CHAPTER 21:

Understanding School and Classroom Contexts for Civic and Citizenship Education: The Importance of Teacher Data in the IEA Studies

Bruno Losito, Gabriella Agrusti, and Valeria Damiani

Abstract IEA surveys traditionally include a teacher questionnaire among the contextual questionnaires aiming at collecting data on school factors that could be associated with students' cognitive outcomes. This chapter discusses how data collected from teachers has played a role in IEA studies on civic and citizenship education from the Six Subjects Survey to the Civic Education Study (CIVED) 1999 and the International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2009 and 2016. Elements of continuity and discontinuity are identified over time in relation to the content and the structure of the teacher questionnaires adopted in each survey, looking at the conceptions of civic and citizenship education that informed the instruments' development and at the changes that occurred over time in the delivering of civic and citizenship education at school. The use of data collected through the teacher questionnaire in IEA international reports as well as in secondary analyses is presented. A substantial increase in informative secondary analyses using teacher data has been registered in the last years, confirming the importance of the teacher questionnaire despite the difficulties in finding direct strong associations between teacher data and students' outcomes. Civic and citizenship education is one of the school education areas most characterized by gaps between principles and official regulations, between intended and implemented curricula, and between theory (or ideals) and practices. The information gathered through the teacher questionnaire is of great relevance for a better understanding of the characteristics of the schools as learning environments and provides policymakers and researchers with data from the perspective of teachers on the democratic experience students actually have at school.

Introduction

Our intent is to present some reflections on the characteristics of the teacher questionnaire adopted in International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) surveys on civic and citizenship education and on the use of resulting teacher data in studying this aspect of schooling. Our reflections begin with a discussion of how data collected from teachers has played a role in IEA studies from their beginning 50 years ago. Then we focus on our team's participation in these studies since the mid-1990s when the Civic Education Study (CIVED) was planned. We had direct involvement in the development of the teacher questionnaire and in the preparation of the international reports of CIVED, International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) 2009, and ICCS 2016. Thus, our perspective is that of insiders.

We identify elements of continuity and discontinuity over time in relation to the specific teacher questionnaires adopted in each survey, looking at the several conceptions of civic and citizenship education that informed the instruments' development, and at the changes that occurred over time in the delivering of civic and citizenship education at school. These changes relate to the curriculum content, to the increasing importance attributed to the school as a "democratic learning environment," to the role of teachers, and to the opportunities provided to students

Bruno Losito, Dipartimento di Scienze della Formazione, Università Roma Tre, Rome, Italy
email: bruno.losito@uniroma3.it
Gabriella Agrusti, Lumsa Università, Rome, Italy
email: g.agrusti@lumsa.it
Valeria Damiani, Lumsa Università, Rome, Italy
email: v.damiani2@lumsa.it

for participating in school life. We also present a brief review of the contributions (international reports, articles, and papers) that used data collected from teachers. In the conclusions, we examine issues and challenges related to the use of the teacher questionnaire in future IEA studies in this field.

Contextual Questionnaires in the IEA Surveys

Since the 1960s, the IEA international comparative studies have included background questionnaires with the aim of collecting data on contextual factors that could be associated with students' cognitive outcomes and that could help in predicting students' achievement (Postlethwaite 1967; Peaker 1975; Walker 1976). The data collected through these questionnaires from students, teachers, and principals are central to the interpretation of results and focus on a range of student, school, and classroom characteristics. Traditionally, the school-level variables included in the school and teacher questionnaires are related to school context (e.g., urban/rural, resources available in the local community), school characteristics (e.g., school type, school size, and instructional time), school resources and management (e.g., teaching materials, funding, decision-making processes), school activities in the field of interest for each survey, and teachers' characteristics and self-reported teaching practices (Postlethwaite and Ross 1992).

As shown by the international reports of various IEA studies, the school variables that are associated with student achievement are those related to school context, school characteristics including resources, and characteristics of students in the class (Walker 1976; Postlethwaite and Ross 1992; Schulz et al. 2010; Mullis et al. 2012a; Mullis et al. 2012b).

In all the IEA civic and citizenship education studies since 1971, a measure of open classroom climate for discussion (based on students' responses to the questionnaire) has been a positive predictor of student civic knowledge in the large majority of countries (Torney et al. 1975). The scale includes items related to student-teacher relations such as "teachers encourage students to make up their own minds," "teachers encourage students to express their opinions," and "students bring up current political events for discussion in class" (Schulz et al. 2010; Torney-Purta et al. 2001). At the same time, because these are one-time surveys, it has not been possible to draw causal inferences about the relations between school variables and students' civic achievement. Wide differences across countries and within countries are usually reported, which has been noted since civic education was part of the Six Subjects Survey (Torney et al. 1975).

