



This paper is taken from

*Lifelong Learning and Active Citizenship  
Proceedings of the twelfth Conference of the  
Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe  
Academic Network*

London: CiCe 2010

edited by Peter Cunningham and Nathan Fretwell, published in London by CiCe,  
ISBN 978-1-907675-01-0

Without explicit authorisation from CiCe (the copyright holder)

- only a single copy may be made by any individual or institution for the purposes of private study only
- multiple copies may be made only by
  - members of the CiCe Thematic Network Project or CiCe Association, or
  - a official of the European Commission
  - a member of the European parliament

If this paper is quoted or referred to it must always be acknowledged as

*Vamvakidou, I. et al (2010) Researching active citizenship and lifelong learning in CICE conference publications (1998-2008), in P. Cunningham & N. Fretwell (eds.) Lifelong Learning and Active Citizenship. London: CiCe, pp. 548 - 560*

© CiCe 2010

CiCe  
Institute for Policy Studies in Education  
London Metropolitan University  
166 – 220 Holloway Road  
London N7 8DB  
UK

This paper does not necessarily represent the views of the CiCe Network.



Lifelong Learning Programme

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

#### Acknowledgements:

This is taken from the book that is a collection of papers given at the annual CiCe Conference indicated. The CiCe Steering Group and the editor would like to thank

- All those who contributed to the Conference
- The CiCe administrative team at London Metropolitan University
- London Metropolitan University, for financial and other support for the programme, conference and publication
- The Lifelong Learning Programme and the personnel of the Education and Culture DG of the European Commission for their support and encouragement.

## **Researching active citizenship and life long learning in CICE conference publications (1998 – 2008)**

*Ifigenia Vamvakidou,<sup>1</sup> Argyris Kyridis,<sup>1</sup> Maria Troullou,<sup>1</sup> Maria Keramyda,<sup>1</sup> Julia Spinthourakis,<sup>2</sup> and Susana Goncalves<sup>3</sup>*

*<sup>1</sup>University of Western Macedonia (Greece), <sup>2</sup>University of Patras (Greece), <sup>3</sup>Escola Superior de Educação de Coimbra (Portugal)*

### **Abstract**

*The study is concerned with the diversity of ideas regarding Citizenship Education research and practice by scholars from different countries. Our research seeks to explore the different approaches taken with respect to Active Citizenship and Life long Learning as they appear in the CiCe conference publications proceedings (1998 to 2008). In order to identify the influential aspects around teaching and learning citizenship, we applied the Quantitative and Qualitative Content Analysis method to a sample of 184 abstracts of studies conducted by academic scholars between 1998 and 2008. The basic unit of analysis was considered the 'theme in the summaries' (Lasswell et al, 1952; Lasswell and Leites, 1965). The researched thematic categories give evidence for the content and the context of citizenship identity from an educational perspective. Whether national, European or global, citizenship identity combines several dimensions such as social, political, cultural, moral and/or economic and therefore its effective application to formal and non-formal educational environments appears to be a complex issue to investigate. Apart from the range and frequency of some of the most influential points and ideas concerning active citizenship and Life long Learning, we see the transition of interests and understandings that constitute the contemporary appreciation of citizenship identity and its development through teaching and learning.*

**Key words:** *Content Analysis, active citizenship, lifelong learning, citizenship education*

Citizenship consists in sharing a political community, and enjoying the benefits and assuming the political responsibilities that give effect to this shared experience. Our research aim is to explore the diversity of approaches and the variety of ideas in Citizenship Education research and practice with respect to Active Citizenship and Life Long Learning as they appear in the CiCe conference publications proceedings (1998 to 2008). For this purpose, we accessed the publications of the on-line Cice database looking for scholarship concerning teaching and learning active citizenship and life long learning. The final sample comprised of 184 abstracts written by scholars from different countries in the ten years of Cice studies.

The methodology applied was the Quantitative and Qualitative Content Analysis method (Grawitz, 1981). The basic unit of analysis was considered the theme in the title and in the summaries.

