

1997

Multidimensional Citizenship: Educational Policy for the Twenty-first Century

John J. Cogan
University of Minnesota

Patricia Kristine Kubow
University of Minnesota

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceinternational>

 Part of the [International and Area Studies Commons](#), and the [Service Learning Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Cogan, John J. and Kubow, Patricia Kristine, "Multidimensional Citizenship: Educational Policy for the Twenty-first Century" (1997). *International Service Learning & Community Engagement*. 2.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceinternational/2>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Barbara A. Holland Collection for Service Learning and Community Engagement (SLCE) at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Service Learning & Community Engagement by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

Multidimensional Citizenship:

Educational Policy for the
Twenty-first Century

Final Report of the Citizenship Education Policy Study Project

Funded by the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, Tokyo, Japan

NSLC
c/o ETR Associates
4 Carbonero Way
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

**Multidimensional Citizenship:
Educational Policy for the 21st Century**

**The Final Report of the
Citizenship Education Policy Study Project**

Funded by the
Sasakawa Peace Foundation
Tokyo, Japan

John J. Cogan, PhD
Project Director
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0208
USA

Patricia Kristine Kubow, PhD
Research Coordinator
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0208
USA

and

The Citizenship Education Policy Study Project Researchers
from Nine Nations

Copyright 1997

Contents

| | Page |
|--|------|
| I. Background and context | 1 |
| Working definitions | 2 |
| Five Attributes of Citizenship | 3 |
| Global Trends Literature | 8 |
| II. Overview of the Study | 16 |
| III. Findings | 23 |
| Global trends | 24 |
| Citizen characteristics | 29 |
| Educational strategies/approaches/innovations | 31 |
| IV. Multidimensional citizenship as educational policy | 36 |
| The personal dimension | 37 |
| The social dimension | 38 |
| The spatial dimension | 39 |
| The temporal dimension | 39 |
| The core dimensions and key questions | 41 |
| The citizenship education self-assessment checklist | 43 |
| V. Challenges and conclusions | 47 |
| VI. References | 53 |
| Appendices | |
| 1 CEPS policy expert panelists | |
| 2 CEPS project researchers | |
| 3 CEPS consensus criteria | |
| 4 Summary data tables | |

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

As we approach the end of this turbulent century and prepare to meet the challenges of the next, the question of what constitutes education for citizenship in various nations appropriate to the demands and needs of a rapidly changing global community is critical in both national and international contexts. The planet and the human family are facing an unprecedented set of challenges, issues and problems including the globalization of the economy, a significant level of deterioration in the quality of the global environment, rapidly changing technologies and the uses of same, and ethical and social issues. How does one respond to these challenges both as a member of a particular nation state as well as a member of the community of nations in a manner that is thoughtful, active, personal and yet with a commitment to the common good? This was the underlying question as we began to explore the concept of citizenship appropriate for life in the early 21st century. The vehicle for doing this was the Citizenship Education Policy Study project (CEPS), an international research network project designed to examine the changing character of citizenship over the next twenty-five years and the subsequent implications of these changes for educational policy across the nine participating nations and beyond.

Preparation for citizenship has traditionally been carried out through formal educational programmes in schools and almost always through the social subjects area of the curriculum. Citizenship education has typically been embedded in courses of study in history and civics in most nations and has for the most part focused upon developing a knowledge base about how government and other institutions in any given state work and the rights and duties of citizens with respect to the state. It has been oriented largely toward the development of a national identity.

At one point, when the world was a simpler place, this conceptualization of citizenship may have served us well; but this is no longer the case. The complexity and interconnectedness of the challenges and issues facing us at the close of this century and the dawn of the next simply cannot be met through conventional means. What is called for is a new vision of citizenship education, one in which both the school and the communities it serves, and is a part of, are equal partners in the education of each new generation of citizens. It calls for citizen education which in this Report we define as *multidimensional* since it embraces many interconnected dimensions. It is first and foremost personal, but it also acknowledges the need to improve the social communities and institutions within them simultaneously. It is a conception which is based in dimensions of time; that is, it takes account of the past and present when envisioning what the future might be. It is also spatial in nature in that it acknowledges the different levels of community which must be

taken into account as we face and attempt to resolve global problems and issues which are manifested in regional, state and provincial, and most certainly, local circumstances.

The Citizenship Education Policy Study was carried out by four national and/or multinational teams totaling 26 researchers, all specialists in citizenship education and/or research methodology, and was a pioneering effort with respect to research networking among exchange partner universities in Asia, Europe and North America. Each of the partner universities, Chulalongkorn in Thailand, Hiroshima in Japan, Amsterdam in the Netherlands and the lead institution, Minnesota in the USA, had previous bilateral exchange agreements with one another. However, this was the first time that all four had agreed to cooperate in a multinational research endeavor.

A total of 182 policy experts from a broad range of fields of endeavor participated as panelists over the interview and subsequent two survey rounds of the study which employed a cultural futures modification of the Ethnographic Delphi Futures Research methodology (EDFR). This method is designed to achieve as much consensus as possible amongst the participating panelists over the several rounds of a study in order to best inform public policy.

Working Definitions

In a cross-national, cross-cultural study such as this, there are many nuances with respect to concepts and the definition of terms, not the least because of differences in language and culture. Accordingly, at the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee in September, 1993, both general and working definitions were established for the project to guide the inquiry over the next four years. These were not necessarily optimal definitions in the eyes of each participating nation but they were acceptable for purposes of launching the study. The discussion of and consensus reached upon these signaled from the outset the collaborative nature of this project.

The Committee first developed a set of general definitions and then a working definition of citizenship. The general definitions included the following:

A citizen was defined as "a constituent member of society". *Citizenship*, on the other hand, was said to be "a set of characteristics of being a citizen". And finally, *citizenship education*, the underlying focal point of the study, was defined as "the contribution of education to the development of those characteristics of being a citizen".

