitudes

• Teachers and principals
  – Questions on aspects of civic and citizenship education
  – Questions on school characteristics/climate

• National centres
  – Questions about policy and practice
Regional modules

- Successful implementation of additional data collection targeted at aspect relevant in geographic regions
- Regional student instrument administered after international instruments
- Europe: 24 countries
- Latin America: Six countries
- Asia: Five countries
Scope of ICCS

• How many units of analysis?
  – 38 countries
  – 140,000 students
  – 5,000 schools
  – 62,000 teachers

• How many international items?
  – 80 cognitive items
  – 173 student questionnaire items
  – 114 school questionnaire items
  – 102 teacher questionnaire items
Quality Control - 1

• Adaptation review
  – Discussion of National Adaptations with International Study Centre (ISC)

• Translation verification
  – Review of translation by language experts (organised by IEA Secretariat)

• Layout verification
  – Final optical check by ISC
Quality Control - 2

- International quality monitoring
  - Organised by IEA Secretariat
  - ~15 schools per country visited
- National quality monitoring
  - Organised by national centres
  - Recommended to visit 10% of tested schools
- Re-verification of specific items
  - Translation checks for items that behaved differently (after scaling analysis)
Data Processing

• IEA DPC received data files and undertook cleaning, weighting and computation of item statistics

• ISC at ACER:
  – Analysis of item dimensionality
  – Scaling analysis
  – Item adjudication
  – Final scaling
  – Analysis for reporting tables
Sampling outcomes - 1

Sample participation categories

1. Reached before inclusion of replacement schools > no annotation
2. Reached after inclusion of replacement schools > annotation
3. Not reached even after inclusion of replacement schools > reporting in separate section of tables
Sampling outcomes - 2

- Country data in category 3 were not included in the reporting tables but displayed in a separate section

- Student survey adjudication
  - 8 countries reached requirement only after replacement
  - 2 countries did not meet minimum sample participation requirements
Sampling outcomes - 3

• Generally more problems with teacher participation
• Separate adjudication and reporting rules for student and teacher survey
• Teacher survey adjudication
  – 5 countries reached requirement only after replacement
  – 9 countries failed to meet sampling participation requirements
  – Two countries were not included in report
Outputs of ICCS - 1

- Initial Findings (released 29 June 2010)
- Extended international report (end November 2010)
- European report (end November 2010)
- Latin American report (early 2011)
- Asian report (early 2011)
Outputs of ICCS - 2

• ICCS International database and user guide (end November 2010)
• Technical report (early 2011)
• ICCS Encyclopaedia (early 2011)
Report on initial findings

Report on initial findings - contents

• National contexts for civic and citizenship education
• Assessment results for students’ civic knowledge
• Results on selected student perceptions and behaviours
• School and community contexts
• Influence of family background on civic knowledge and interest
Extended international report

- To be released end of November 2010
- More detailed results on student attitudes, perceptions and behaviours as well as on school and community context
- Multivariate analysis to explain civic knowledge and expected participation
Extended international report - contents

• Contexts for civic and citizenship education
  – NCS results and country statistics
• Students’ civic knowledge
• Students’ civic value beliefs and attitudes
• Students’ civic engagement
• The role of schools and communities
Extended international report - contents

• The influences of family background
  – Bivariate association
  – Multiple regression models

• Explaining variation in learning outcomes
  – Two-level regression analysis for civic knowledge
  – Multiple regression analysis for expected participation as adults
Summary of ICCS results
Educating for Citizenship

- Different approaches to citizenship education evident
- Approaches include teaching it as specific subject, integration into other subject and implementation as a cross-curricular theme
- Twenty-one of 38 countries have specific subject concerned with civic and citizenship education
Educating for Citizenship

• Topics most frequently emphasized in curriculum
  – Human rights (in 25 countries)
  – understanding different cultures and ethnic groups (in 23 countries)
  – the environment (in 23 countries)
  – parliament and government systems (22 countries)
  – voting and elections (20 countries)
Knowledge for citizenship