The abstracts were categorized in six thematic categories and the proceeded subcategories.

**Table 1: Distribution of the sample by year of publication**

Year of publication	f	%
1999-2000	11	6,0
2000-2001	17	9,2
2001-2002	27	14,7
2002-2003	26	14,1
2003-2004	20	10,9
2004-2005	38	20,7
2005-2006	17	9,2
2006-2007	22	12,0
2007-2008	6	3,3
Total	184	100,0

The analysis indicated 4.693 statements within 184 abstracts.

All abstracts were categorized by the year of publication.

The results are presented in table 1 (T.1).

The abstracts were also allocated in accordance to five geographical regions.

In the Mediterranean region were grouped the abstracts registered by authors who represented the states of: Greece, Turkey, Italy, Cyprus, Spain, Malta, Portugal.

**Table 2: Distribution of the sample by geographical region**

Geographical region	f	%
Mediterranean	39	21,2
Central Europe	55	29,9
Northern Europe	79	42,9
Non- European country	2	1,1
Bilateral or more	9	4,9
Total	184	100,0

The second category, the geographical area of Central Europe, consisted of Poland, Czech Republic, Romania, Slovenia Hungary, Netherlands, France, Slovak Republic, Germany, Austria and Belgium.

Additionally, the region of Northern Europe included the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, UK, Sweden, Denmark, Ireland and Iceland.

The fourth category was introduced in order to cover the cases were the participants represented countries outside the European Community, such as the U.S.A. and Australia.

According to the sample distribution, 79 abstracts (42,9%) out of 184 were presented by authors from the Northern Europe, whereas 55 abstracts (29,9%) of the total sample belonged to scholars from Central Europe. The lowest percentages, 1,1% refers to abstracts from non European countries and 4,9% from bilateral scholarship. Finally, abstracts from Mediterranean countries reached 21,2% of the total sample.

**Table 3**

Context of citizenship	Geographical origin									
	Mediterranean		Central EU		Northern EU		Non EU		More	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
National	61	7,4	85	7,2	151	9,6	0	0,0	44	16,4
European	33	4,0	58	4,9	38	2,4	0	0,0	17	6,3
Global/international	13	1,6	8	0,7	33	2,1	2	4,3	6	2,2
total	107	10,8	152	10,5	222	11,9	2	3,6	67	19,9
p=0,000										

### Quantitative and Qualitative analysis of the research data.

The analysis of the data indicated the most influential points and ideas concerning active citizenship and life long learning in Cice publications. As it turned out the variety of approaches suggest the idea of citizenship on a national (7,3 %), European (3,1 %) and global level (1,3 %). As for the content of citizenship, scholars seem to be more interested in the development of moral values (5,6%) and the political aspects of citizenship (4,1%). Their approaches also negotiate citizenship and its social (4,0%), cultural (2,5%) and economical content (1,3%). Furthermore, the analysis indicated that 9,0% of the statements refer to the students, whereas 4,1% contributes to the teachers' perspective. Also, 0,6% of the statements refer to the contribution of the family in the development of citizenship identity and 2,8% to educators specialized in civic education. Apart from the above, the idea of active citizenship (10,3%) seems to be one of the most influential, whereas civics as a distinct subject of studies (2,7%), as a curriculum (2,9%) and interdisciplinary (4,0%) are also of great interest.

