GREEK CONCEPTIONS OF CITIZENSHIP AND THE STATE ROLE

Georgia Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, University of Athens, Greece
C. Andritsopoulou, University of Athens, Greece
Georgia Papadopoulou, University of Athens, Greece

Abstract

This paper aims at exploring aspects of political thinking of Greek adolescents. The focus is on the ways in which 15year-old students conceptualize citizenship and the role of the state, on the basis of research findings related to civic education (CIVED). Students conceptualizations have been identified through factor analysis. The concepts are derived on the basis of students' responses to the relevant items-questions in the IEA CIVICS Research. The same concepts serve as categories in the conducted content analysis of the official textbook. Students' conceptualizations are further explored on the basis of the students social characteristics.

The approach aims to explore textbook content and students conceptualizations as distinct but nevertheless related fields. In such an approach, conceptions which deviate from the formulated in the literature model of citizenship and the role of the state are not treated as limitations, but as alternative possibilities in the creation of meanings specific to the Greek society and culture. In this case, adaptations and/or co-existence of modern/western conceptions with pre-existing/local context, are viewed as unique modes of understanding and experiencing citizenship and the role of the state.

INTRODUCTION

This paper aims at exploring aspects of political thinking of Greek adolescents focusing especially on the relation of social and political education, as taught in high school, to 14year-old students' concepts of citizenship and the role of the state. The concepts are derived on the basis of students' responses to the relevant items-questions in the IEA CIVICS Research and have been identified through factor analysis. Students' conceptualizations are further explored on the basis of the student's social characteristics. The same concepts serve as categories in the

conducted content analysis of the official textbook.

The specific research questions in this work refer to

i. whether adolescents living in different social and cultural milieus develop different conceptions of citizenship and the role of the state.

ii. whether the students' concepts are in accordance with the aims and goals of Greek education, as these are depicted in the textbook.

iii. how can any differences that arise be explained.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The analysis that follows is twofold: it examines concepts of citizenship and the role of the state as they are manifested in the official textbook, on the one hand, and as they are expressed by the students' answers in the IEA CIVIC Research, on the other. The orientation of Social and Political Education in the lower secondary schools of Greece centers on curriculum content and is reflected in the content of the textbook. The reader should keep in mind that there is only one textbook per subject per grade in the Greek educational system. In this sense, the textbook constitutes the legitimate source of school knowledge. The textbook taught in schools during the IEA CIVICS research focuses on issues of democracy and citizenship. It also presents functions and structure of institutions, social problems, human rights, and international organizations (Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, et al., 2000).

Our analysis follows these stages: citizenship and the role of the state are presented, each accompanied by the pertinent presentation of the Factors that students construct. These Factors are examined as per each cultural capital group. The concepts of citizenship and the role of the state are related to the IEA Research framework. Convergence and discontinuities are discussed in relation to models of democracy, well-established in theory and in praxis. However, these are not conceived as prototypes but rather as lenses through which what students mean/what the students actually have to say is better explored. This procedure implies the examination of students concepts through a two-step analysis that allows for the particular blending of meaning to be interpreted in its own context. "Conclusions", actually points for further discussion, are comprised in each section of this paper. More specifically:

Students' conceptualizations of citizenship and the role of the state have been identified through factor analysis. The factors were estimated for students in groups of varying social origin. Factor analysis was performed using principal components extraction with varimax rotation. All statistics in the Factor analysis are based on cases with no missing values for any of the variables used while the number of factors extracted in each case is defined by the number of the eigenvalues that are greater than 1. Students' answers were originally coded: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree, 0 = I don't know. The 0 value was treated as missing. The minimum loading used to identify items to factors was 0.30. Our analysis is focused on the differences as well as the similarities of the factors.

In order to delineate social grouping we have used "cultural capital" as an indicator

of student ranking in the Greek social hierarchy. The assumption here is that cultural capital, related to students' social environment, experiences and practices, is important in the shaping of students' conceptualizations. "Cultural capital" reflects the qualitative characteristics such as Bourdieu's habitus on measurable features of students socio-economic background that are translated into social status categories. More specifically, the variables used are:

(a) the type of community the students live in,

(b) the language spoken at home, this considered an indication of the student's ethnic origin,

(c) mother's level of education, and

(d) number of books at home (Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, Andritsopoulou, forthcoming).

The emphasis in the present analysis is on the two extreme groups (highest cultural capital-group 1, and lowest cultural capital-group 5).

In order to better explore students' conceptualizations and the textbook's content we are using three different, though well-established, models of modern Democracy: liberal, social and radical democracy. As it will be explained later on, these models serve here as the means that help us explore student conceptualizations and are not treated as prototypes to which students' answers or the textbook content are compared.

As it is well-documented in the literature, the concepts of citizenship and the state role acquire specific meanings in the context of modernity and are strongly connected to the concept of modern democracy (Held, 1996). The pioneer characteristic of the modern nation-state which makes it different from all pre-industrial traditional states is that the modern state is the only one that managed to penetrate into societies in such a way that people were less connected to the local community and more to the national center, the imagined community (Anderson, 1983, p. 126-128). It is, therefore, through the nation-state that the transition from the loyal subject to the modern citizen is manifested (Mouzelis, 1998). Within the same context, modern democracy is threatened when citizens are not well informed, do not participate, do not vote, do not care about the environment, etc. (Bens, 2001, p. 193-197). Nevertheless, modern democracy, the "legitimate heir of the Enlightenment project" (Held, 1992), and its associative notions, such as citizenship and state role, have given rise over time to different interpretations of democracy and its notions/conceptions that actually encourage in a different way political dialogue in practice (Held, 1992).