It should be further noted that education is defined here in its broadest sense: formal, meaning primarily schooling; non-formal, meaning educational programmes which exist outside the context of formal schooling, (e.g. adult and continuing education programmes, special educational programmes for children and youth, etc.) and informal, which are those learnings

acquired almost unconsciously in a variety of settings both in formalized settings and in the wider community.

These general definitions led to the working definition of citizenship established for this study:

Citizenship is a set of characteristics of the citizen of the 21st century given and agreed upon by a panel of experts including educational, political, socio-cultural and economic dimensions at the local, national and international levels.

Once the research teams were established, the first task of their members was to carry out an extensive program of background reading in both the citizenship education and emerging global trends literature, in order to ensure that each of the 26 researchers had the requisite foundation in these areas going into the research process over the next several years. Further, the information gleaned from this reading also was one of the bases for designing the interview and Delphi questions. This was a very time consuming but necessary part of the initial phase of the study.

Thus, before going into the details of the conduct of the study, it is necessary to review, briefly, the historical and contemporary issues related to citizenship education, and, to a lesser extent, the global trends literature, to set the context for the subsequent inquiry. First, the citizenship education literature.

The Five Attributes of Citizenship

Modern political systems depend for their successful functioning upon a conception of citizenship. It can be explicitly spelled out in a constitution, a bill of rights, or some similar document, or it can be left implicit within national traditions and institutions. Usually it is a combination of both explicit prescription and implicit practice. But whichever is the case, any conception of citizenship contains a conception of the knowledge, skills, values and dispositions that, ideally, citizens should possess.

These attributes of citizenship will vary according to the nature of the political system of which they are a part, but in general terms they can be classified into five categories: [1] a sense of identity; [2] the enjoyment of certain rights; [3] the fulfillment of corresponding obligations; [4] a degree of interest and involvement in public affairs; and [5] an acceptance of basic societal values. All five are conveyed through a wide variety of institutions, both governmental and non-governmental, including the media, and especially through the school system. Citizenship education, in the broadest sense, is an important task in all contemporary societies.

A Sense of Identity

The first element of citizenship, a sense of identity, is usually defined in national terms, though not necessarily exclusively so, since most countries acknowledge the existence of multiple and overlapping identities, be they local, ethnic, cultural, religious, or whatever. This is especially the case in societies that are multicultural in their make-up, though even in the most homogeneous society citizens will usually possess an attachment to more than one identity. Nonetheless, a sense of national identity and patriotism is usually seen as an essential ingredient of citizenship, though some commentators argue that national citizenship alone will not be enough to meet the challenges of the 21st century as the world becomes ever more interconnected and interdependent.

There are those who reject national citizenship as obsolete and even dangerous and argue instead for a globally oriented cosmopolitan citizenship that cuts completely across national loyalties (Nussbaum, 1996). More usually, however, it is argued that the demands of national citizenship should not be denied, but must be combined with a realization that no nation can operate in isolation in today's world, so that citizenship must contain both national and multinational dimensions (Boulding, 1990; World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987; Ramphal, 1992; Commission on Global Governance, 1995). This interest in combining the national and multinational dimensions of citizenship is clearly reflected in the data emerging from the Citizenship Education Policy Study project (CEPS) and is one of the reasons why later in this Report we speak of the concept of *multidimensional citizenship*.

Rights and Entitlements

The second element of citizenship consists of the enjoyment of certain rights or entitlements. To be a citizen is to be a member of a group and thus to be entitled to the benefits that group membership confers. Citizens, for example, are entitled to the protection of their government when they are traveling outside their own country. They are entitled to the protection of the law and to whatever rights their constitution and political system guarantee them.

The British sociologist, T.H. Marshall, has argued that in the Western world citizenship rights can be classified into three categories, listed in the order in which they were won historically. The first are legal rights, such as freedom from arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, and the entitlement to a fair trial and due process if charged with a crime. The second are political rights, consisting primarily of the right to vote, to run for public office, and to participate in public affairs. The third are economic and social rights, as in the case of the right to organize trades unions, to attend school, to obtain social security, and so on (Marshall, 1950; Barbalet, 1988; Turner, 1986 & 1989). There is obviously a good deal of debate about rights such as these. How

extensive should they be? What is the appropriate balance between public and private provision? How much should be the responsibility of the individual citizen and how much of society as a whole? These and other questions remind us that citizenship is not a static, once and for all, set of practices, but rather a continuing process of debate and often a subject of political disagreement and dispute. Again, this is why, in this Report, we argue for what we describe as *multidimensional citizenship*.

Responsibilities, Obligations and Duties

The third element of citizenship consists of responsibilities, obligations and duties. Some commentators, especially in the Western world, argue that the pursuit of individual rights has overshadowed the performance of the duties of citizenship, which have been unduly neglected (Gwyn, 1995). Indeed, some political theorists argue that liberal democracy, as practiced in Europe and North America, contains a built-in tendency to emphasize the maximization of individual rights and to minimize the pursuit of the public interest. This charge, for example, is at the heart of the continuing debate between so-called liberals and communitarians (Etzioni, 1993; Barber, 1984; Galston, 1991; Macedo, 1990; Holmes, 1993; Bell, 1993).

In any event, though practice is not always consistent with theory, it is universally accepted that citizenship carries with it the obligation to perform certain duties, including the responsibility to obey the law, to pay one's taxes, to respect the rights of other people, to fight for one's country and generally to fulfill one's social obligations. Some commentators go further than this and insist that the most pressing duty of all is participation in public affairs. As in the case of citizenship rights, the duties and obligations of citizenship are also subject to debate and discussion. The readiness to engage in this debate constitutes an important facet of what we describe in this Report as *multidimensional citizenship*.