**Table 4**

Content of citizenship	Geographical origin									
	Mediterranean		Central EU		Northern EU		Non EU		More	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Social	45	5,5	54	4,6	77	4,9	2	4,3	12	4,5
Cultural	16	1,9	35	3,0	58	3,7	2	4,3	5	1,9
Political	41	5,0	62	5,3	80	5,1	0	0,0	10	3,7
Moral	51	6,2	96	8,2	90	5,7	0	0,0	27	10,1
Economical	12	1,5	18	1,5	16	1,0	0	0,0	14	5,2
total	165	16,7	265	18,2	321	17,3	4	7,3	68	20,2
p=0,000										

The issue of life long learning was also allocated in 1,2% of the total sample. 8,4 % of the statements refer to the research methods that have been conducted (case studies, content analysis, questionnaires, interviews *etc*) and 1,2% to the cooperation between the academic community and other governmental or non governmental institutions. Finally, the statements referring to the educational perspective of active citizenship are 6,4% of the total. With respect to the sampling distribution, the data were analyzed in ANOVA test in order to define the effect of the geographical region and the publication year on the theme. The analysis indicated a high value of significance ( $p=0,000$ ) in both cases.

As it can be observed in table 3 (T.3), the notion of citizenship and the educational implementation of the idea is mostly studied on a national level (16,4%), and not so much in a European context (6,3%). The analysis of the results also indicated that scholarship from northern Europe is nationally orientated (9,6%), not European (2,4%) nor global (2,1%). Another interesting point concerns the content of citizenship. As we can observe in table 4 (t.4), except non-European countries (0,0%)

Table 5

Educational agents	Geographical origin									
	Mediterranean		Central EU		Northern EU		Non EU		More	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Preschool students	2	2,6	6	6,5	20	10,3	0	0,0	0	0,0
Primary students	10	12,8	16	17,2	18	9,2	1	6,7	2	9,1
Secondary students	8	10,3	16	17,2	28	14,4	2	13,3	1	4,5
Tertiary students	22	28,2	19	20,4	43	22,1	7	46,7	2	9,1
Students with special needs	0	0,0	2	2,2	1	0,5	0	0,0	0	0,0
Preschool teachers	0	0,0	2	2,2	6	3,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
Primary teachers	2	2,6	3	3,2	1	0,5	0	0,0	0	0,0
Secondary teachers	0	0,0	1	1,1	0	0,0	0	0,0	0	0,0
Tertiary teachers	3	3,8	1	1,1	8	4,1	0	0,0	0	0,0
Civic education educators	7	9,0	2	2,2	12	6,2	0	0,0	0	0,0
Family	6	0,7	13	1,1	8	0,5	0	0,0	3	1,1
Having citizenship	12	15,4	21	22,6	25	12,8	0	0,0	11	50,0
Not having citizenship	12	15,4	4	4,3	33	16,9	5	33,3	6	27,3
total	151	15,3	213	14,6	336	18,1	17	30,9	60	17,9

p=0,000

Scholarship from Mediterranean (6,2%), central European (8,2%) and northern European (5,7%) countries or in the case of bilateral cooperation (10,1%) is mainly focused on the moral aspects of civility. According to the results displayed in table 5 (T.5) scholarship from non European countries (46,7%) deals with students in tertiary education, whereas in bilateral cooperation (50,0%) the highest percentage is about adolescent citizens and their duties and responsibilities. As for the implementation of citizenship in education, as we can see in table 6 (T.6) the highest percentage comes from non-european countries about life long learning (19,1%), whereas countries in central Europe are more interested in active citizenship (15,3%) and very little in life long learning (1,4%). Finally, according to the data in table 7 (T.7) the analyzed abstracts give evidence about the research conducted mostly in northern European countries (11,6%) and bilateral co-operations (11,9%).

**Table 6**

Application in education	Geographical origin									
	Mediterranean		Central EU		Northern EU		Non EU		More	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Distinct subject	40	4,8	32	2,7	55	3,5	0	0,0	1	0,4
Active citizenship	96	11,6	180	15,3	188	11,9	6	12,8	14	5,2
Curriculum	42	5,1	36	3,1	57	3,6	2	4,3	1	0,4
Interdisciplinary	55	6,7	82	7,0	37	2,3	3	6,4	10	3,7
Life long learning	8	1,0	17	1,4	19	1,2	9	19,1	1	0,4
Total	241	24,4	347	23,9	356	19,1	20	36,4	27	8,0
p=0,000										