Modern representative-parliamentarian democracy is usually described in political theory under the lens of two models: liberal and social democracy. In *liberal democracy* the emphasis is on "the attempt to uphold the values of freedom of choice, reason and toleration in the face of tyranny, the absolutist system and religious intolerance" (Held, 1996, p. 74). From this liberal perspective, state intervention in the economy (and other social spheres) (Held, 1996, p. 247) is considered as opposing liberalism. State power is regarded with skepticism and

hostility and the "separation of state from civil society is considered as an essential prerequisite of a democratic order" (Held, 1996, p. 306-307). Liberalism's principle seems to be "the segregation of powers and a world marked by openness, controversy and plurality…compromised by the reality of the 'free market'(Held, 1992, p. 41). Citizens not only have rights but also [important] duties such as being active. In that case, being a citizen means that people "are free…to argue against democracy and free speech, to discourage people from voting…and even to write and publish books excoriating liberalism" (Kukathas, 2001).

In *social democracy* (whereas social democracy of today is much more reformed compared to its vague classical model), besides the value of equality, the role of the intervening state and its protective activity remain crucial (Broadbent, 1999). The social democratic state is seen as "the essential means of ensuring that men and women do not become enslaved to the severe inequality and commercialization of life that unfettered markets produce" (Broadbent, 1999). In these terms, the notion of citizenship places its emphasis on the social rights of citizens: good public schools, free health care, measures for unemployment, retraining programs etc., and "…it is this balance between market principles and no market values that has made possible the sense of freedom and social equality" which "can be achieved only by the state" (Broadbent, 1999).

Although in theory these models are usually described as distinct, in praxis, at least in the Western world of today, none of them appears independently of the other: a historical perspective would reveal that during the 1970s representative democracies of the West added to their liberal-pluralistic practices a more social democratic approach, following the changes in the world economy of the time (Held, 1996, p. 119-120). The reforms that were introduced then aimed at moderating and regulating the "world of free enterprise…by an interventionist state" (Held, 1996, p. 234). So, already well-established liberal-pluralistic practices such as equal vote, freedom of conscience, information and expression on all public matters, associational autonomy, periodic elections and pressure-group politics etc., were combined with policies that realized the "welfare state" on the basis of equal chances for all. Not only did these reforms not reverse the liberal-pluralistic character of representative democracy, but they even secured and reinforced it. However, social-democratic policies came under serious debate in the beginning of the 1980s when the New Right strategy of rolling back the state began to enjoy substantial political support, especially in the Anglo-American world (Held, 1996, p. 262). The New Right insisted that individual freedom had been diminished because of the proliferation of bureaucratic state agencies, attempting to meet demands of those involved in group politics (Held, 1996, p. 254). A commitment to a "strong state" to provide a secure basis upon which it was thought business, trade and family life would prosper actually increased aspects of the state power while restricting the scope of the state's actions (Held, 1996, p. 254). So, under this "pressure", during the 1990s social democracy rewrote its values orientated on a less intervening welfare state where "private freedom, personal choice, environmental issues, less state intervention for industries, productivity, supporting political participation" prevailed (Giddens, 1998, p. 34).

Policy changes inspired by the New Right principles were seriously questioned during the same period. The critique against them led to the development of theories on democracy that have a more radical character, as far as the role of the citizen is concerned. In *radical democratic* perspectives the notions of liberty and equality hold crucial roles. They are accepted as principles, however, they "are a long way from being implemented" (Mouffe, 1992, p. 1). [We]should " take its [liberalism] declared principles literally and force liberal democratic societies to be accountable for the professed ideals" (Mouffe, 1992, p. 2). In the perspective of radical democracy, the liberal rights articulated with the ideas of popular sovereignty and civic equality, contain the basis that allows for "new rights to be claimed, and new meanings, new uses and new fields of application to be created for the ideas of liberty and equality" (Mouffe, 1992, p. 2). So, the institutions of the representative-liberal democracy are considered as the prerequisites of any democratization process.

In *radical democracy* the state is neither intervening (social democracy) nor agnostic on questions of political values (liberal state), but it "postulates a certain set of those values, which constitute its ethicopolitical principles" providing a "framework of common practices to guide political conduct" (Mouffe, 1992, p. 12). In these terms, the notion of citizenship seems to need a new content based on active participation and on notions of common good and civic virtue. These are represented in new social movements and generally in any aspect of social life that can ensure "the multiplicity of social logics and the necessity of their articulation" (Mouffe, 1992, p. 14). The most crucial point in radical democratic theory is the achievement of the maximum of pluralism (Mouffe, 1992, p. 3). This also serves as the measure for its opposite, which is the *conservative or conventional citizenship*: the more the ideas of radical democracy are spread, the more the image of the conservative citizen becomes clearer. Under this light, conventional citizenship can be defined as restricted to the most basic elements of liberal representative democracy, such as voting, being an informed, respectful citizen, sometimes, also, containing notions of patriotism.

RESULTS

Tables 1 and 2 present the concepts, derived from relevant items-questions in the IEA civic education research questionnaire, that have also served as categories in the content analysis of the textbook that will be presented later in this paper. Given the design of the IEA conceptual framework, these concepts reflect the most common (Torney-Purta J. et al., 2001, p. 77), and therefore are considered here as prevailing, practices in the West regarding citizen's rights and obligations as well as the responsibilities of the state.

Table 1: Items on Citizenship

B1	A good citizen-obeys the law
B2	A good citizen-votes in every election
B3	A good citizen-joins a political party
B4	A good citizen-works hard
B5	A good citizen-would participate in a peaceful protest against a law believed to be unjust
B6	A good citizen-knows about the country's history
B7	A good citizen-would be willing to serve in the military to defend the country
B8	A good citizen-follows political issues in the newspaper, on the radio or on TV
B9	A good citizen-participates in activities to benefit people in the community [society]
B10	A good citizen-shows respect for government representatives [leaders, officials]
B11	A good citizen-takes part in activities promoting human rights
B12	A good citizen-engages in political discussions
B13	A good citizen-takes part in activities to protect the environment
B14	A good citizen-is partiotic and loyal [devoted] to be country
B15	A good citizen-would be willing to ignore [disregard] a law that violated human rights