Active in Public Affairs

The question of the duties of citizenship introduces the fourth element--the responsibility to participate in public affairs. There is a long tradition, dating back to the Ancient Greeks, that distinguishes between a good person and a good citizen. A good person lives his or her life virtuously and honourably, but without any involvement or interest in public affairs. A good citizen, by contrast, not only lives decently in his or her private life, but is also committed to participation in public life; at the very least to taking an informed interest in public affairs, and, ideally, playing an active part in them (Boyte, 1980; Boyte and Kari, 1996). Again, as with citizenship rights and duties, involvement in public affairs is not a matter for prescriptive command, but rather for deliberation and debate.

Acceptance of Basic Societal Values

The fifth element of citizenship is the acceptance of basic societal values. These will obviously vary from country to country and they are often the subject of debate during which honest and principled differences of opinion are revealed. They are sometimes described, directly or indirectly, in constitutional documents and sometimes left more or less unstated, but they always exist. Examples include trust, cooperation, respect for human rights, non-violence, and so on. Such societal values are seen as helping to constitute the distinctive identity of a country and to make social living possible. They are also seen as an important ingredient of good citizenship, and, as with the other elements of citizenship, can pose problems which citizens must be ready and able to resolve for themselves while at the same time respecting the viewpoints, interests and rights of others. This interplay among the priorities of the individual citizen, those of his or her fellow citizens, of citizens of other societies, and even of citizens yet unborn, constitutes another reason for this Report's insistence on what we call *multidimensional citizenship*.

As already noted, all five elements or attributes of citizenship can and do give rise to debate and dispute. Rights can conflict with each other. The interpretation of rights and duties is not always clear cut. Citizens can differ with each other over solutions to public issues. Political change can lead to accepted definitions of citizenship coming into question. Certain groups can be denied the benefits of citizenship, as happened historically in the case of women and racial and ethnic minorities. Citizens can honestly and honourably place claims of principle and conscience above those of citizenship as conventionally defined. In all such cases, and others like them, citizenship is not a matter of unquestioned obedience to whomever is in power or to the forces of tradition. Nor is it conformity to majority opinion or passive acceptance of conventional wisdom. Rather, citizenship involves thinking for oneself, while at the same time listening to and respecting the viewpoints of other people, in order to become personally engaged with the problems and issues that confront one's society. Some commentators speak of deliberative citizenship, arguing that citizens must be able to think, to reflect, to discuss, and to act in ways that are rational, reasonable and ethically defensible (Cohen, 1989; Miller, 1993; Matthews, 1996). We include this concept of deliberation, of reflective action, in the concept of *multidimensional citizenship* that forms the main theme of the Report.

All five elements of citizenship have obvious implications for and application to education. Historically, compulsory public education has always been assigned an important role in the preparation of citizens. Schools were intended to give young citizens a sense of identity, and often of national pride, and to teach them the rights and duties of citizenship as officially defined. There is research to indicate that the schools have not been as effective in this role as the proponents of citizenship education have hoped (Oppenheim, Torney, et al, 1975; Hodgetts, 1968). For

example, the view of citizenship taught in the schools has often been unduly passive and conformist, and it has discriminated against girls and minority students (Hess and Torney, 1968; Crick and Porter, 1978; Anyon, 1980; Oakes, 1985; Curtis, Livingstone and Smaller, 1992; Phillips, 1989 & 1993). It has also often reflected the interests of those in power in a particular society, and, thus, has been a matter of indoctrination and the establishment of ideological hegemony rather than of education (Snyders, 1976; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Apple, 1979 & 1982; Whitty, 1985). Recent years have seen a wide variety of proposals for the strengthening of citizenship education in the schools (Shaver, 1977; Newmann, 1970 & 1975; Crick & Heater, 1978; Engle and Ochoa, 1988; Cogan, 1989; Ichilov, 1990; Center for Civic Education, 1991; Janowitz, 1983; Osborne, 1994; Parker, 1996) and the concept of *multidimensional citizenship* that is described later in this Report reflects much of this debate.

Recent years have also seen increasing attention given to the subject of citizenship by political theorists and philosophers. Some have approached it directly, examining the strengths and weaknesses of current conceptions of citizenship, its present practice, and its historical development (Heater, 1990; Riesenber, 1992; Beiner, 1995; Andrews, 1991; Shklar, 1991; Kaplan, 1993; Kymlicka, 1992 & 1995; Pocock, 1992). Feminist scholars have drawn attention to the biases of citizenship theory and practice (Phillips, 1989 & 1993; Okin, 1992; Elshtain, 1981; Young, 1990; Frazer & Lacey, 1993). Advocates of multiculturalism have argued for a more inclusive approach to citizenship (Taylor, 1992; Kymlicka, 1995; Banks, 1996) and have provoked counter-arguments from those who worry that their proposals might be unduly divisive (Schlesinger, 1991; Bissoondath, 1994).

Others have placed citizenship in a broader context, looking at ways of reshaping and strengthening democratic institutions so as to produce a richer and deeper sense of citizenship than now often exists (Held, 1993). In this vein, there have been proposals for strong democracy (Barber, 1984); for radical democracy (Mouffe, 1992; Trend, 1996); for deliberative democracy (Cohen, 1989; Miller, 1993; Mathews, 1996); for participatory democracy (Pateman, 1971; Gould, 1988); for associational democracy (Hirst, 1994); for discursive democracy (Drysek, 1990); for dialogic democracy (Giddens, 1994); all of which have clear implications for citizenship. There is also an increasing literature that argues for a global conception of citizenship in which people will identify less with their own nations and more with the planet as a single entity. This is not, of course, a new concept. In this century it received some attention after both the First and Second World Wars and formed part of the educational agenda of both the League of Nations and the United Nations. However, it is now receiving a new emphasis as it becomes more and more obvious that the world's problems and the solutions to them can be dealt with only on a multinational basis (Boulding, 1990; Ramphal, 1992).