**Table 7**

Research in citizenship education	Geographical origin									
	Mediterranean		Central EU		Northern EU		Non EU		More	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Issues of interest	78	9,5	83	7,1	129	8,2	1	2,1	11	4,1
Methodology	70	8,5	106	9,0	182	11,6	2	4,3	32	11,9
Cooperation	13	1,6	10	0,9	29	1,9	1	2,1	3	1,1
Total	161	16,3	199	13,7	340	18,3	4	7,3	46	13,7
p=0,000										

## Results

### *Citizenship identity at a national, European or global level*

In the first thematic category were included the statements that referred to the notion of citizenship identity at a national, European or global level. This thematic category included 550 (11,7% of the total) of 4693 statements in total.

*National level* - 341 statements (7,3% of the total) which referred to the idea of citizenship on a “national” level. This category included statements about national actions in specific states and countries.

*European level* - 146 statements (3,1% of the total) which referred to the idea of citizenship on a “European” level. These statements deal explicitly with citizenship identity of “Citizens of Europe” and “the concept of the European dimension”.

*Global level* - 62 statements (1,3% of the total) referring to the level of citizenship identity “in Western Europe and North America”, “the wider world” and “across countries”. Also several issues underlying the global dimension of citizenship identity at “supranational levels”, about “global issues” and from the “global perspectives” were also included in this category.

**Table 8. Statements' distribution by thematic category**

Thematic category	f	%
1. Level of citizenship identity	550	11,7
1.1. National	341	7,3
1.2. European	146	3,1
1.3. Global/international	62	1,3
2. Content of citizenship identity	823	17,5
2.1. Social	190	4,0
2.2. Cultural	116	2,5
2.3. Political	193	4,1
2.4. Moral	264	5,6
2.5. Economical	60	1,3
3. Educational Agents	777	16,6
3.1. students	422	9,0
3.1.1. <i>Preschool</i>	28	0,6
3.1.2. <i>Primary</i>	47	1,0
3.1.3. <i>Secondary</i>	55	1,2
3.1.4. <i>Tertiary</i>	93	2,0
3.1.5. <i>Special needs</i>	3	0,1
3.2. educators	194	4,1
3.2.1. <i>Preschool</i>	8	0,2
3.2.2. <i>Primary</i>	6	0,1
3.2.3. <i>Secondary</i>	1	0,0
3.2.4. <i>Tertiary</i>	12	0,3
3.2.5. <i>Civic education educators</i>	21	0,4
3.3. Family	30	0,6
3.4. Civilians	131	2,8
3.4.1. <i>Having citizenship</i>	69	1,5
3.4.2. <i>No having citizenship</i>	60	1,3
4. Application in education	991	21,1
4.1. distinct subject	128	2,7
4.2. active citizenship	484	10,3
4.3. curriculum	138	2,9
4.4. interdisciplinary	187	4,0
4.5. life long learning	54	1,2
5. Research in citizenship education	750	16,0
5.1. Issues of interest	302	6,4
5.2. Methodology	393	8,4
5.3. Cooperation	55	1,2
6. Unclassified	802	17,1
Total	4693	100,0

### *Content of citizenship*

In the second thematic category were included 823 statements (17,5% of the total) that depict a specific content or implications about the social, cultural, moral, political and economical aspects and dimensions of citizenship.

*Social* - we find 190 statements (4,0% of the total) with respect to the social dimension of citizenship. These statements refer to the “socio-political structure within the community” and “the socialization process” which depends on “the social construction of that society/ the institutional socialisation” and “the social diversity of each country” “with a focus on equal opportunities in citizenship” that “are independent of gender”.

Among the main interests of this category we find the “social orientation”, “social obligations” and “the challenges of living in diverse societies”.

*Cultural* - we come across 116 statements (2,5% of the total) referring to the cultural dimension of citizenship. Such statements are concerned with the “cultural implications for identity formation” and the “complexity of identities in the cultural context” in today “multicultural societies/multi-ethnic states”. The statements of this category give evidence for the appreciation of “cultural identity” as a fundamental component of citizenship with respect to several factors, such as “ethnicity and religion”, “historical consciousness” and “cultural pluralism/and consciousness”.