Table 2: Items on State responsibilities

C1	State responsibility-To guarantee a job for everyone who wants one
C2	State responsibility-To keep prices under control
C3	State responsibility-To provide basic health care for everyone
C4	State responsibility-To provide an adequate [decent] standard of living for old people
C5	State responsibility-To provide industries with the support they need to grow
C6	State responsibility-To provide an adequate [decent] standard of living for the unemployed
C7	State responsibility-To reduce differences in income and wealth among people
C8	State responsibility-To provide free basic education for all
C9	State responsibility-To ensure equal political opportunities for men and women
C10	State responsibility-To control pollution of the environment
C11	State responsibility-To guarantee peace and order [stability] within the country
C12	State responsibility-To promote honesty and moral behavior among people in the country

To examine the concepts that students from the two extreme cultural groups construct on citizenship and the responsibilities of the state we focus on the process of conceptualization as it is revealed through the meanings that students construct, by exploring the following two steps:

i. the conceptual content of the (positively) chosen item in the IEA questionnaire

(what the student chooses to agree with from elements of the prevailing models-practices that are shown on Tables 1 and 2);

ii. the construction of meaning, that is, the conceptualization of the specific blend of items that the student (positively) chooses (or what the combination of items that the student chooses to agree to indicates) (Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, Andritsopoulou, *forthcoming*).

This two-step formulation of concepts depicts a certain type of cultural appropriation. Such formulation potentially indicates that the meaning is constructed in relation to practices, as well as that the practices are possibly enacted in relation to the construction of meanings, at a given time in history and in a specific context. In these terms, the Greek socio-historical context is brought into the analysis as the frame that can contribute to the interpretation of the derived factors. Also, the three models of democracy described above serve here as means for better exploring students' conceptualizations, e.g., content and construction of meaning. In trying to identify students' concepts under the lens of pre-conceived models, as the case is for the above three, we came to realize that the items that students choose can only acquire meaning in the context of their combination in each Factor (step 2 of cultural appropriation). In other words, the a priori identification of the IEA items as belonging to a specific model of democracy cannot serve as main analytical tool, since it is often defied by the blending of items that appear in the Factor constructed by the students.

Following the above, it is obvious that the approach taken here aims at overcoming the typical dichotomies that prevail in the literature, namely "traditional/modern (=western)", "individualistic/communitarian", "diversity/unity", etc., in order to better recognize what the students express: by examining students' constructions without evaluating them in the light of preconceived models, we view them as valid in their own right. Under this light, concepts that have been formulated in the context of modernity (western societies), either in theory or in practice or even both, are not a *priori* accepted as models or prototypes. If this were the case, then students' conceptualizations should be compared to this prototype and evaluated as right or wrong, modern or traditional, progressive or backward, which is contrary to the intension and the theoretical presuppositions of the present work.

Furthermore, we explore textbook content and students' conceptualizations as distinct but nevertheless related fields, and even untangle seemingly contradictory concepts in an effort to allow alternative possibilities for viewing the modes of the creation of meaning. So, the effort here, as in previous work (Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, 2002), is to look for discontinuities rather than continuities and at the same time treat discontinuities as legitimate ways of creating meaning. It is clear that in such an approach conceptions which deviate from the well-formulated western model of democracy and related institutions and practices are not treated as contradictions or limitations, but are integrated in an effort to give the opportunity for alternative creation of meaning.

Civic education and textbook in Greece

Student conceptions of state and citizenship are not necessarily constructed in a way reflecting the content of the textbook. So, by exploring such content and respective students' concept formation, interesting points are revealed regarding the way in which student conceptualizations reflect either the school's (textbook) content knowledge or everyday experiences or both, to the extent that these (textbook content and everyday experience) are similar. The civic education textbook is oriented towards the established, western, modern content of civic education centering on relationships and concepts (e.g., citizenship related to environmental movement, the "ideal" citizen as an active carrier of rights) (Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides et al., 2002) expressing mainly liberal and even radical notions of modern democracy. These trends are in accordance with the Greek Constitution, the presentation of which takes a good part of the textbook, its main principles also underlying much of its content.

At this point it should be noted that in-force political, and also sometimes social practices and institutions in Greece, derive from the Constitution. The Greek Constitution *has at its core classical parliamentarianism and liberalism* (Tsatsos, 1981, p. 88) combined with the basic principles of social state. Such combination reflects the necessities put forth in the modernization era (Tsatsos, 1981, p. 224-227). Although some researchers express the view that the 1986 revision of the Constitution was not daring enough as to *suggest a more decisive [political] participation of the people in the decision-making centres* (Manitakis, 1997, p. 78), it is still valid in that it gives a rather broad frame for the practice of personal/human and social rights (Tsatsos, 1981, p. 96).

Civic education is taught as a separate subject in (a) primary school, (b) in the 9th grade (grade 3 of the gymnasium) and (c) in the Lyceum. Moreover, a good part of civic education knowledge content is integrated in other school subjects such as History, Ancient Greek, Greek Literature and Religion. Since the majority of these school subjects are taught in all grades of compulsory schooling, the importance of civic education in the Greek curriculum becomes obvious (Makrinioti, & Solomon, 1999).

As it has already been mentioned in previous work, "in recent years, political education in the country has changed from a traditionalist to a new approach in defining content. It deals with political systems, the democratic state, its role (security, health, education, welfare, employment, etc.), institutions and functions, the benefits and problems of social life, rights and obligations of citizens and human rights, international organizations, and the EU" (Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, et al., 2002). These changes in civic content are strongly connected to the changes in civic education textbooks since textbooks reflect the aims, objectives and knowledge content of the official curriculum. In grade 9, in which the IEA Research took place, textbooks have changed twice in recent years. The content analysis that follows centers on the 1998-9 civic education textbook, as it is the working textbook used by the students participating in the IEA civic education field research, realized in May 1999.