The five elements of citizenship outlined above derive largely from European and North American research and scholarship. However, these elements, as described, are generally acceptable and applicable to the two Asian nations participating in this study. There are differences to be sure. For example, in Japan, much more emphasis is placed upon the family and human relationships as part of being a good citizen. Although the rights and duties of citizenship and social and political participation are taught as part of citizenship education, family and human relationships are seen as most important. At the same time, citizenship education courses or programmes tend to emphasize the concept of "nation" and national identity more than that of the individual "citizen". In addition, moral aspects of citizenship are also included in the concept of being a "good citizen".

In Thailand, the conceptualization of citizenship also includes, in addition to the above family and human relationships as in Japan, a religious definition of the good citizen. Spiritual and moral development are seen as very important elements of citizenship. In the predominantly Buddhist society, these are very important and are both explicit in curricula and implicit in policies and in the preparation of teachers.

In the case of national identity, in both Japan and Thailand, there is an explicit attempt to develop and nurture globally oriented citizens who have both international perspectives and a strong national sense of identity. But the basic five elements, as described in the main body of this section, apply to the Asian and Western nations participating in this study.

In conclusion, citizenship and citizenship education, whether defined in national, multinational, global, Western or Asian terms, have attracted considerable attention in recent years, and this Report should be read in the context of this overall debate.

The Global Trends Literature

During the past decade or more, a number of works have been published which forecast probable or anticipated global trends as we approach the turn of the century (Brown, 1996; Brown & Kane, 1994; Drucker, 1994; Hauchler & Kennedy, 1994; International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, 1996; Kaplan, 1994; Kennedy, 1993; Kidder, 1987, 1989, 1994; McRae, 1995; Naisbitt, 1982; Naisbitt, 1996; Ohmae, 1987; Ohmae, 1990; Reich, 1992; Snyder, 1995; Waters, 1995; World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987; Zhou, 1996). As one reads these works several themes emerge, notably economic concerns, technology and communication trends, and population and environmental issues. The other factor which stands out is that these trends are interwoven and linked to one another. A brief examination of each of these trend areas, will provide some idea of what futurists think the world

will look like in the next twenty-five years. The ideas of these futurists informed the thinking of the Project researchers, both in a general way, and as suggesting directions/topics/concerns for interview and survey questions.

The Global Economy

While there were wide differences of opinion over whether a global economy was a positive or negative development, as well as, over the speed with which it would come about, all writers agreed that this is where the world is headed, if not already there in some instances. It will take at least the next 25 years for a global economy to fully emerge but its momentum will ensure its realization. Perhaps Robert Reich describes it best in his book, *The Work of Nations*.

We are living through a transformation that will rearrange the politics and economics of the coming century. There will be no *national* products or technologies, no national corporations, no national industries. There will no longer be national economies, at least as we have come to understand that concept. All that will remain within national borders are the people who comprise a nation. Each nation's primary assets will be its citizens' skills and insights. Each nation's primary political task will be to cope with the centrifugal forces of the global economy which tear at the ties binding citizens together—bestowing ever greater wealth on the most skilled and insightful, while consigning the less skilled to a declining standard of living. As borders become ever more meaningless in economic terms, those citizens best positioned to thrive in the world market are tempted to slip the bonds of national allegiance, and by doing so disengage themselves from their less favored fellows (Reich, 1992, 3).

Japanese commentator Ohmae Kenichi, makes the point even more succinctly:

“Words such as overseas operations, affiliates, and subsidiaries are disappearing. Nothing is ‘overseas’ any longer” (Ohmae, 1990, viii).

Within this global economy, a major shift in emphasis is taking place away from the production of manufactured good to services in the industrialized world whereas the production of goods is moving increasingly to non or newly industrializing nations. Hamish McRae, a British economic journalist, comments on this in his recent book, *The World in 2020*.

During the next century, the gradual shift away from the production of manufactured goods towards the production of services in industrial countries will not happen suddenly or swiftly, and it will not happen at all for the newly industrialized countries, so for the rest of the twentieth century and the first years of the twenty-first, it will remain vitally

important to be good at making things. But gradually the comparative advantage will be won by being good at producing services... (McRae, 1995, 11-12).

In the United States, for example, this trend is already well underway. The U.S. Bureau of National Affairs reports that by the end of this century, less than five years away, nine out of ten working Americans will hold jobs in the service sector; in 1980 this figure was six in ten. Further, fifty percent of these persons will be working in the information industry and half of them will be working from their homes (Snyder, 1995).

But the movement away from many individual national economies to a global one does not come easily. Our identity as cultural and ethnic groups is in most instances tied to the nation-state and thus one of the attributes of future citizens will be the need to develop multiple perspectives and loyalties where identity is concerned.

Evidence that a global economy is emerging is the movement, especially in the industrialized world, to regional trading zones or blocs, e.g. the EC, NAFTA, ASEAN, and others. These are but transitional groupings while nations position themselves to take full advantage of the global trade potential. In some respects this represents a last attempt to hold on to what *was* rather than accepting what *will be*. Many nations are simply moving from bilateral trading mechanisms and frameworks to regional groupings or blocs in an attempt to solidify their comparative advantage while, in point of fact, the multinational corporations conducting the actual business of manufacture and trading and providing services have moved considerably beyond this point to a totally global economic framework which involves actual nation-states with less and less frequency. Rather than taking the truly big leap from national to global economic activity, nation-states are lagging further and further behind by making only gradual moves toward globalization. In the long-run, if this practice is maintained, the multinationals, may come to realize that the nation-state is superfluous and move ahead without their involvement. This is a trend which bears close watching in the next decade and beyond.