*Political* - 193 statements (4,1% of the total) that refer to the political dimension of citizenship. According to the scholars in order to appreciate citizenship “is necessary to understand politics/ political contexts and the political culture”. In this category we also find different understandings and opinions about “what political participation is” and “what motivates individual political participation”. The “absence from voting” seems to be of a great interest among the scholars who are “talking about political socialization” in societies that are characterized by “political pluralism and democracy”.

*Moral* - 264 statements (5,6% of the total) that refer to the moral and ethical aspects of citizenship. Scholars are interested in “the clinical and the neurophysiological dimension of morality” “which influence how a person makes a decision how to act” and “how a person evaluates events”, as well as, the “social-emotional characteristics”, “abstract values”, “ideas and ideals”, “beliefs”, “attitudes” and “behavioural patterns” that constitute “characteristics and qualities” of a citizen. When scholars “are talking about citizenship and democratic values/ civic values/ identity and multicultural values” they refer to the “moral requirements” “of human behaviour and activity” and “those structural personality traits” that contribute to the development of a “positive identity” and secure “equality for all humans, both men and women”. Such “personal” and “interpersonal” values on “conceptual, emotional and behavioural level” are considered to be “mutual respect and responsibility/empathy/ solidarity with those in need/ self-responsibility as a social competence/ freedom of the personality/ self-esteem/ tolerance/ sense of justice/ caring for the other/ human rights/ equality/ freedom/ cooperation/ respect for differences/ communitarism/ and collectivism”. Finally, in relation to education scholars’ basic questions deal with “how do children learn values in life?” and “how is it possible to learn values from teaching?/ develop children's values”.

*Economical* -60 statements (1,3% of the total) that refer to citizenship in its “economical context”. Such statements depict what “might have changed with the arrival of a common European currency/ with the Euro/ after the Euro became the common currency” in “different economic systems” or “state-controlled economy”. According to the data of this category, in the context of “a free-market economy” several “economic issues” arise: the “standard of living”, “unemployment and competition in the job market/ the increase in competition”, “the growing number of enterprises”, “the liberalization of world markets”, “the boom in scientific and technological knowledge” and “the progress in communication systems”. Apart from statements on “developing a consumer policy”, in this category we also find aspects of “educational practice in

relation to citizenship and enterprise/ citizenship and enterprise education/ schools for developing enterprise”.

As scholars suggest in order to develop citizenship we have to “think about the relationship between civic obligations within the context of action for enterprise/Can 'money' help teach citizenship to our children?”

### *Educational agents*

Third category-Educational agents, the analysis of data indicated that according to the scholarship, citizenship education is about the involvement of different agents through formal or non-formal institutions. Analyzed in four thematic categories, educational agents were found in 777 statements (16,6% of the total).

#### *Students*

422 statements (9,0% of the total) with reference to students of all levels. These statements were further analyzed into 5 sub-categories according to the educational level.

*Preschool level* - 28 statements (0,6% of the total) “for children aged from 5/ the pre-school/ children in kindergarten/ in nursery school/ in early childhood”. Scholars seem to be interested in “the key features of citizenship education in early childhood” and the development of citizenship identity “in a preschool context” in order “for young children to participate as citizens in their kindergartens”.

*Primary level* - 47 statements (1,0% of the total) about “elementary and grammar school” students. These statements also depict scholars’ interest in “primary school children's attitudes to citizenship” and especially “children from eight to eleven years old/ pupils aged 10 to 12 years/ children aged 7-11/ pupils aged 6 – 12/ between the ages of 12 and 14/ Key Stages 3 (11-14 year olds)”.