- Civic knowledge was broadly defined as encompassing reasoning and analysis as well as knowing facts.
- Included elements and concepts of citizenship as well as traditional civic education.
- International proficiency scale with mean of 500 across participating countries.
Knowledge for citizenship

• Considerable variation between participating countries
• Four countries not significantly different from ICCS average
• Average scores of 14 countries were significantly higher
• Average scores of 18 countries were significantly lower
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years of schooling</th>
<th>Average age</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>700</th>
<th>800</th>
<th>Average scale score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>576 (2.4) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark †</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>576 (3.6) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>565 (1.9) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Taipei</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>559 (2.4) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>537 (3.1) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>536 (4.7) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>534 (4.6) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland †</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>531 (3.8) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>531 (3.3) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>531 (3.3) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>528 (4.5) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525 (4.5) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England †</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>524 (4.4) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand †</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>524 (5.0) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>531 (2.7) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway †</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>531 (3.4) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Flemish) †</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>529 (4.7) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic †</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>528 (2.4) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>509 (3.8) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>506 (2.8) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>508 (4.1) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>508 (4.0) ▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>524 (4.5) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>442 (3.5) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>476 (4.0) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>447 (4.4) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>463 (2.2) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>466 (5.0) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>462 (2.9) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>453 (2.4) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>452 (2.8) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand †</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>452 (3.7) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>435 (3.8) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>433 (3.4) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>424 (3.4) ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>380 (2.4) ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge for citizenship

• Three proficiency levels were established

• Hierarchy of civic knowledge in terms of increasing sophistication
  – From engagement with fundamental principles and broad concepts to application of knowledge and evaluation or justification of policies
Knowledge for citizenship

• On average:
  – 28% were at Level 3
  – 31% at Level 2
  – 26% at Level 1
  – 16% below Level 1

• In four highest performing countries over half of students in highest level

• In four lowest performing countries over 70 percent in lowest level or below
Explaining civic knowledge

- Girls scored significantly higher in 31 out of 38 ICCS countries
- Larger gender differences found than in CIVED
- Broadened and more contextualised assessment domain
Changes since 1999

• Comparison of “civic content knowledge” for 15 countries with IEA CIVED study in 1999

• Indication that there was significant decline in seven countries and increase in one country (Slovenia)

• Caveat: Changes in test design and small number of link items!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years of Schooling</th>
<th>Mean Scale Score 2009</th>
<th>Average Age 2009</th>
<th>Mean Scale Score 1999</th>
<th>Average Age 1999</th>
<th>Differences between 1999 and 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104 (0.6)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>102 (0.5)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109 (0.7)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>108 (0.7)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95 (0.9)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>94 (0.5)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89 (0.7)</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>89 (0.6)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94 (0.6)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>94 (0.7)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100 (0.7)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>101 (0.7)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>-1 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91 (0.6)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>92 (0.9)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>-1 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland (German)†</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94 (1.0)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>95 (0.9)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-2 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85 (0.6)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>89 (0.8)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-4 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway †~</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>97 (0.8)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>103 (0.5)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>-5 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102 (0.8)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>109 (0.7)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>-7 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>103 (1.0)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>112 (1.3)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-9 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic¹</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97 (1.1)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>107 (0.6)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-10 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic †</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93 (0.5)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>103 (0.8)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-10 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88 (0.9)</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>99 (1.1)</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>-11 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>96 (0.0)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>100 (0.0)</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-4 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Countries with different survey periods in 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years of Schooling</th>
<th>Mean Scale Score 1999</th>
<th>Average Age 1999</th>
<th>Differences between 1999 and 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England² †</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90 (0.7)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-6 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden³</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98 (0.8)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score in 1999 higher: □
Score in 2009 higher: □
Student perceptions and behaviours