The textbook of 1998-99 is structured in three parts. The first is titled "*The Individual and Society*", includes seven chapters and introduces a sociological-social

anthropological analysis of society. The emphasis is on social structure, social stratification, social changes and solving of serious social problems. The second part titled "The Individual and '*Politeia*'" includes six chapters on legally organized society, political structure, human rights, democratic coexistence, and principles of democratic life. This is where the description of the Greek Constitution is mainly presented. It should be noted here that *Politeia* is a conception more comprehensive than the state. It is "the society organized on the basis of laws and institutions". The term does not refer to state power alone but is "indicating the total of the organized co-existence of people" (textbook 1998-9, p.127). Finally, the *third* part titled "The Individual, the State, International Organizations and the European Union" includes two chapters that describe international/European relations, functions, organizations, as also rights and duties of a European citizen. All chapters include a short introduction, pictures, maps, tables and questions-suggested activities for each unit.

The textbook aims at "help[ing] students become familiar with important issues related to their position in society and their role as citizens. Students are asked to comprehend the basic structures, functions and problems of society, the state and international organizations and to enact their own rights and responsibilities" (textbook 1998-9, p. 6). Furthermore, the textbook aims at "help[ing] students develop social and political awareness in the world they will live in and which they will contribute to shaping later" (textbook 1998-9, p. 7).

As the authors claim, these aims should be accomplished through the development of students' critical thought, using the textbook exercises. The objectives that the authors set, as well as the guidelines they give are of great importance if they are seen as a statement against *didactism* "which was very visible in earlier textbooks" (Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides et al., 2002). However, although the (1998-99) textbook incorporates a social studies perspective (instead of political or legalistic), issues concerning democracy, citizenship, functions and structure of institutions, social problems and national organizations "are presented in a descriptive way that emphasizes the typical functioning of the institutions at the expense of everyday social and political practices" (Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides et al., 2002).

At this stage it is worth pointing out that for the last decades the modernization discourse has not actually been introduced in the field of education, thus preventing radical educational changes (Gotovos, 2003, p. 71-72). In this perspective, the new approaches-changes (of the 1998-9 textbook) in defining content "are very limited in extent and quality in primary as much as in secondary education", so that "for the last decades...there has been no radical change either in educational programmes/curricula.... or in educators' preparation" (Gotovos, 2003, p. 71-72).

The above references support the view that the attempt of the textbook for a new, sociological, scientific, objective and neutral approach does not actually overcome the normative, descriptive character usual in Greek textbooks, nor is it enough to surpass the *didactism* which prevails in the Greek educational process.

Conceptions of citizenship in the textbook

Conceptions of Citizenship are to be found at specific chapters, either in terms of the ideal "*Individual*" (part 1:chapters 1,5) or the ideal "*Citizen*" (part 2: chapters 1,6 and part 3: ch.2) implying a more sociological or a more political science approach, respectively. As we will see later, the liberal-pluralistic model of democracy, combined with radical democracy's components, seem to constitute the concept of citizenship in the textbook. It must be stressed however, that the conceptual basis of the textbook's references on citizenship is the representative-parliamentarian democracy.

The **first part** of the textbook emphasizes social structure, social changes and social problems (namely drugs, poverty, car accidents, environmental pollution) (textbook, 1998-9, p. 82). In the last cases the positioning of individuals in solving social problems reveals the first interesting points of -liberal- active citizenship in the textbook. So, individuals "as members of the society are mobilized and organized in order to solve social problems" (textbook, 1998-9, p. 14). For example, the individual-citizen participates actively in dealing with the social problem of tax evasion or environmental pollution (textbook, 1998-9, p. 110, 116) and is always informed (textbook, 1998-9, p. 65,82,92). However, it is worth underlining that citizens and Politeia are jointly responsible for social problem solving (textbook, 1998-9, p. 102), thus expanding the concept of citizenship to a direction that reflects the theory of radical democracy. Overall, the individual's participation is considered important both at a collective (through social groups) and an individual level (textbook 1998-9, p. 30, 115).

Interestingly enough "in democracies, such as our country, citizens seek changes through peaceful ways" (textbook, 1998-9, p. 14). Such a citizen is more clearly presented through the extensive reference to environmental issues, which is described as a social problem of international interest, demanding the cooperation with non-governmental organizations (textbook 1998-9, p. 81, 116-7). This might be considered to involve a radical turn. It is quite interesting that in this case of environmental issues the citizen is expected to conceive him/herself as *part* of the problem, in that sense placing emphasis on his/her accountability for such problems (textbook, 1998-9, p. 115). Moreover, in the case of the pollution problems, it is clearly stated that citizens should respect the pro-environment laws in the context of "communal action" by joining environmental unions (textbook, 1998-9, p. 116-117). Nevertheless, what is of importance here is that there are no references of active citizenship on other important social problems such as poverty issues.

Concepts of citizenship are also depicted in the **second part** of the textbook, where the citizen's role is directly connected to the individual's participation in politics since this participation is presented as the essence of citizenship (textbook 1998-9, p. 131). The definition of the citizen reflects a basic component of representative democracy, but it is also general enough to comply with both liberal and/or social democratic perceptions of citizenship. Citizens' rights are emphasized and related to liberal democracy: human life and dignity, political freedom, equality, the separation of private-public spheres (textbook 1998-9, p. 151-159). These rights are

strongly respected by all state powers, but they also demand citizens' active participation (textbook, 141). The active citizen participates in governance through the practice of his basic-liberal political rights and duties (e.g., voting, participation in political parties/ political dialogue **and** critical participation in political procedures) (textbook 1998-9, p. 167-8, 184-5).

The (last) chapter of the second part of the textbook titled "Civil Society" refers to citizens' rights and responsibilities according to the Constitution, emphasizing at the same time the meaning and the role of citizens' associations. The civil society is presented as one of the means to influence state decisions. However, civil society is not clearly defined but simply related to social associations that are organized *independently* from the state and express citizens' opinions. It is in this way that the state's, and others fields' (namely market, mass communication means, employment field) autarchy is prevented (textbook, 1998-9, p. 233-237). For these reasons it is necessary for people to assemble, discuss public issues, demonstrate and ask for compensation of injustices, co-operate, form associations, exercise pressure on the government, and even strike (textbook, 1998-9, p. 224-5). Active citizenship contains both liberal and social democratic components as well as radical components (*demonstrate, exercise pressure, strike*).