*Secondary level* - 55 statements (1,2% of the total) about “junior adolescent citizens/ teenagers”. Depending on the educational system of the country these students are found in “secondary schools/ the comprehensive school” or “lower secondary education/ upper secondary school/ colleges/ lyceum”. Apart from the “Compulsory Education Students” that is “16 -18 year olds/ school children aged 11-16/ (14-16 year olds)/ high-school students/ middle school students/ 18 years old pupils” in this category we also find statements about “talking with teenagers” and ‘teenagers’ orientation” on active citizenship.

*Tertiary level* - 93 statements (2,0% of the total) with reference to higher education “undergraduate” and “postgraduate” students. This educational level seems to be of great interest in the case of “tertiary teacher education” and especially “student teachers” in “early childhood education”, “primary teacher education”, or “bachelor’s degree in elementary education”. Apart from the “student teacher perceptions” there is also evidence for a preoccupation with “teacher-preparation programmes” and “citizenship in teacher education programmes”.

*Students with Special Needs* -In the last category were included only 3 statements (0,1% of the total) with reference to “education of children with special needs”.

#### *Educators*

In this category were included 194 statements (4,1% of the total) referring to those involved in citizenship education from the educators’ point of view. The data were further analysed in 5 subcategories according to the school levels in formal education. The last subcategory includes special reference to specialists in civics education.

*Preschool level* - only 8 statements (0,2% of the total) about “preschool teachers” or “teachers in kindergarten” in relation to the development of citizenship through education.

*Primary level* - few statements (6 or 0,1% of the total) and thus little concern about “elementary teachers’ attitudes towards such aims”, although there is some investigation in “the experiences of primary education teachers” within citizenship education.

*Secondary level* - only 1 statement (0,0% of the total) about “middle and high schools teachers”, proving scholars’ lack of interest in studying the potentials of teaching citizenship in this level of education.

*Tertiary level* - 12 statements (0,3% of the total) about “higher education teaching” or “individual tutors” and “lectures in higher education institutions”. There is also some interest in “adult educators’ reflections” and “academic culture itself”, as well as “the university teacher education programme”.

*Civic education specialists* - 21 statements (0,4% of the total) exploring the idea of “qualified citizenship teachers”. As it appears “the practice of training future specialists in citizenship education” is popular among the scholars who believe that “there is no such training available” and “no teaching specialisation” in most of the European countries at the moment. Scholars also believe that “civic educators can do better” with citizenship development, so that in order to have more “future civic managers”, teachers “specialising in citizenship as a subject area”, great effort should be made in acquiring appropriate “training programme for civic education teachers” for “preparing professionals to promote citizenship”.

*Family* - 30 statements (0,6% of the total) with regard to the development of active citizenship with “the influence of the home environment”. Citizenship “for each family member” and its practice in different “family forms” is suggested by the scholars with equal respect to “the impact of family background” to the development of active citizens.

*Civilians*- 131 statements (2,8 % of the total) underlying “the importance of active, participative citizens” and the development of “creative, social responsible people”. This category refers to “the ideal citizen” and the “the political development of adolescents”. For the scholars “teaching new citizens” and “particular the development of democratic citizens” is not maintained only through the formal education processes, but through “the participation of all citizens” “and members of society” to the practice of active

citizenship. Furthermore, the statements of this category were analysed in 2 subcategories according to the constitutional level of citizenship identity.

*Having citizenship*- 69 statements (1,5% of the total) about the “public” and the “ruling citizen of tomorrow” those “who should be the next generation of active citizens”.

*Not having citizenship*- 60 statements (1,3% of the total) about “minority students”, “immigrant children”, and “economic immigrants” or “refugees from many parts of the world”. Among these statements we find reference to “the lack of inclusion of immigrant children at the school level” and “the marginalisation of the minority ethnic voice”, although there is some preoccupation with “how best to educate and support teachers of immigrants”.

### ***Application in education***

Apart from the agents involved, the data were also related to the implementation of citizenship in education. The analysis indicated 991 statements (21,1% of the total) with reference to civics and citizenship education in different forms and types of the educational practice which were further analyzed in 5 categories.