• ICCS measured student perceptions and behaviours relevant to civic and citizenship education
  – Value beliefs
  – Attitudes
  – Behavioural intentions
  – Behaviours
Value beliefs

• Overwhelming majorities of students tended to agree with statements reflecting basic democratic values

• Young people supported restrictions on media and more power to security agencies as reactions toward terror threats

• High ratings for importance of voting for being a good citizenship but not for joining political parties
Trust in institutions

• Only 40 percent of students expressed trust in political parties
• On average, 60 percent of students expressed trust in national government
• 75 percent stated trust in schools
• Considerable variation: In some countries students had higher levels of trust (in particular in Northern Europe)
Student preferences for political parties

• Students were asked whether they like one political party more than others
• On average, about half of the students did not express any preferences
• There were considerable differences between countries
Support for gender equality

- Similar results as in 1999 CIVED study
- On average over 90 percent agreed with positive statements regarding equal rights for gender groups
- Female students were significantly more supportive of gender equality than male students
Student interest in political and social issues

• Generally, student interest was greater in domestic political or social issues than in foreign issues or international politics
• Gender differences tended to be small
• Only smaller associations with parental occupational status and immigrant background but large association with parental interest in political/social issues
Active participation

- Student participation in the wider community (e.g. human rights association, political youth groups) was not very common
- Civic participation at school (debates, elections) was much more widespread
Expected participation in the future

- Large majorities (about 80%) expected to vote as adults in national elections
- Expectations to vote associated with higher civic knowledge and interest in political or social issues
- Only minorities of students expected more active forms of participation (like joining a political party or standing as candidate in local elections)
Teaching of civic and citizenship education

• School principals reported different approaches to teaching civic and citizenship education

• Only minorities of students (23% on average) were at schools with no specific provision for this learning area
Aims of civic and citizenship education

• Teachers were asked to name the three most important aims

• “Development of knowledge and skills” regarded as the most frequently mentioned aim

• Development of active participation not frequently named
  – Teachers teaching all subjects included in survey
School-based participation in local communities

- According to ICCS teacher survey target grade students frequently participate in community events
- Focused on sport events and cultural activities
- Only minorities of teachers report involvement in human rights projects or activities to help underprivileged people
Influences of family background

• Indicators of socioeconomic background were consistently associated with civic knowledge
  – Notable difference between countries!
• Smaller associations of civic knowledge with immigrant background and parental interest in social and political issues
• Strong association between home orientation and students’ interest in political and social issues
Explaining variation in civic knowledge

- Test language, gender, socioeconomic background, media use and discussions with parents important predictors at student level
- Important school-related student level predictors were expected further education, perceptions of openness in classroom discussions and experiences with voting
- School average SES most important school level predictor, school average of perceptions of openness in classroom significant in a number of countries
Explaining variation in expected participation

- Dependent variables: Expected electoral and active political participation
- Student background not so important
- Students’ self-beliefs and motivation as well as attitudes toward civic institutions associated with expected political participation
- Civic knowledge positive predictor of expected electoral participation
Looking across countries

• Comparing country-level variations of cognitive and affective-behavioural averages there were some interesting regional patterns

• A number of countries with very low levels of civic knowledge tended to have students with high scores on civic engagement (and vice versa)
European outcomes

- Generally higher levels of civic knowledge but considerable variation among European countries
- Basic facts on European Union well known but considerable variation for more test items measuring in-depth knowledge
- Strong sense of European identity and support for increased harmonization
- Low levels of participation in activities related to Europe
Latin American outcomes

• Not unexpectedly, lower levels of civic knowledge in these countries
• Students not supportive of authoritarian government and corrupt practices but many students prepared to justify dictatorships
• Many students experience verbal and physical abuse at schools and considerable minorities support use of violence
Outlook

- ICCS provides a rich database that will be available for secondary analyses
- Regional module data likely to further stimulate regional initiatives (in particular in Europe and Latin America)
- Baseline for further surveys on civic and citizenship education in the future
Thank you!