In the ***third part*** of the textbook (ch.1: International community, international relations and international organizations), issues of the protection of the environment and human rights are presented as issues of a global society. In this perspective, international governmental associations and non-governmental organizations are emphasized as of equal importance (textbook, 1998-9:, p. 251). In the chapter on the European Union (ch. 2) there is a specific reference to the rights and duties of a European citizen. Special emphasis is put on the *awareness* demanded from the European citizen concerning notions of multi-cultural society, global values and interests and, finally, the formation of a global civil society (textbook, 1998-9, p. 294- 297).

To summarize, the main theme throughout the textbook appears to be the active citizen. His/her active participation is justified in the realm of modern representative democracy. So, the functions of citizen depicted in the book are spread throughout the models of democracy. The content of citizenship is based both on classic *liberal* values and on *radical* citizenship mainly constructed in a modern/western framework, as far as it is connected to new social movements, non-governmental organizations and human rights. It seems that the textbook authors aim at connecting, even expanding, the established notion of *people* in liberal representative democracies, to the more radical, (*also western*) notions, *of active citizen.*

Students' conceptualizations of the characteristics of the ideal citizen

This section presents the findings of the Factor analysis on students' concepts of citizenship. As we will see in the following analysis, students' concepts of citizenship are not actually constructed in a way that would reflect the textbook's content.

The factors for students that belong to cultural groups 1 and 5 are presented in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

Table 3: Factor Analysis: Citizenship, Cultural Group 1

A good citizen	*F1*	*F2*	*F3*	*F4*
B7 Would serve in the military	0,8			
B1 Obeys the law	0,8			
B14 Is patriotic and loyal	0,7	0,4		
B2 Votes in every election	0,7		0,5	
B13 Participates to protect the environment		0,8		
B11 Participates to promote human rights		0,6	0,4	0,3
B4 Works hard		0,5		
B9 Participates to benefic the community	0,4	0,5	0,4	
B6 Knows country's history	0,3	0,4		
B10 Respects government representatives	0,4	0,4		
B3 Joins a political party			0,8	
B12 Engages in political discussions			0,8	
B8 Follows political issues in the media		0,4	0,5	
B15 Would ignore law against human rights				0,8
B5 Peacefully protests			0,4	0,6
% of variance explained	**17,7**	**15,9**	**15,1**	**8,7**
Total variance explained		**57,4**		

Extactrion Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

The findings of the data analysis indicate that students in ***cultural group 1*** are better represented by the conventional-patriotic citizen (F1), who is willing to *serve in the military, obey the law, is loyal to his/her country*, and vote. The second factor (F2) blends together items from different "models", such as p*rotecting the environment, promoting human rights* (radical), *participating for the community* (liberal) as well as some conventional characteristics such as *hard working, knows county's history, respects government representatives*. This particular/unique blending of items (=*step two of cultural appropriation*) depicts a rather "Greek" concept of the "politically correct" citizenship: in this context, engagement for human rights and protection of environment may not be conceived as radical, since these have been established and therefore legalized as symbols of modernized political attitude. Finally, the active liberal citizen (*participate in political parties, in political discussions, get information from the media*) and the active radical citizen (*ignore an unfair law, protest peacefully*) emerge in weaker factors (F3 and F4, respectively).

Table 4: Factor Analysis: Citizenship, Cultural Group 5

A good citizen	F1	F2	F3	F4
B14 Is patriotic and loyal	0,8			
B7 Would serve in the military	0,7	0,3		
B13 Participates to protect the environment	0,6	0,5		
B1 Obeys the law	0,4		0,4	
B6 Knows country's history		0,7	0,3	
B2 Votes in every election		0,7		0,3
B10 Respects government representatives		0,6		
B9 Participates to benefit the community	0,4	0,6		
B12 Engages in political discussions			0,7	
B3 Joins a political party			0,7	
B8 Follows political issues in the media			0,6	
B15 Would ignore law against human rights				0,8
B4 Works hard		–0,3		0,5
B11 Participates to promote human rights	0,4			0,5
B5 Peacefully protests	0,3			0,4
% of variance explained	**17,3**	**13,4**	**12,9**	**11,2**
Total variance explained		**54,8**		

Extactrion Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Factor 1 (F1) for students in **cultural group 5** seems to be similar to the same Factor for students in cultural group 1, but for one item. The Factor reflects the construction of the conventional-patriotic citizen, except that the students of the lowest cultural capital group include in the concept of the ideal citizen elements that in the Greek context could be perceived as status symbols, such as the item *knows country's history*, the "radical" item "*protect the environment*", instead of the item "*vote in every election*", as the case is for students of cultural group 1. Analyzing the conceptual content of the chosen item (= *step one of cultural appropriation*), we would point out that environmental concerns are connected to new social movements, related to radical democratic trends (*see theoretical framework*). The particular blending of items that construct the Factor (= *step two of cultural appropriation*) though, indicates a unique meaning construction, probably reflecting Greek particularities, meaning the way in which students appropriate the "legitimation" of environmental concerns in Greek society since they became part of the official compulsory school curriculum.

Factor 2 also reflects conventional meaning, containing the main aspects of the traditional-liberal voter, also active in "good work" in his/her community. Factor 3, depicting the active-liberal citizen, is identical to the same one of cultural group 1. The inclusion of two more items in Factor 4 when compared to the same Factor for cultural group 1, changes its meaning: the particular blending of items reflects the

Greek version of the radical/social democratic citizen more than the active liberal citizen (cultural group 1).

It is apparent that the strongest factors center on conventional meaning, while elements of the active and radical citizen follow as parts of weaker factors, in the construction of which traces of conservatism are never missing. It is also obvious that the prevailing type of ideal citizen, on which student groups with different social characteristics seem to agree, is the conventional-patriotic citizen. The meanings constructed by the students of both cultural groups seem to differ from the model presented in the textbook: only traces of the active and radical citizen (the type of citizenship described in the textbook) are present in students' conceptualizations and these only in the weaker factors. Furthermore, the type of citizen that is absent in the textbook, i.e., the conservative one, is quite present in the concepts that students form. This finding can probably be explained through the dominance of the patriotic-nationalist conceptions in the Greek context, common in the literature (Fragoudaki, Dragona, 1997) (Diamantouros, 2000) and also attested by the findings of the IEA Research.