*Citizenship as subject* was included in 128 statements (2,7% of the total) that refer to a variety of approaches in “civic education”. According to the educational policy of each country “citizenship education” can be “political education/ younger children's political learning”, “political literacy” or “education for democracy” or “moral and civic education”. Apart from that we find several concerns about “teaching democracy and citizenry” through “themes in our course and programs/ specific courses” and by focusing “teachers' attention on specific subjects” or “subject themes”.

*Active citizenship* - 484 statements (10,3% of the total) that “emphasize the interest on participation and citizenship education” and especially “student activism and agency”. This raises arguments on how “children can be active members of their institutions” but also which teaching strategies and educational contexts “are promoting active citizenship”. In this category we also find statements about the meanings of active citizenship in the formal school setting. For example, active citizenship in “school as a micro-society” involves “children's participation in decision-making” and “learning through meaningful activities, for real purposes”. Apart from the “meaningful social participation” and the use of “individualised ‘child centred’ approaches” educating active citizens means understand teaching and learning “as a ‘symbiotic’ relationship” and “co-operation and space for democratic decision making”. Individuals who “identify themselves as active citizens” are those who are “aware of their rights, duties and responsibilities” and “have a positive idea about democracy”. According to this category, “if children have enough opportunities to create their institutional life” they can “become critical thinkers” who “can contribute in meaningful ways”. As the analysis indicated active citizenship is about “the possibilities for the development of social personality features”, “identity and civic competencies”, “interpretations of the planned activities” and “concrete skills” like “decision taking”, “problem solving” and “creative thinking”.

*Citizenship education and the Curriculum*- 138 statements (2,9% of the total) with reference to citizenship in the “curriculum”. According to this category there are cases where “the curriculum does not mention the terms ‘citizen’ or ‘citizenship’” or there is “a lack of consistency among curricular issues” in citizenship education. As it appears, apart from the “citizenship education curriculum” and “the hidden curriculum”, it is suggested that further attention should be given in “curricular State policies” and “curricular models” in general. Finally, scholar research focus on the problem of “what curricular places do students learn about citizenship?”

*Interdisciplinary* -In this category we find 187 statements (4,0 % of the total) about teaching citizenship that “appeared as a cross-curricular theme” or “as integrated subjects” “within the traditional disciplines” and “independent projects” whose “contents are hidden in other subjects”. According to the scholars, citizenship can be practiced “through humanities (Greek and Latin authors) and “through history”, but it can also be integrated in “various disciplines” “including science” and “geography courses”. Implementing citizenship in “different subject areas” appears to be a common practice it teaching “social sciences”, though there are also statements about “cross-thematic activities” in “art” and “music”. Finally, there are also statements about “individual projects” like “citizenship and Scientific Literacy for all students”, “citizenship education: the role of media environments” or citizenship “from the environmental education approach”.

*Citizenship and Life long learning* - 54 statements (1,2% of the total) with reference to life long learning. According to this category “social skills are simultaneously life skills” and from this point of view citizenship is also a matter of “non-formal education”. In this context there are statements about the contribution of “civil society organisations in citizenship education” “among other civic and professional societies”. Apart from “the motivation to be life-long multifaceted learners” and our “continuing professional development”, “active citizenship in leadership and support to enable community organisations” is also discussed with reference to several settings like “business and public services (including education)”, “voluntary associations” “and community service”.

### ***Research in citizenship education***

In this thematic category were included all statements with respect to research in citizenship education. The analysis indicated 750 statements (16,0% of the total) which were further analysed in 3 distinct categories.