Attempts have also been made to investigate the associations between general school characteristics and students' reports of their attitudes, and their likelihood of participation using ICCS 2009 results. After controlling for student and school average SES (socioeconomic status), the impact of specific school variables was negligible (Caponera and Losito 2011; Caponera et al. 2012). This is not surprising given that the role of parents and, more generally, students' socioeconomic background have major influences on students' attitudes and participation. For example, in ICCS 2016, parental interest in civic issues was one of the strongest predictors of expected civic engagement, while students' characteristics and social background were also important predictors of their civic knowledge (Schulz et al. 2018).

When one looks at the associations between teacher-related factors and student achievement using data collected in international comparative studies, the findings are not consistent. Several analyses have identified associations between those factors and student achievement in mathematics (e.g., Rivkin et al. 2005; Akiba 2007; Akyüz and Berberoglu 2010). On the other hand, some studies found limited evidence of this impact in both mathematics (Luschei and Chudgar 2011; Sturman and Lin 2011; Dodeen and Hilhal 2012) and reading literacy (e.g., Van Daal et al. 2006). This is probably because teacher-related factors can influence students' achievement in different ways depending on the specific features of a given school context. This is one reason why research has not been able to clearly identify a set of teacher characteristics and classroom

practices that consistently improve students' learning across countries. In addition, one should consider that in a single survey it is not possible to measure the cumulative influence of all past teachers on the sampled students.

To get a clearer picture we would need more in-depth questions, and this would be likely to further reduce teachers' and schools' willingness to participate in the study.

The Teacher Questionnaire in Civic and Citizenship Education Studies: From the Six Subject Survey to ICCS 2016

The analysis of the teacher questionnaires developed for the different IEA international surveys on civic and citizenship education provides an overview of the variables deemed relevant to include in the instruments and of different strategies adopted for teachers' sampling. At the same time, it allows us to reflect both on the specific nature of civic and citizenship education within school curricula (in comparison with other areas) and on the changes that occurred over time in the conceptualizations of civic and citizenship education underpinning the IEA surveys. This mirrors the changes occurring in societies and in the role attributed to education and experience in the school context over the last 50 years.

The first IEA survey on civic education, which was carried out between 1967 and 1971 within the Six Subject Survey, addressed some of the recurrent issues in this field of study—the importance of measuring not only cognitive aspects, but also attitudes related to civic participation and social justice, the focus on processes that occur inside and outside schools, and the status of civic education in school curricula.

The analysis of the documents provided by the countries participating in the survey showed that there were different definitions of this subject area, different names given to it, and different ways of delivering it (Torney et al. 1975). These differences were reflected in the procedures for teacher sampling. For the 14-year-olds and pre-university populations teachers who taught civic education or subjects such as history, political science, geography, sociology, or economics were sampled. However, students and their teachers were not linked in the analysis. Teachers' answers were meant to represent educational processes related to civic learning in the school overall, together with data collected through the principals' questionnaire (Torney et al. 1975).

The teacher questionnaire of the Six Subject Survey included questions similar to those administered to teachers in other IEA subject areas (such as teaching methods, student assessment, and years of training) together with other variables more related to civic education such as "amount of social science study; perception of the appropriateness of discussing controversial issues in the classroom; membership in subject matter associations; conception of the 'good citizen,' and the importance of teaching about topics such as democracy, political history, social problems, international problems, local and national government, and political parties" (Torney et al. 1975, p. 43).

The huge political changes that occurred in the late 1980s and early 1990s triggered the organization of the second IEA study on civic education, CIVED, which was conducted in 1999. In investigating the ways young people were prepared to become citizens in democratic societies, the survey focused on school-based learning and on the influences and opportunities for civic participation outside school.

The theoretical model developed for the study, called the Octagon, reflects the twofold focus of CIVED. In the model, schools (teachers, implemented curriculum, and participation opportunities) as well as peer groups, the family, and neighbors are viewed as "a 'nested' context for young people's thinking and action in the social and political environment," and as "communities of discourse and practice" in which the individual student is at the center (Torney-Purta et al. 2001, p. 20). Based on these assumptions, teachers were identified sources of information about two

of CIVED's policy and research issues—the influence of different types of classroom practices and how teachers are prepared to deal with civic-related topics.

Differences in the delivering of civic and citizenship education across countries identified in the survey of the early 1970s, made it important but difficult to select comparable samples of teachers across countries. For these reasons, in CIVED a set of strategies were put in place to enhance comparability. National research coordinators (NRCs) were asked to fill out a “subject allocation grid” listing the topics from which the items included in the student test were drawn in order to identify which teachers were teaching them and their subject matter. Following the instructions from NRCs, in each sampled school the teacher questionnaire was administered to three teachers of civic-education related subjects who were teaching the tested class of students. However, in most of the participating countries it was not possible to select three teachers of the tested class. In those cases, countries were asked to administer the questionnaire to teachers of civic education-related subjects of a parallel, previous, or following grade in the sampled school. In CIVED, data were therefore collected from teachers both “linked” and “not linked” to the tested class; only findings related to linked teachers were included in the international report. As teachers sampled in CIVED represented the teachers of the representative samples of students, the unit of analysis for results was the student and not the teacher, and teacher results were weighted with the number of students they taught (Losito and Mintrop 2001).