This is resulting in the transition from what Reich terms high-volume to high-value enterprises, in an economic sense value-added, the latter meaning that profits derive not from scale and volume but from continuous discovery of new linkages between solutions and needs. The leading multinational businesses today have already made this transition (Reich, 1992, 85).

Within this context, Reich has identified three interrelated working skills necessary to drive high-value businesses forward. These will be carried out by three kinds of workers whom Reich terms *problem-solvers*, *problem-identifiers* and *strategic brokers*.

First, *problem-solvers* must not only know how things work or fit together for their originally intended use but how they might serve another function if reassembled in a different

manner. These are people capable of continually refining products or services to meet emerging needs.

Second, *problem-identifiers* need to understand client needs and how they can be met by customized products. These persons don't wait for the customer to come to them; they anticipate situations in which a new product or service might be helpful to the client.

Third, there are the *strategic-brokers* who bring the problem-solvers and the problem-identifiers together to develop specific products or services for specific clients.

The high-value enterprise cannot be organized along a traditional pyramid organizational structure because these three groups adding value to the business must be in constant and direct contact with one another. As such, the structure of the high-value enterprise looks more like a spider's web.

Strategic brokers are at the center, but there are all sorts of connections that do not involve them directly, and new connections are being spun all the time. At each point of connection are a relatively small number of people—depending on the task, from a dozen to several hundred...Here individual skills are combined so that the group's ability to innovate is something more than the simple sum of its parts. Over time, as group members work through various problems and approaches together, they learn about one another's abilities. They learn how they can help one another perform better, who can contribute what to a particular project, how they can best gain more experience together. Each participant is on the lookout for ideas that will propel the group forward. Such cumulative experience and understanding cannot be translated into standard operating procedures easily transferable to other workers and other organizations. Each point on the "enterprise web" represents a unique combination of skills (Reich, 1992, 89).

Speed and flexibility are key features of the high-value enterprise. Overhead, equipment, factory facilities, large payrolls are a burden because they limit the capacity to quickly change directions and respond to immediate needs. Accordingly, space, factories, equipment, warehouses are leased; parts are bought from wholesalers around the world and labour is contracted out as needed. In this enterprise, there will be relatively few salaried employees in the more traditional sense. People will work in teams and be encouraged to experiment and take risks because the rewards for success are high. Everyone on the team shares in both the successes and the failures; thus, the motivation to get it right initially is very high.

This will also likely result in "stateless" corporations which are global in many ways including ownership, management, financing, production and marketing. Many leading global corporations have already made this transformation. Howard Snyder in his new book, *EarthCurrents*, comments on the long-range impact of these entities.

Many of these enterprises are bigger financial operations than the nations where they operate. Their political and economic clout is enormous. A giant stateless corporation with its global web of investors, managers, researchers, designers, workers, marketers, lawyers, and customers constitutes a human and economic entity that cuts across the scores of nationa-states it touches. Arguably, this is a force for global cohesion. But since the relationships are almost solely economic, pressing issues of ecology, social welfare, and cultural identity may get trampled (Snyder, 1995, 54).

Technology and Communication

Technology is the second global trend area which receives a great deal of attention in the public media. Technological change has impacted nearly every activity in which we are engaged on a daily basis, i.e. in the workplace, the home, at school, at leisure; yet it is probably the computer and electronics revolutions which have most noticeably touched the daily lives of people directly.

The key element, however, is access. Proponents of 'on-line access' claim that this will ensure that everyone will have access to the same information, and thus will be empowered. But information is a commodity as we enter the 21st century; it is wealth and power. Snyder warns of the potential dangers.

Since information is a key economic asset and speed in moving information gives an economic edge, wealth increasingly means access to information. The global gap between the "haves" and "have-nots" is increasingly a question of the information access that makes material wealth possible (Snyder, 1995, 43).

Hauchler and Kennedy, in their recent book, *Global Trends*, also caution about all of the optimism being raised about new technology.

In many parts of the world, technological innovations are gaining influence over economic, social and cultural development. New technologies promise solutions to global problems such as hunger, environmental destruction, and disease; but they also harbor a host of risks that have as yet been scarcely explored, and they raise questions about the ethical and social problems associated with an automated world. In addition, they widen the technological gap between industrial and developing countries. Attempts at formulating a responsible technology policy geared to global considerations are almost non-existent. Up to now, this area has been dominated by "strategic alliances" between large-scale

technology-intensive enterprises based in the industrial countries (Hauchler and Kennedy, 1994, 15).

Beyond this, there are the questions surrounding genetic engineering, which though they are rooted in basic science, are brought to reality through technology. This raises all kinds of ethical and moral questions and has the potential to bring about major changes in society. So there remain major questions regarding access to and use of technology.

It can be assumed that technological change will continue well into the next century. Many of its results will be positive and will make people's daily lives easier. But there is a potential negative side which bears careful attention if we are to avoid the pitfalls noted by McRae, Hauchler and Kennedy, and Snyder above.

Population and Environment

The third and fourth most prevalent trends discussed in futurist literature involve population and the environment. These are perhaps two of the most difficult areas to assess as there is so much disagreement over what the real issues are.

There is increasing agreement, however, that these two areas are closely interrelated and, if left unchecked, could lead to planetary collapse. The planet's population, currently standing at nearly six billion, will continue to rise, barring a major global disaster, by most estimates to nearly eight billion by 2025. This exerts enormous pressures upon the environment. All of these new humans need to be fed, sheltered, able to find work, and prepared to achieve some decent quality of life.