It is quite important to stress the fact that in the case of constructing the meaning of citizenship, the boundaries between cultural groups seem vague and hard to identify. At the same time, as mentioned before, the "radical" citizen is quite weak for both cultural groups. These findings can be explained through the assessment of post-war circumstances in Greek society. According to Tsoukalas (Tsoukalas, 1986, p. 19-52) a characteristic of Greek society is its fluid social hierarchy in which middle class elements prevail. In addition, the importance of the Greek nationalism-patriotism combined with the orthodox tradition (Kitromilidis, 1983, p. 35-38), renders citizenship in the-narrow-meaning construction of nationality. It is thus that the reasoned people are identified with the "mythical" nation (Tsoukalas, 2001) and not with the active-radical citizen participating in a society without exclusions, as the textbook preaches. Moreover, the conservatism of the students in group 1 (similar to group 5) and their apparent indifference towards an active-radical citizen can be interpreted in light of the clientelist system of politics (Dertilis, 2000), rendering the active-radical citizen as not particularly convenient. The weak presence of the majority of the new social movements that are connected to radical aspects of democracy appears to be related to the above arguments. According to researchers, such issues are related to the strong presence of civil society (Lipovatz, 1995, p. 191). This seems to be interrelated with the development of intermediating agencies and institutions between the people and the state. It appears, however, that in Greece clientelist politics coupled with the ways in which individuals joined and related to political parties, prevented the development of such intermediaries, and that *"the extension (of clientelism) to various sectors of social, economic and cultural life has bred a weak civil society, that has submitted itself to it"* (Makridimitris, 1999). In these terms, we realize why the environment, human rights, peaceful protest issues (new agenda issues) are not clearly depicted by the students.

At this point it should be mentioned that our main assumption is that student choices reflect a specific mode of cultural appropriation in their construction of meaning: their everyday experience prevails (as the strongest factors revealed), while the

textbook content is much less present. Moreover, the content of citizenship in the textbook seems to have a different impact on students' construction of meaning. We assume that the liberal notions related to the Greek Constitution and therefore to common practices in Greece allow for a more clear construction of the "liberal-active citizen". As shown before there are only traces of radical citizenship in the Factors constructed by the students, although there is a lot of emphasis on these concepts in the textbook. This finding leads us to the assumption that issues, such as these, related to new social movements, could not allow for clear-cut construction of meaning by the students, probably because they are not yet integrated in everyday life.

The role of the State in the textbook

In all three parts of the textbook, the role of the state is presented in relation to the citizen and to society. Inevitably, the analysis that follows, focuses on the relation *state-citizen*.

Conceptions of the state role are rather disseminated across the whole textbook with the exception of a short chapter in the second part of the book, where the basic definitions of society, citizen, state, politics and power are described. The state is presented as closely related to power and one of its possible roles is the regulation of differences in social life (textbook, 1998-9, p. 124-127). The state is described as the facilitator that assures "important social processes", such as education or the infrastructure necessary for the economy (textbook, 1998-9, p. 129). Although the basic characteristics of representative democracy are introduced in this chapter, the presentation is restricted to definitions (textbook, 1998-9, p. 129-134). The reader must proceed in the next chapters in order to find any reference to the *justification of state power* in modern democracies, for instance, its stemming from the institutions that implement the principles of popular sovereignty (textbook, 1998-9, p. 167,183) or from the citizen's right to control the Parliament (textbook, 1998-9, p. 150). However, these conceptual connections between the representation mechanisms and their dependence on the *citizen and* the people, are missing. In these terms the authors' urge for active participation cannot be directly connected to active-radical citizenship. Nevertheless, it should be noted that these conceptual connections might rely on the effectiveness of teaching or on other factors that go beyond the textbook and its content analysis.

In the **first part** of the textbook, there is often a side-glance reference to the state by "replacing" it with the broader notion of Politeia (quite obvious in Chapter 7). In this broader frame, *Politeia* is responsible for the preservation of justice and order, the protection of citizens and even democracy from external enemies, economic development (liberal aspect), welfare provisions for weak social groups (social-democratic aspect) (textbook, 1998-9, p. 26-27), as well as access to education, etc. (textbook, 1998-9, p. 109-111). The last issues are later in the book clearly connected to the role of the state. As mentioned above, in the chapter "Social Problems", Politeia has the main responsibility for three out of four important social problems (drugs, poverty, car accidents), while the citizen has the main responsibility for environmental pollution. The authors' aim is to emphasize the common responsibility of Politeia-Citizen-(individual). There are, nevertheless, two problems: a) this balance

is not carried through. In the section "confronting poverty" the individual (not the citizen) is "advised" to overcome poverty by "finishing at least compulsory education"; b) the relation of Politeia-Citizen does not materialize as an active citizen supporting state policies or negotiating redistribution of power and wealth. Politeia and Citizen are presented as jointly responsible without any clear meeting point of their roles.

The modern democratic state is presented in the **second part** of the textbook, mainly from a political science perspective: laws, institutions, organization of democratic governing, the Greek Constitution. The emphasis is on the role of the state vis-a-vis welfare provisions, following the main lines of the Greek Constitution. In this social rights are described and vested with the state's power to enact them on behalf of the citizen (textbook, 1998-9, p.177-179). Basic social rights such as housing, care for the elderly, retraining programmes, education, protection of environment and culture, etc., are guaranteed by the state but cannot be claimed from the citizens i*n any clear way* (textbook, 1998-9, p. 129-130, 227-8, 179).