The CIVED's teacher questionnaire was divided into nine sections: five sections were aimed at gathering information about the individual teachers (age, gender, the subject taught, work experience, education, and specific preparation for civic education such as professional development activities and degree held). The sixth section was related to teachers' views on civic education in the curriculum (i.e., how civic education should be taught, what is important to learn in civic education, the general importance conferred on civic education, which topics and skills are emphasized in civic education, and what students learn at school). The seventh section was focused on teachers' concept of citizenship and asked teachers what students should learn to become good citizens. The eighth section aimed at gathering information on their civic education-related activities and lessons. Two questions were included in this last section: first, on the sources used by teachers for planning their civic education related activities and a second set on teachers' rating of the importance to teach civic and citizenship education (CCE) related topics, their confidence in teaching them, and the opportunities their students have to actually learn them. The last section focused on instruction (e.g., activities used in civic related education, suggested improvements about civic education, and student assessments).

The changes that occurred in governance, international relations, migration, and globalization of societies since CIVED informed the third IEA CCE-focused study, ICCS 2009. This study also considered changes in the conceptualizations and practices related to civic education that occurred in that period. In order to highlight those developments, the study adopted the term, focused on “knowledge and understanding and on opportunities for participation and engagement in both civic and civil society” and was concerned with “the wider range of ways that citizens use to interact with and shape their communities (including schools) and societies” (Schulz et al. 2010, p. 22).

The broadening of the concept of civic education is reflected in the instruments' development and implied a different emphasis on data collected from teachers (and schools). While in CIVED the focus was mainly on teaching practices and teaching preparation in civic education, ICCS presented an additional focus on the role of teachers and schools in enhancing students' participation at school. One research question underpinning the study looked not only at teachers' reports on instructional practices, but also examined students' opportunities for participation at schools and their involvement in decision-making. Teachers were asked to report on students'

behavior at school and their perception of school climate (Schulz et al. 2010, pp.169–174). These data have unrealized potential.

The shift from conceptualizing civic education as mainly conducted in a specific set of classes to CCE that included broader school opportunities also resulted in a particular sampling design for teachers. In ICCS 2009 and ICCS 2016, the teacher questionnaire was administered to up to 15 teachers of all subjects sampled from all teachers who were teaching at the target grade (grade 8) during the testing period (if they had been employed at the sampled school at least since the beginning of the school year). In ICCS, the approach underpinning this sampling design was to survey teachers from civic-related and non-civic-related subjects without linking the teachers to the students who took the test.

To summarize the contrast, CIVED surveyed teachers who taught subjects mainly related to humanities and social sciences, while in ICCS the teacher questionnaire was administered to a sample of teachers of all subjects at the target grade. The aim was to take school contexts and characteristics into account, as they constitute the general culture and climate in which civic and citizenship education is developed (Schulz et al. 2008, p. 36).

The possibility to use teachers as source of information without focusing exclusively on history and social studies related subjects corresponds to two assumptions: i) that CCE is a cross-curricular theme that can be implemented including all subjects as well as in specific classes; ii) that civic-related learning outcomes can be influenced by the characteristics of the school environment as a whole (whole-school approach). The findings were discussed in the international reports and in secondary analyses, as reported in the next section.

The teacher questionnaire in ICCS 2009 comprised 29 questions divided into four sections: general information, the school context, CCE at school, and the teaching of CCE. The last section was part of the international option addressed only to individuals within the teachers' sample in each school who were teaching CCE-related subjects. The ICCS 2009 teacher questionnaire encompassed four questions that were similar to the ones included in the teacher questionnaire in CIVED. Those questions were about the sources used for planning civic and citizenship education, on how teachers assess their students in CCE, on teachers' confidence about teaching specific topics related to CCE, and on teachers' ideas about the improvements needed in this area.

ICCS 2016 shares the research design and sampling procedures of the 2009 survey. One of the research questions of the study investigates the extent to which schools have participatory processes in place that facilitate civic engagement, the extent to which schools and communities interact to foster students' civic engagement and learning and, finally, the ways schools and teachers perceive the role of civic and citizenship education (Schulz et al. 2016).