The list of environmental problems facing the planet is enormous. There are global problems manifested in local situations. They include, but are not limited to, desertification, destruction of arable lands, depletion of major aquifers, acid rain, the disposal of nuclear and chemical waste, resource depletion, endangered species, erosion, rainforest destruction, salination due to poor irrigation practices, poisoning of the atmosphere, ozone depletion and climate change, and critically short supplies of fresh water. The latter will very likely be the most serious resource problem facing the world in the next 25 years.

Three-quarters of the planet's fresh water supply is contained in polar icecaps and glaciers and thus unavailable for use, at least utilizing current technologies. Further, "where water is plentiful, people are frequently few, and vice-versa" (McRae, 1995, 124). The problem is so serious that, "Water will become a political issue in much the same way that oil has been for much of the period after the Second World War" (McRae, 1995, 127).

Howard Snyder in his aforementioned book, *EarthCurrents*, describes what he terms the “lethal spiral” linking population growth, the ecological crisis and social conflict. It is a dangerous cycle which must be broken if the world is to survive through the next century.

Each of these factors affects the others, and together they form a cycle. *Population growth*, concentration, or displacement puts new burdens on the environment. These burdens take various forms: pollution, depletion of water, deforestation as people cut down forests for firewood. The result is *ecological crisis*....Environmental crisis in turn increases social conflict. Disease, famine, and resulting migrations of people add to existing political, ethnic and religious tension. When the physical environment goes bad, social conflict easily leads to complete social breakdown. The social environment reflects the physical environment. Even if chaos is averted, ecological crisis aggravates social tensions. It is now clear that social conflict in turn stimulates further population growth, thus completing the lethal cycle (Snyder, 1995, 85).

Robert D. Kaplan argues forcefully in his article entitled, “The Coming Anarchy”, that the environment will be “the national security issue of the early twenty-first century”, unless the spiral described above is broken:

The political and strategic impact of surging populations, spreading disease, deforestation and soil erosion, water depletion, air pollution, and, possibly, rising sea levels in critical, overcrowded regions like the Nile Delta and Bangladesh—developments that will prompt mass migrations and, in turn, group conflicts—will be the core foreign-policy challenge from which most other will ultimately emanate (Kaplan, 1994, 46).

The link between the environment and population is strong, the interrelationships are clear. Changing demographic patterns have powerful and longlasting effects. One of the key problems, of course, is that this growth is not evenly distributed. Most of it will take place in the non-industrialized world, about 95% by most estimates. This means that the population of the industrial world will grow older and will have to learn to adapt to changing patterns of growth and development. This will have major social, economic, and political consequences for all nations.

Further, it has been raised repeatedly by many third world and newly industrializing nations that many of these environmental problems are largely a result of West’s exploitation and excessive use of the world’s resources. North America and Europe consume far more resources per capita than any other regions of the world. In these circumstances, third world and newly industrializing nations query why they should not do all they can to catch up? Thus, if we are to

truly 'solve' these environmental problems, then the West has to seriously consider scaling back its levels of consumption in concert with developments in other parts of the world. It also must share its environmentally friendly technology to help other nations meet these challenges.

The industrialized world will become more stable as it grows older while the younger non-industrialized world will become increasingly chaotic. This will lead to increased tensions between the 'haves' and 'have-nots'. Immigration pressures will increase as a result of population growth, raising additional tensions between the industrialized and non-industrialized worlds. People on the fringes of the rich industrial nations will continue to seek entry to them. Even if immigration quotas were dramatically increased in the industrialized world, the pressures of population growth in the non-industrialized world not be alleviated in a significant way. Hauchler and Kennedy contend that the only real solution to this migration pressure will be, "if extreme poverty is eliminated, health and education improved, and the social status of women enhanced will it be possible to put a brake on the growth in population" (Hauchler & Kennedy, 1994, 12). This will, in turn, require fundamental and difficult changes in existing assumptions and policies.

However, McRae warns that we are a long way from the resolution of the population-environment issue. Indeed, he forecasts that this will be with us for some time to come.

The degradation of the environment will be a greater preoccupation in the year 2020 than it is in the early 1990s. The industrialized countries, and increasingly the middle-income countries, will be spending a greater proportion of their resources to try to correct the damage, and as a result will be cleaner and in many ways nicer places to live. The present generation of newly industrialized countries will be working hard to improve the quality of their environment, and will be achieving much higher standards of air and water quality and solid waste disposal in their cities. They will have the advantage of the technologies developed in the rich countries under the influence of their tough environmental controls. But other countries (or regions) at the earliest stages of industrialization will be struggling with even more serious problems than they do at present (McRae, 1995, 137).

Multidimensional Citizenship

The work of futurists, which as been briefly summarized here, together with the findings of this study, strongly suggest that current modes of educating for citizenship are not adequate to meet the challenges of the coming century. Future citizens must be prepared to focus upon multiple elements, issues and contexts simultaneously. The central recommendation emerging from this study is that future educational policy be based upon a vision of *multidimensional citizenship* appropriate to the needs and demands of the early part of the 21st century. A vision of

multidimensional citizenship must permeate all aspects of education, including curriculum and pedagogy, governance and organization, and school-community relationships. It can be achieved only if schools and other key elements/agencies of society work together. The four dimensions of multidimensional citizenship are personal, social, temporal and spatial. These will be explained and examined in more depth later in this Report. Suffice to say that these four dimensions must be present and interrelated if the citizen of the next century is to become a contributing member of society.

The remainder of this Report addresses the Overview of the Study, the Findings, the Policy Recommendations focusing upon the conceptualization of Multidimensional Citizenship, and the Conclusions and Challenges for the Future. A number of key Appendices have been attached as well, including a listing of the the Expert Panelists, Project Researchers, and the Consensus Criteria for acceptance of Trends, Characteristics and Educational Strategies.

II. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

How the Study Began

Discussions regarding the feasibility of this project actually began in 1991, nearly two years before funding support for the project was achieved. The idea of the project was proposed by the project director to key faculty members of each partner university with whom he met individually several times and on one occasion collectively. The purpose of these sessions was to explore the use of the existing educational exchange agreements network as the foundation for a collaborative research project involving multiple nations. Once feasibility was established, the University of Minnesota, home-base of the proposed project, was selected to be the lead institution.

A fully developed research proposal was then circulated by the project director to the appropriate faculty at the partner institutions for comment and feedback before being submitted to a possible funding agency. Several foundations expressed some interest but in the end it was the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, Tokyo, Japan, which committed the financial resources necessary to launch the study.

Selection of Research Team Leaders

Once the project funding was secured, the next step was to secure a research team leader from each of the four partner institutions to guide the project activities. The criteria for the selection of these individuals were (1) serious interest in the project, (2) demonstrated expertise in

either the fields of citizenship education or research methodology, and (3) the willingness to stay with the project throughout its existence. The latter criterion was very important as this was to be a commitment of four years, many meetings, coordination of one's national/regional team activities, stretching very meager budgets to the limit to accomplish the work, preparing a series of reports on the progress of one's team, and preparing team members for each of the three international meetings which were to take place over the course of the life of the project -- all without financial or other remuneration. In each instance, the designated team leaders did this willingly.

Four research teams, one from Japan, Thailand, the European region (England, Germany, Greece, Hungary, and the Netherlands) and from the North American region (Canada and the United States) carried out the study. The project was guided by a Steering Committee made up of the Project Director, the Project Research Coordinator, the team leaders and one associate from each of the four teams and a Cultural Futures Dephi methodology specialist. This committee totaled nine persons and met at least twice annually throughout the project. Their input, organizational skills, and research expertise were critical in keeping the project on-line and at a high level of performance.

Development of Research Teams

The project research teams were composed of five to ten persons. In each instance the research team leader took responsibility for selecting team members based upon the following criteria established at the initial Steering Committee meeting in Hiroshima, Japan, in September, 1993. The research team members were to have demonstrated (1) expertise in either citizenship education and/or research methodology, (2) a future oriented vision, (3) interest in the study and (4) a willingness to remain with the project through to completion. Initially 28 individuals met and agreed to these criteria. However, very early into the first year of work, two individuals, one each from the Japanese and North American teams, had to withdraw due to work and health problems. The remaining 26 continued with the project throughout the four year period.

Questions have been raised as to why these particular nine nations were chosen, especially since most are considered members of the industrialized world. Why no African, South Asian or Middle Eastern, Latin American countries? This is a fair query. As noted earlier in this report, the research network was based upon the working educational exchange agreements between the four partner universities, Minnesota, Hiroshima, Chulalongkorn and Amsterdam, so it was understandable that they chose their own or closely related nations as study participants. The choices were also limited by the funding available. The supporting foundation had a limited amount of funding available for this project and as it was there were times when the Project

Secretariat and the Steering Committee questioned whether we had attempted more than we could realistically achieve.

In the case of the North American region, several Canadian scholars were asked to participate and a number of attempts were made to include Mexican scholars as well but without success. The end result is that the North American region includes only Canada and the United States. In Europe, the possibilities are, of course, almost limitless. The difficulties of choosing scholars from member European states was a major task. Again the limited funding for the project determined in large part how many nations would be included. In the end, the research team leader for the European region, from the University of Amsterdam, elected to select persons from nations with whom he had had good working relationships in the past. Scholars from several additional nations were invited to participate but they could not meet the conditions set forth and thus declined. The European region also had to face the task of working across five different language groups, to say nothing of cultural traditions, and this proved difficult as well.

Ideally, this project would form the first phase of a larger effort, a pilot if you will. A second phase would include nations from other parts of Asia and the Middle East, Africa, states of the former Soviet Union, and Latin American nations. The absence of any but the nine countries that did participate in the study certainly constitutes a potential weakness. It would obviously have been preferable to involve a cross-section of all the world's regions, but such a task was far beyond the resources that were available. Instead, the study could attempt only that which was practically possible. Nonetheless, it is hoped that this study constitutes a worthwhile and useful contribution to the ongoing debate on citizenship and citizenship education. Perhaps at some future date a more globally representative study, that builds upon the work of this project, will be possible.

Background Reading and Case Studies

During the first year of the project, each of the four research teams carried-out an extensive program of background reading in the areas of citizenship education, both generally and specifically, and of future global trends and persisting issues, in order to develop the kinds of key questions necessary to elicit information from policy shapers. This background reading was essential to build the necessary foundation to begin framing possible questions for the initial interview round as well as the subsequent survey rounds. The several teams undertook the reading independently and then met to discuss and debate the relevance of the readings for the forthcoming tasks.

The teams also developed summary reports of the "state of citizenship education" in their respective nations/regions. These case studies of citizenship education in the respective nations

were important in giving all of the 26 researchers a sense of what was taking place in the other eight nations as a basis for discussion at the first international meeting in Bangkok, Thailand, in June, 1994. A further task during the first year of the project was for each research team to develop lists of key policy shapers across the broad range of fields noted above from which the study participants would ultimately be drawn.

The Cultural Futures Delphi Method

The methodology employed in this study was a cross-cultural adaption of an Ethnographic Delphi Futures Research model. This research method is based upon Delphi methodology (Lindstone and Turoff, 1975) and although it employs the use of questionnaires it differs considerably from conventional survey methods. It was developed as a method of forecasting future developments so as to better inform policy and decision makers. It can also be used to identify problems, define needs, establish priorities, and identify and evaluate solutions. The Delphi is a method commonly used by governments and businesses to make longterm projections in order to develop appropriate policy directives.