In convergence to the active-liberal citizen (presented above), the modern state has liberal principles as reference points: freedom, equality, political representation, segregation of authorities, solidarity, polyphony-pluralism (textbook, 1998-9, p. 129-130, 156, 164, 173-5) expressing the principles of the Rule of Law in modern parliamentary democracies. The concepts of "popular sovereignty" and the role of political parties serve as means for the presentation of the basic mechanisms and institutions of representation and pluralism (textbook, 1998-9, p. 167-174, 175-178, 183). In relation to the functions of political parties in representative systems of governance, the main difference between the liberal and social democratic approach is also presented, though briefly. The role of the Parliament, the Government and other institutions of representation, as well as the relationships among them are presented in the next chapter (textbook, 1998-9, p. 183-211), depicting the outline of the Greek Constitution and putting special emphasis on its extensive protection of rights. These rights are described in the chapter "Civil Society" from a rather legalistic point of view, without any clear reference to their possible connection to the legitimation of power or the democratization process. However, as mentioned above, citizens' participation in different associations is expected to eliminate any kind of oppression that comes as a result of the exercise of power on the part of the state and other institutions (e.g., the free market, employers and the media) (textbook, 1998-9, p. 236-7). The state is legitimized to intervene in order to protect important aspects of social and economic life from the private sector's misuse and disinterest with respect to employment, insurance, tourism, transportation (textbook, 1998-9, p. 203).

The approach of the textbook on the issue of the state is rather a social-democratic one. The intervention of the state is emphasized but this emphasis does not lead to diminishing the role of the citizen: the authors never fail to stress that the citizens have the *main* responsibility for the implementation of modern democracy's principles (textbook, 1998-9, p. 129-130). This is probably the way the authors chose to combine the established (deriving from the Constitution) practices with their aim of introducing a more "participatory" perspective of the role of the citizen. In the same sense, although modern democracy is safeguarded by a democratic state,

democracy is mainly under threat if citizens' active participation is missing (textbook, 1998-9, p. 172, 217). What is not clearly stated in the book is the likelihood that by enforcing his/her rights the citizen can definitely influence decision-making, thus enlarging and substantiating democracy, as the theory on radical democracy claims.

The **third part** of the textbook (ch.1: International community, international relations and international organizations), emphasizes issues of global society, where the states are expected to co-operate in order to face global social problems under international Law: peace, human rights, social and economic development, protection of the environment (textbook, 1998-9, p. 243-251) issues on equality, health and democracy (textbook, 1998-9, p. 260). The state is expected to co-operate in international fora and organizations in order to safeguard democracy, peace and order, and to develop actions for the environment, unemployment, social discriminations (textbook, 1998-9, p. 291-2).

In summary, it could be claimed that when examining the relation of state-citizen, the liberal and radical elements of citizenship prevail over the possible domination of the state. On the other hand, when the role of the state is examined separately, then social-democratic characteristics prevail. The authors seem to encourage an active -and even radical- citizenship, without, however, clearly relating it to a welfare state that contains the everyday claims of citizens in Greece today.

Students' concepts regarding the role of the state

This section presents the findings of the Factor analysis on students' concepts with respect to the role of the state. The factors for students in groups 1 and 5 are presented in Tables 5 and 6, respectively.

Table 5: Factor Analysis: State's responsibilities, Cultural Group 1

A good citizen	F1	F2	F3	F4
C3 Basic health care for everyone	0,8			
C11 Guarantee peace and order within the country	0,7			0,3
C2 Keep prices under control	0,5		0,5	
C6 Decent standard of living for the unemployed		0,7		
C1 Guarantee jobs		0,6		
C4 Decent standard of living for old people		0,6		
C7 Reduce income differences		0,5		0,3
C10 Control pollution of the environment			0,8	
C12 Promote honesty and moral behaviour			0,7	0,3
C5 Support industries			0,7	
C9 Equal political opportunities for men and women				0,8
C8 Free basic education for all				0,8
% of variance explained	**15,0**	**14,4**	**13,7**	**11,4**
Total variance explained		**54,4**		

Extactrion Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

The results of Factor analysis indicate that students in cultural group 1 construct meaning that reveals a "merging" of liberal and social-democratic features, which is also reflected in the Greek Constitution and everyday practices. The Factors constructed by students of this group include *provision for healthcare, ensuring the country's peace and stability, control of prices and free basic education* (F1), as well as *decent standard of living for the unemployed and old people, guarantee jobs, reduce income differences* (F2). In the first case, the blending of items reflects the notions of basic welfare provisions in terms of a social-democratic approach (Giddens, 1998, 101-126). Such an approach appears adjusted to the "Greek context", where health, education, and control of prices are usually high in the everyday political agenda and, therefore, well known to students everyday experience. The reader is reminded that these same concepts are clearly depicted in the textbook as responsibilities of the state. In Factor 2, the economic-social democratic role of the state is more emphasized and there is also a radical trend in it (*decent standard of living for the unemployed*) as in the textbook. Other issues of the new social movements (environment, ethics, equality) that are related to the radical model of democracy have a lower priority for students in cultural group 1 and they are blended together with liberal and/or social democratic characteristics in factors F3 and F4. These choices are converging with what is perceived in related literature to be the predominant attitude in the country, as far as the state is concerned (Mouzelis, 2001, 30-41). It is clear that the demands for education, health and peace are stronger than other responsibilities that the state is usually vested with, as for example gender equality and other issues included in the new social movements discourse (Vergopoulos, 1985).

Table 6: Factor Analysis: State's responsibilities, Cultural Group 5

A good citizen	F1	F2	F3	F4
C4 Decent standard of living for old people	0,7		0,3	
C5 Support industries	0,7			
C6 Decent standard of living for the unemployed	0,6	0,4		
C1 Guarantee jobs	0,4	0,4		0,4
C9 Equal political opportunities for men and women		0,8		
C8 Free basic education for all		0,7		
C7 Reduce income differences	0,3	0,4		
C3 Basic health care for eveyrone			0,7	
C2 Keep prices under control			0,6	0,3
C10 Control pollution of the environment		0,3	0,5	
C11 Guarantee peace and order within the country				0,8
C12 Promote honesty and moral behaviour				0,7
% of variance explained	**15,1**	**14,3**	**13,4**	**12,6**
Total variance explained		**55,5**		

Extactrion Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

The conceptions of students in cultural group 5 partly reverse the above pattern of students in cultural group 1. More specifically, in this particular blending of items in Factor 1 the basic welfare provisions and the social-democratic characteristics of the state prevail. In the second factor too, there seems to be a blending of items from different models. However, this specific demand for gender equality of political opportunities, free education for all, reduce income differences, strongly indicates the social-democratic component of the state present in the textbook. Other responsibilities of the state that reflect well-established practices common in the West and Greece are integrated in the weak Factors F3 and F4.