The general structure of the ICCS 2016 teacher questionnaire follows the one adopted in 2009—first, teachers' general information, second, the school, and third, CCE at school. It was addressed to teachers teaching regular school subjects to students in the target grade, questions and items related to the new areas included in the student survey (environmental sustainability, social interaction at school, and the use of new social media) were also included in the teacher questionnaire. Eleven questions were modified from the 2009 version, six were unchanged, and five questions were inserted related to the new focus areas of the study. A fourth section on the teaching of CCE was an international option for teachers of civic-related subjects. Thirty-five out of 38 countries participated in this option.

Several aspects of continuity as well as differences can be identified across the four surveys. These aspects reflect changes that occurred in the conceptualization of civic and citizenship education and to its delivery at a school level over time. In our view, the following are the major aspects of continuity:

- i. the inclusion of students' civic-related attitudes and dispositions in the "learning outcomes" of civic and citizenship education; and
- ii. the existence of a diverse set of approaches for the delivery of civic and citizenship education at the classroom and school levels.

The most important developments are related to:

- i. the recognition of the importance of informal learning for students' knowledge and attitudes. Acquiring civic knowledge and attitudes is not only the result of formal classroom practices, but is also influenced by the experiences students have in various contexts (i.e., schools and classrooms, home and peer environment) and by their interactions with others in the communities where they are living;
- ii. the increased relevance of the school environment as a "democratic learning environment" and of the quality of experiences students have at school for developing their knowledge and attitudes; and
- iii. the inclusion of new contents in the CCE curricula in relation to perceptions of changes occurring in societies.

These new developments are reflected in the teacher questionnaires in ICCS 2009 and 2016. As mentioned, new questions were included in the instruments, mainly related to the investigation of teachers' perceptions of the school environment, of its relations with the local community, and of social relations at school. In ICCS 2009 and 2016, those questions asked teachers about their perceptions of classroom climate (e.g., how many target grade students get on well with their classmates and are well integrated in the class), students' behaviors at school (e.g., how many students have a good relationship with teachers and staff and are well behaved during breaks), social problems at school (such as vandalism, ethnic intolerance, religious intolerance, bullying), and students' participation in civic related activities in the local community (such as activities related to environmental sustainability and human rights projects). In ICCS 2016, to match the new areas of assessment included in the student questionnaire, issues related to bullying were explored in greater depth with a specific question asking teachers about their perceptions and/or direct experience with students being bullied at school. Additional questions inquired about the role teachers play in shaping the school environment and explored teachers' participation in the running of the school, their willingness to accept responsibilities beyond their teaching assignment, and their collaboration with other teachers in planning educational activities inside the school.

The aforementioned questions were asked to teachers of all subjects and not only to teachers of subjects more directly related to CCE. The description of school contexts for CCE largely benefited from the different sampling procedures adopted for teachers in ICCS 2009 and 2016. There was extensive material about teachers' perceptions of the school environment in the ICCS international reports (2009 and 2016) as well as in most of the national reports of the participating countries.

At the same time, this choice had consequences for teachers' completing the questionnaires in some countries. In both ICCS 2009 and ICCS 2016, difficulties in obtaining the required level of participation of teachers was registered in several countries; 8 out of 38 countries in ICCS 2009 were unable to meet the sample requirements for the teacher survey, as well as 5 out of 22 countries in ICCS 2016. In ICCS 2016 two other countries were excluded from the analysis of teacher data because they did not meet the sample requirements for students either. Aside from more general problems related to teacher reluctance to participate in assessments in several countries, this low participation might be related to the subjects taught by sampled teachers. As reported by several NRCs, teachers of mathematics and science were unlikely to recognize

their role in students' civic and citizenship education, although this highly depends on how CCE is conceptualized and delivered in individual school systems and on responsibilities assigned to teachers at the school level in addition to their teaching.

Increased attention paid to the school context did not imply less attention to specific aspects of the teaching of CCE in a more specialized sense. In ICCS we included an international option in the questionnaire for teachers whom the national centers identified as teachers of civic-related subjects. In ICCS 2009 35 out of 38 countries participated in this option, while in ICCS 2016, all countries participated in it. In both surveys most teachers of civic-related subjects reported that they felt very well prepared or quite prepared to teach almost all the topics and issues listed in the question. The highest percentages were recorded for human rights, citizens' rights and responsibilities, and equal opportunities for men and women (Schulz et al. 2010; Schulz et al. 2018).

In concluding this overview of the characteristics of the teacher questionnaires across the different IEA studies on CCE, it is important to highlight some developments that, in our view, should be taken into consideration in relation to the instrument for collecting teachers' data in future surveys on CCE.