*Issues of interest* -In this category were included 302 statements (6,4% of the total) about several educational issues concerning citizenship. In this category we can locate several “issues concerning citizenship” or different aspects of “the contemporary debate about citizenship”. On one hand, there statements with reference to “the learning and teaching process” at “compulsory education”, in general, for example the “basic principles of the educational system”, “professional practice”, “new areas of study”, “new educational materials”, “manuals and resources”, “good practices”, “the didactics”, “methods of teaching”, “educational practices”, “pedagogical thinking”, “what happens in

classrooms”, “goals and means implied by the teaching programme”, “study programs” and the “ideal forms of pedagogy”. On the other hand, the statements stress “the need and importance of citizenship education” with an emphasis on “how citizenship education might be implemented” in “general education”. According to the scholars, “in order to provide effective support to schools in relation to citizenship education” several aspects of “teaching civic education” should be thoroughly considered. Such may include, “the meaning of terms such as citizenship/ the polysemic meanings of citizenship/on notions of citizenship”, “different theories of citizenship education” and “new approaches in citizenship education”, “different ways to actually teach citizenship”, “the pre-conditions for effective education for citizenship”, “the process of identity development in children”, “the civic aims” and “problems of Civic Education”. Finally, there is an argumentation on “what will young people need to know and be able to do as a citizen in the future” an aspect strongly correlated with the dilemma between “education through citizenship” or “education for citizenship”.

*Methodology* -In this category were included 393 statements (8,4% of the total) about the researched methodology that was applied in this publications. The analysis indicated that “the researchers are specifically interested” to “determine the theoretical foundation for citizenship education” and “investigate controversial and sensitive issues” or “conceptual problems” of the matter. Among the statements we find reference to “partial action research”, several “case studies”, “review of empirical findings”, “Cross-Sectional Study”, “comperative studies” and “pilot studies” based “on the analysis of official documents”, “observations and interviews”.

Cooperation - 55 statements (1,2% of the total) about “national governments and high status international organisations” or other institutions that are presented in the examined abstracts involved in actions and projects concerning citizenship education, for example “the South London Refugee Project”, “the Refugee Council”, “the University of North London”, “I.E.A.”, “the IUFM of Lyon”, “the Spanish educational ministry”, “the university of New England”, “the UNESCO international Commission”, “the university of Tartu”, “the British council”, “the Hungarian academy of sciences”, “the commission on Citizenship”, “the national curriculum council”, “the Social Affair and Culture Authorities” and more.

*Unclassified*- 802 statements (17,1% of the total) that did not refer to any of the above thematic categories.

The thematic categories presented above give evidence for the content and the context of citizenship identity from an educational perspective. Whether national, European or global, citizenship identity combines several dimensions and therefore its effective application to formal and non-formal educational environments appears to be a complex issue that is reflected in the range and frequency of some of the most influential points and ideas concerning active citizenship and Life long Learning. These interests and understandings constitute the contemporary appreciation of citizenship identity and its development through teaching and learning in CiCe publications. As represented by Hannah Arendt, at the conclusion of *On Revolution*, she endorses the ancient Greek solution to the problem, posed by Sophocles, of how “to bear life’s burden”: “It was the polis, the space of men’s free deeds and living words, which could endow life with splendor” (Arendt, 1965, p 285).

**References**

- Arendt, Hannah (1965) *On Revolution*. New York: Viking
- Grawitz, M. (1981) *Méthode des Sciences Sociales*. Dalloz: Paris
- CiCe (1998-1999) London- Young Citizens in Europe, May 1999
- CiCe (1999-2000) Athens -Developing Identities in Europe, May 2000
- CiCe (2000-2001) Bruges-Learning for a Democratic Europe, May 2001
- CiCe (2001-2002) Budapest-Future Citizens in Europe, May 2002
- CiCe (2002-2003) Braga-A Europe of Many Cultures, May 2003
- CiCe (2003-2004) Krakow- The Experience of Citizenship, May 2004
- CiCe (2004-2005) Ljubljana-Teaching Citizenship, May 2005
- CiCe (2005-2006) Riga, Latvia-Citizenship Education: Europe and the World, May 2006
- CiCe (2006-2007) Montpellier, Citizenship Education in Society, May 2007
- CiCe (2007-2008) Istanbul, Reflecting on Identities: Research, Practice and Innovation, May 2008