It is obvious that student conceptions of state responsibilities are more differentiated across cultural groups. This was not the case in students' concepts of citizenship. It is worth noting though, that social-democratic trends regarding the role of the state are present in both groups' conceptualizations. Following the second step of conceptualization process, where the blending of items is examined, the choice of items that construct each Factor appears different, reflecting probably the different positioning of students in the social structure, or, in other words, their different perception of social group interests. In Greece there is a strong demand across the whole society for the state to undertake economic responsibilities. And this appears to be an important component in the factors, although it is rather smaller for students in cultural group 1. This finding converges to the observation that economic interests tend to cross social class boundaries, since they display concerns at all levels of the social hierarchy (Mouzelis, 1999).

It is worth pointing out that this specific construction of meaning seems to partly converge to the textbook content for the role of the state. As it became obvious in the content analysis, the textbook is addressing a social-democratic state expected to provide some welfare provisions for weak social groups. In the case of Greece, this type of state is strongly connected to the protection of rights and to representative institutions that implement the principles of freedom, equality, pluralism, etc. The students' concept of an "interfering" state (particularly with respect to welfare provisions) can be understood in the frame of the Greek historical-social context. The Greek state has historically been constructed in a way that emphasizes an increased role, extended state protectionism for all social activities, and provisions for most social and economic activities (Tsoukalas, 1986, p. 19-25). Students' conceptualizations seem well settled within such context.

Under this perspective, new social issues, particularly the textbook's emphasis on environment protection and gender equality, are revealed in students' constructions of meaning only in weak factors as traces of radical issues. We are led to assess that students' everyday experience in the "local/Greek context" is manifest in this case too.

References

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism.* London, Verso.

Bens, Ch. (2001) What does it mean to be a good citizen? *National Civic Review, 90*(2).

Broadbent, E. (1999) Social Democracy: Past and Future. *Dissent, 46*(4).

Dertilis, G., B. (2000) Social and Clientelist Networks (in Greek). *The Vima* (20.08.2000).

Diamantouros, N. (2000) *Cultural duality and political change* (in Greek). Athens, Alexandreia.

Frangoudaki, A., Dragona, Th., (1997) *What is our country ? Nationalism in Education*, (in Greek), Athens, Alexandreia.

Gotovos (2003) Citizenship education in post cold war era (in Greek). *Comparative and International Education Review*, 1.

Giddens, A. (1998) *The third way* (in Greek). Athens, Polis.

Held, D. (1996) *Models of Democracy*. Polity and Stanford University Press (second edition).

Held, D. (1992) Liberalism, Marxism and Democracy. In Hall, S., McGrew, T. (eds) *Modernity and its Futures*. UK, Polity Press in association with the Open University.

Kitromilidis, P. (1983) Ideological Tendencies and Political Demands : Aspects from 19th Greek Century. *In Aspects of Greek Society in 19th Century* (in Greek). Athens, Estia.

Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, G. (in press) Citizenship and Education. *Educational Practice and Theory.*

Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, Ntelikou, M., Papadopoulou, G, Tsakmaki, B. (2002) Greek Conceptions of Democracy, Citizenship, the State role and Immigrants. *Onlinejournal for Social Sciences and their Didactics.*

Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, G. (2002) Cultural Appropriation of Social and Political Education. In Steiner-Khamsi, G., Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J. (Eds) *New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Democracy.* New York, Elsevier.

Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, G., Andritsopoulou, S. (in press): Cultural appropriation of political participation and concepts of Democracy in Greece.

Kontogiannopoulou-Polydorides, G., Dimopoulou, K., Kottoula, M. (2000) Citizen Education: Silencing Crucial Issues. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 18.

Kukathas, C. (2001) Education and Citizenship in diverse societies. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35.

Lipovats A. (1995) *Against the current: towards a civil society* (in Greek). Athens, Plethron.

Makridimitris, A. (1999) Civil Society and its enemies (in Greek). *The Vima* (03.01.1999).

Makrinioti, D. and Solomon, J. (1999) The discourse of Citizenship Education in Greece. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille and J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.) *Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-Four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*, Amsterdam, IEA.

Manitakis, A. (1997) *The Constitutional Coincidence of the after-Junta Democracy* (in Greek). Athens, Exantas.

Ministry of Education (1998-9) *Social and Political Education*, third class of "Gymnasium", students' textbook, Athens, OEDB (Organization for the Publications of School Textbooks).

Mouffe, C. (1992) Democratic Citizenship and the Political Community. In C. Mouffe (Ed.), *Dimensions of Radical Democracy*. London, Verso.

Mouzelis, N. (2001) *An alternative third way* (in Greek). Athens, Themelio.

Mouzelis, N. (1999) The Class Dimension in Modernity (in Greek). *The Vima* (14.3.1999).

Mouzelis, N. (1998), *State-Nation and rights of the Citizen of the 21st century, Records of the International meeting of Athens*, 3-4 July 1997: The Left in Europe of the 21st century. Athens, Istamai (Institute of Strategic and Development Studies).

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., Schulz, W. (2001) *Democracy and Education in Twenty-eight Countries. Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*. IEA.

Tsatsos, D. (1981) *Constitutional Right* (in Greek). Athens, Sakkoulas.

Tsoukalas, K. (2001) State, Nation and Church (in Greek). *The Vima* (07.01.01).

Tsoukalas, K. (1986) *State, Society and Labor in the after-Junta Greece* (in Greek). Athens, Themelio.

Vergopoulos, K. (1985) *The State in Peripheral Capitalism* (in Greek). Athens, Exantas.

SITES