It is not easy to identify which aspects of teacher activities at the school level contribute to students' outcomes in CCE across countries. In selecting the constructs and variables to be included in the teacher questionnaire, one needs to examine not only the results in ICCS (at both international and national levels), but also studies on teachers carried out in individual countries. This could suggest more in-depth ways to investigate this area in the future, also through qualitative studies, aimed at looking more in depth at the results of international surveys (see, for example, Toots and Lauri 2015) and at gathering data on country-specific issues that are not included in IEA surveys (such as, for instance, the role of non-teaching staff). These kinds of studies, even if they do not allow for cross-country comparisons, can provide insights from a different perspective that could benefit from both the quantitative and the qualitative approaches. In CIVED, during the Phase 1 of the project, NRCs wrote national case studies that also allowed to better identify constructs and variables to be included in the teacher questionnaire (as well as in the other CIVED contextual questionnaires) (Mintrop 2002).

More generally, there is a need to update the content of the teacher questionnaire in each new cycle to reflect the changes that have been introduced over time in school curricula, and in the delivering of CCE. Changes introduced in the student test and questionnaire might suggest the inclusion of new topics for the teacher questionnaire, as it was done in ICCS 2016 in relation to environmental sustainability, and as it is proposed for ICCS 2022 in relation to global citizenship education.

There is one more aspect that is important to mention. In the Six Subject Survey report (Torney et al. 1975), the authors pointed out the importance of using different sources of information (school, teacher, and student) "to characterize the educational inputs in different countries permitting us to gain a better understanding of the patterns of achievement" (p. 66). In ICCS 2009 and 2016, several questions were included in the school and teacher questionnaires that were similar to the questions administered in the student questionnaire (e.g., perceptions of bullying at school, students' participation at school, and perceptions of students' and teachers' relations). This allowed a comparison between teachers' and students' perceptions. For example, when analyzing students' and teachers' answers to the questions on bullying, it emerged that teachers appear to underestimate the phenomenon (also in comparison with principals' reports) (Schulz et al. 2018). So, it is important to maintain "parallel" questions across the instruments.

The Use of Data Collected Through the Teacher Questionnaire: International Reports and Secondary Analyses

In order to investigate how the information gathered through the teacher questionnaire in the IEA studies were used, we looked at how findings were described in the international reports of the four surveys and identified the main strands that have emerged in the academic research, and in other publications that used teacher data for secondary analyses.

Teacher Data in the International Reports

Starting from the common elements among the reports, we identified the topics/areas whose findings were reported in more than one survey report, from the Six Subject Survey to ICCS 2016. If we compare the international reports of the four IEA surveys on CCE, there are six areas of commonalities across the studies. Some topics seem to be of recurrent interest for understanding the delivery of CCE in the classroom (i.e., teachers' reports on the activities in the classroom, teachers' report of assessment methods) and teachers' confidence in tackling CCE-related issues and training. However, it has to be taken into consideration that in ICCS 2009 and 2016, those questions were included as international options and thus were not answered by all sampled teachers, but only by teachers identified by national centers as teachers of CCE-related subjects. Other topics, such as teachers' reports on CCE aims and teachers' perception of students' activities in the community, highlight changes in the conception of CCE that occurred from the Six Subject Survey to CIVED to the two ICCS studies.

The number of questions from the teacher questionnaire that were examined in the international reports varies: eight questions in the Six Subject Survey, seventeen in CIVED, six in ICCS 2009, and seven in ICCS 2016.

In all of the international reports and in most of the national ones (often following the same structure as the international reports, highlighted in an online consultation with NRCs carried out by the study's consortium for ICCS 2016), data collected through the teacher questionnaires allowed an informative description of the school and the classroom contexts and illustrations of what actually happens at the school and classroom level in the delivery of CCE, and in relation to students' outcomes. For example, the chapter on schools in the report of ICCS 2009 reported that in several European countries teachers' perceptions of open climate were associated with higher overall student knowledge achievement (Schulz et al. 2010, p. 173). This kind of informative description is of particular interest in CCE because several studies carried out by the Council of Europe have shown this area to be characterized by gaps (e.g., between official curricula and school activities or between theory and practice). One of the most relevant gaps shown by these studies is related to the lack of suggestions for implementation by national authorities that could provide support to schools and teachers in pursuing CCE educational aims more effectively (Birzea et al. 2004).

Secondary Analyses of Teacher Questionnaire Data

In the last 20 years, a number of secondary analyses were carried out using CIVED and ICCS teacher questionnaire data. Two recent reviews of the research conducted across different disciplines published in English have highlighted the multifaceted nature of the studies that used datasets from the IEA large-scale international surveys on civic and citizenship education (Knowles et al. 2018; Knowles and Di Stefano 2015). The 2015 piece was preliminary to the extensive search for secondary analysis published in 2018, which found and summarized 100 articles using CIVED and ICCS 2009 data.

In relation to the studies using the teacher questionnaire data, we have identified two main strands of academic research in these reviews. The first strand focused on teachers' beliefs and

teachers' confidence in teaching CCE-related topics, and the second aimed at understanding the associations between specific teachers' characteristics or practices and students' civic knowledge.

The first strand comprises studies such as the one by Alviar-Martin et al. (2008), who used CIVED data from four countries (Germany, Italy, Hong Kong, and the United States) and aimed at examining teachers' perceived confidence in teaching about civic-oriented topics. They highlighted that most teachers believed that they were poorly prepared to deliver an issue-centered curriculum. This strand also includes the study by Ljunggren and Unemar Ost (2011), which used ICCS data to investigate the teaching of controversial issues in Sweden and compared the responses of Swedish teachers with those of other countries participating in the study. The research identified four different roles played by teachers in classroom debates on controversial issues ("debate leader," "tutor," "mediator," and "rejector").

This category of research also includes the analysis by Reichert and Torney-Purta (2019), which examined teachers' beliefs about the aims of citizenship education in 12 countries using a person-centered analysis with ICCS 2009 teacher data; the question had asked teachers to choose the three most important aims of CCE. Some differences between regions were found. For example, teachers in the Asian region emphasized citizenship as it would be practiced at school (especially conflict resolution) rather than taking a broader societal perspective. For teachers in the other regions the goals of civic education more frequently encompassed activities that were situated globally, nationally, or in the local community.

Placing these findings into the context of all 38 participating countries, the international report shows that the percentage of teachers who thought that civic education should prepare students for future political participation averaged only seven percent across these countries (see Schulz et al. 2010, p. 182). Reducing xenophobia was also rarely endorsed as an aim of civic education. An average of only 10% of teachers across countries answered that this was one of the three most important objectives. On the other hand, promoting students' knowledge of citizens' rights and responsibilities and students' critical and independent thinking were frequently chosen by teachers as of among the three most important aims (with an average across countries of 60 and 52% respectively).

In the second strand, we included studies based on a CIVED dataset such as the article by Chin and Barber (2010), which examined the relation between teachers' beliefs and their organization of classes and student learning in Australia, England, and the United States, and also the contribution of Torney-Purta et al. (2005), which analyzed in some detail the associations between teachers' confidence in their knowledge about various topics and their students' civic knowledge. This second strand also includes two analyses conducted by Gainous and Martens (2012, 2013), who focused on United States data and explored the associations between teachers' beliefs, the implementation of an open classroom climate, and students' civic knowledge and the relation between teaching approaches (identified in the study) and open classroom climate. Finally, the study by Treviño et al. (2017), using ICCS data, investigated the association between teachers' practices and school characteristics with students' civic knowledge, civic attitudes, and future participation in three Latin American countries (namely Chile, Colombia, and Mexico). The study highlighted how teacher practices and attitudes are related to civic knowledge and that the schools' democratic environment is relevant for encouraging students' expected participation and their attitudes toward diversity.

In addition to the above-mentioned studies, which focused on teachers in CIVED and ICCS, several secondary analyses included teachers' variables to investigate associations with the variables from one of the other instruments (administered at school and/or student levels). We cannot conduct a detailed review here. However, it is relevant to refer to some studies that provide evidence about the different use of teachers' data gathered in the IEA civic and citizenship surveys. For instance, data on teachers have been used to estimate models to further

understanding of the associations between school factors and students' future electoral and political participation (Sampermans et al. 2018; Quintelier and Hooghe 2013) and to explore the relationship between school factors and students' civic development (Torney-Purta et al. 2007). Zhang et al. (2012) examined the association between teachers' approaches and students' successful performance on different types of knowledge items in the United States. They found that concept-oriented teaching was especially valuable in helping students correctly answer the more complex civic skills items that were part of the CIVED test.

Discussion

This review has identified several issues that are relevant for reflecting on the teacher questionnaire's structure and content across the IEA studies on civic and citizenship education.

The most general issue is to some extent provocative: do we actually need a teacher questionnaire, given the difficulties in finding strong associations between teacher data and students' outcomes and the difficulties countries encounter in assuring that a substantial proportion of teachers participate? Despite the difficulties and the problems, our answer is positive. Further reflections are probably needed on the current sampling procedures adopted for students (one intact class) and teachers who are not necessarily linked.

A second issue is whether there are specific research questions that suggest specific changes or additions to the questions asked to teachers. These could include questions of specific interest at the country level (where the teacher data is especially likely to be examined).

First, our review of the studies that used teacher data found that there has been a steady interest in them, and there are possibilities of identifying associations between teacher and student variables (although this has usually been limited to single-country studies). There is a need to continuously refine the constructs that guide the questionnaire development and to identify new constructs that current research shows as associated with students' outcomes (assuming reliable cross-national measures can be developed). The purpose is to better reflect global trends in the content of the questions asked to teachers, and to reflect changes in the school curricula and in the way civic and citizenship education is delivered. There is also a need to balance old and new topics not only to ensure some comparability across time, but also to limit the burden of the questionnaire in terms of length and time needed for its completion (as often requested by the national centers).

Secondly, several examinations of the current situation including those published by the Council of Europe conclude that CCE is one of the areas most characterized by gaps between principles and official regulations or between intended and implemented curricula, or between theory (or ideals) and practices (Birzea et al. 2004; Eurydice 2012; Eurydice 2017). These results were also confirmed by ICCS (e.g., in relation to the approaches adopted in delivering CCE or in teacher preparation and training) (Schulz et al. 2018). In this view, it is of importance to gather information on teaching that is independent from what is reported by the official national documents or other sources. This is useful not only for suggesting interpretations of international comparisons but also for understanding teachers' and principals' perceptions. Collecting such information could be a starting point for case studies or other in-depth investigations.

Another issue is related to the lack of questions in the teacher questionnaire about teachers' opinions related to civic and political issues and their participation in civic and political related activities. These kinds of questions would be of great interest in understanding teachers' perspectives on students' CCE. However, many of the participating countries would probably not consider it acceptable to ask teachers about their personal political opinions (and this is why it has not been done).

In ICCS 2009, a question on teachers' personal participation in civic-related activities outside the school was included (i.e., participation in political parties and organizations, in trade unions, in groups promoting the welfare of ethnic minorities). The idea was that it could be important to explore whether teachers' opinions on CCE were related to their out-of-school experiences with social and political participation. An analysis of this data from twelve countries indicates that teachers' participation in organizations outside the classroom is associated with some of their decisions about pedagogy (Reichert et al. 2020). Being active in out-of-school political, social, and community activities appears to enable teachers to connect abstract civic principles with real life examples relevant to their students. However, this question was not included in the ICCS 2016 questionnaire.

Some countries decided to include relevant questions in the teacher questionnaire as a national option. For example, the Belgium Flemish included a question on teachers' perception of the importance of different forms of social and political action for being a good citizen (using items from a similar question on the student questionnaire). The possibility of including such questions in the teacher questionnaire in the future should be explored.

Another issue that should be addressed more comprehensively in the teacher questionnaire relates to students' participation at school. Including questions on this topic could provide researchers with data from the perspective of teachers on the democratic environment students experience at schools and on which aspects of school life they are involved in (from school management to lesson and extra-curricular activities planning).

In conclusion, teachers' views about their schools and students in the area of CCE remain an important part of these studies. In our view, future research in this area could use the results of large-scale assessment as a starting point for small-scale studies aimed at understanding specific CCE teaching and learning contexts. More specifically this could include analyses of the teaching and learning processes that occur at the classroom and the school levels. Integrating large-scale and small-scale studies could help researchers shed light on issues that need to be further investigated, and that constitute relevant aspects of CCE across educational systems.

References

- Akiba, M., LeTendre, G. K., & Scribner, J. P. (2007). Teacher quality, opportunity gap, and national achievement in 46 countries. *Educational Researcher*, 36(7), 369–387.
- Akyüz, G., & Berberoglu, G. (2010). Teacher and classroom characteristics and their relation to mathematics achievement of the student in the TIMSS. *New Horizons in Education*, 58(1) 77–95.
- Alviar-Martin, T., Randall, J. D., Usher, E. L., & Engelhard, G. (2008). Teaching civic topics in four societies: Examining national context and teacher confidence. *Journal of Educational Research*, 101(3), 177–187.
- Birzea, C., Kerr, D., Mikkelsen, R., Pol, M., Froumin, I., Losito, B., & Sardoc, M. (2004). *All-European study on education for democratic citizenship policies*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Caponera, E., & Losito, B. (2011). *The roles of schools and communities in civic and citizenship education*. Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, 8–18 April, New Orleans.
- Caponera, E., Losito, B., & Mirti, P. (2012). *Civic Participation at School and School-based Community Participation*. Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting, 13–17 April, Vancouver.
- Chin, K., & Barber, C. E. (2010). A multi-dimensional exploration of teachers' beliefs about civic education in Australia, England, and the United States. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 38(3), 395–427.
- Dodeen, H., & Hilal, M. (2012). The effect of teacher's qualification practices, and perceptions on student Achievement in TIMSS Mathematics: a comparison of two countries. *International Journal of Testing*, 12, 61–77.
- Eurydice. (2012). *Citizenship education in Europe*. Brussels, Belgium: Author.
- Eurydice. (2017). *Citizenship education at school in Europe 2017*. Brussels, Belgium: Author.
- Gainous, J., & Martens, A. M. (2012). The effectiveness of civic education: Are "Good" teachers actually good for "all" students? *American Politics Research*, 40(2), 232–66.

- Knowles, R.T., & Di Stefano, M. (2015). International citizenship education research: An annotated bibliography of research using the IEA ICCS and IEA CIVED datasets. *Journal of International Social Studies*, 5(2), 86–118.
- Knowles, R.T., Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. (2018). Enhancing citizenship learning with international comparative research: Analyses of IEA civic education datasets. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, 13(1), 7–30.
- Ljunggren, C., & Unemar Öst, I. (2011). Teachers' dealings with controversial issues: a typology from the 2009 IEA/ICCS study. *Politics, Culture and Socialization*, 2(3).
- Losito, B., & Mintrop, H. (2001). The teaching of civic education. In J. Torney-Purta, R. Lehmann, H. Oswald, & W. Schulz, *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries. Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen* (pp.157–173). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Luschei, T.F., & Chudgar, A. (2011). Teacher, student achievement and national income: a cross national examination of relationships and interactions. *Prospects*, 41, 507–533.
- Martens, A. M., & Gainous, J. (2013). Civic education and democratic capacity: How do teachers teach and what works? *Social Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 956–76.
- Mintrop, H. (2002). Teachers and civic education instruction in cross-national comparison. In G. Steiner-Khamsi, J. Torney-Purta, & J. Schulle (Eds.), *New paradigms and recurrent paradoxes in education for citizenship: An international comparison* (pp. 61–83). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: JAI.
- Mullis, I.V.S., Martin, M.O., Foy, P., & Arora, A. (2012a). *TIMSS 2011 international results in mathematics*. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.
- Mullis, I.V.S., Martin, M.O., Foy, P., & Drucker, K.T. (2012b). *PIRLS 2011 International Results in Reading*. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.
- Peaker, G.F. (1975). *An empirical study of education in twenty-one countries: A technical report*. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Postlethwaite, N. (1967). *School organization and student achievement: A study based on achievement in mathematics in twelve countries*. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Postlethwaite, N., & Ross, K. N. (1992). *Effective schools in reading. Implication for educational planners*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Quintelier, E., & Hooghe, E. (2013). The relationship between political participation intentions of adolescents and a participatory democratic climate at school in 35 countries. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(5), 567–589.
- Reichert, F., & Torney-Purta, J. (2019). A cross-national comparison of teachers' beliefs about the aims of civic education in 12 countries: A person-centered analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 77, 112–125.
- Reichert, F., Torney-Purta, J., & Liange, W. (2020). Teachers' organizational participation: Profiles in 12 countries and correlates in teaching-related practices. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 48(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2020.1795764>
- Rivkin, S.G., Hanushek, E.A., & Kain, J.F. (2005). Teachers, schools and academic achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417–458.
- Sampermans, D., Isac, M. M., & Claes, E. (2018). Can schools engage students? Multiple perspectives, multidimensional school climate research in England and Ireland. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 17(1), 13–28.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 international report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38 countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2016). *ICCS assessment framework*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., & Friedman, T. (2018). *Becoming citizens in a changing world IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 international report*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73963-2>
- Sturman, L., & Lin, Y. (2011). Exploring the mathematics gap: TIMSS 2007. *RicercaAzione*, 3(1), 43–58.
- Torney, J. V., Oppenheim, A. N., & Farnen, R. F. (1975). *Civic education in ten countries. An empirical study*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries. Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Torney-Purta, J., Richardson, W. K., & Barber, C. H. (2005). Teachers' educational experience and confidence in relation to students' civic knowledge across countries. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, 1(1), 32–57.

Torney-Purta, J., Barber, C. H., & Wilkenfeld, B. (2007). Latino adolescents' civic development in the United States: Research results from the IEA Civic Education Study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(2), 111–125.

Toots, A., & Lauri, T. (2015). Institutional and contextual factors of quality in civic and citizenship education: Exploring possibilities of qualitative comparative analysis. *Comparative Education*, 51(2), 247–275.

Treviño, E., Béjares, Villalobos, C., & Naranjo, E. (2017). Influence of teachers and schools on students' civic outcomes in Latin America. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 110(6), 604–618.

Treviño, E., Béjares, C., Wyman, I., & Villalobos, C. (2018). Influence of teacher, student and school characteristics on students' attitudes toward diversity. In A. Sandoval-Hernández, M. M. Isac, & D. Miranda (Eds.), *Teaching tolerance in a globalized world* (pp. 33–67). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Van Daal, V.H., Begnum, A.C., Solheim, R.G., & Adèr, H.J. (2006). Secondary analysis of PIRLS 2001 Norwegian data. In *The Second IEA International Research Conference: Proceedings of the IRC-2006*, Vol. 2, 177–190. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Walker, D. A. (1976). *The IEA Six Subject Survey: An empirical study of education in twenty-one countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Zhang, T., Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. (2012). Students' conceptual knowledge and process skills in civic education: Identifying cognitive profiles and classroom correlates. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 40(1), 1–34.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.