The Cultural Futures Delphi process is one in which a set of questions or statements are developed either directly by the researcher or through interviews of all or a subset of the expert panelists participating in the study. For this study, the latter approach was taken. The panelists are chosen based upon specific selection criteria. Once the survey instrument is developed then the panelists are asked to relate the importance of each statement or item, generally on a five or six point scale to ensure differentiation. They are also encouraged to comment on the statements and add any additional ones not yet present in the survey for possible inclusion in subsequent rounds.

Based upon the responses to the initial questionnaire, a revised instrument is developed and then re-circulated to the panelists complete with their own rating for each item on the original instrument along with statistical scores representing the ratings of others. The panelists are then encouraged to consider the ratings on the revised survey and to keep or change their own ratings in relation to the others as they see fit. This procedure is repeated for two or three rounds or until some degree of consensus begins to emerge.

The Cultural Futures Delphi method has several advantages over the more conventional survey, especially in policy-oriented research. First, issues are clarified and the final result is likely to reflect much more careful thought than would be obtained from a single questionnaire. Second, the method is designed to build consensus among the panelists in that each respondent is asked to re-examine her/his position several times. Third, the panelists are chosen according to specific criteria for their demonstrated expertise in some field as opposed to being chosen randomly from a large general pool irrespective of their level of expertise. Fourth, given these

factors and the level of agreement reached, it is generally much easier to implement the findings of the inquiry as there are a pool of policy experts, persons who shape and influence policy, who have participated and are thus more inclined to assist in applying the results.

The Policy Expert Panelists

Of the 264 policy experts and scholars invited to participate in the study, a total of 182 from across the broad range of fields noted below responded, either in the interview round and/or the subsequent two survey rounds over an eighteen month period. The goal was to use policy shapers from politics and government, business, industry and labour, science and technology, health and education, and cultural and academic fields as the informants in the study across the nine nations, as these were the fields of endeavor which emerged as important from the background reading particularly in the area of emerging global trends. Each team was asked to identify a pool of potential experts from across these fields to be considered as panelists for both the interview and survey rounds. Many more were identified than could be included. A prioritization was done to determine who should be the first choice in a given category and so on. Each of the potential panelists had to meet *all* of the following criteria in order to be eligible for inclusion:

1. *Future orientation* as demonstrated by one's ability to envision changes and opportunities in the future;
2. *Leadership* in one's field of expertise as demonstrated through public addresses, published remarks, and their level of esteem among their peers;
3. *Interest in civic and public affairs* as demonstrated by one's writings, speeches, policies implemented, or participation in civic and other public groups; and
4. *Knowledge of global trends and issues* as demonstrated by one's writings, speeches or policies.

In addition, it was determined by the Steering Committee that the final selection of expert panelists should also reflect as much as possible and where applicable, parity or balance in gender, and ethnic background, and between policy shapers and scholars.

The composition of the expert pool who participated in either the interview and/or survey rounds of the study was indeed rich. A listing of those who agreed to have their names revealed is included in Appendix 1. The opinion makers and scholars who made up the 182 responding expert panelists come from government ministries, elected representative bodies, non-governmental organizations in a variety of areas including the environment and human rights, trades unions, business and industry, media and journalism, health, religion and ethics, a variety

of academic fields including science and technology, the arts and humanities and professional schools, as well as writers and artists. The majority were in their 40's, 50's and 60's in terms of the agespan. And they were diverse in their backgrounds. All met each of the four selection criteria noted above.

The 182 panelists responding to the interview and survey rounds included a total of 43 female and 139 male respondents. While these figures were representative of the respective percentages of women and men in leadership and policy positions in the nine participating nations they were nonetheless disappointing.

Clearly, we fell short of our goal of balance or parity in gender representation. A re-analysis of the data indicate that there was initially a general balance with respect to the number of female and male panelists in the original selection pool. But for some reason, women declined to participate in the final two survey rounds at a much higher rate than did men. This held true across all four teams but was especially true in the two Asian nations participating in the study. There are perhaps many explanations for this, e.g. multiple responsibilities in both the workplace and the home, excessive expectations in the workplace and thus no time to give to a study such as this, timing of the survey periods, etc. Without a follow-up, however, we shall never know the real reasons for this drop-off in participation. Still, it is troubling to us as we had hoped to have a much better gender balance represented in the final panel of experts even though the final totals were representative of the respective percentages of women and men in leadership and policy positions in the nine participating nations.

The Interview and Survey Rounds

Once the final pool of 264 experts had been established, the next step was to identify a subset to be interviewed in order to generate the data to be used in formulating the survey round questions. The expert panelists were now informed that they had been identified for inclusion in this study and were asked to participate in the initial interview round. A total of 110 panelists agreed to be interviewed. At the First International Project Meeting held in Bangkok, Thailand, June, 1994, the researchers were trained in the use of the Cultural Futures Delphi methodology. Based upon the extensive background reading done during the first year of the project, as well as discussions among the researchers, the three major questions to be asked of the panelists in the interview round were identified.

1. What are the major global trends likely to have a significant impact upon the lives of people during the next 25 years?
2. What will be the characteristics required of individuals in order to cope with and manage these trends?

3. How might these characteristics be developed, i.e. what approaches, strategies or innovations might best implement these characteristics?

These major questions, along with appropriate prompts, were used by the 26 researchers as they conducted their interviews with the panelists during the period August, 1994 through January, 1995. These data were then used by the members of the four research teams to develop preliminary survey round statements. The statements were organized around the areas of global trends, citizen characteristics, and strategies/innovations/approaches required to implement the development of the characteristics.

The Second International Project Meeting held in Minneapolis in May, 1995, was used to take the hundreds of trend, characteristic and strategy statements developed by each of the teams and produce a second round survey instrument of 106 items. The 26 researchers working in multinational groups comprised of members from across the four teams, modified and refined the statements in their category groups until they had the requisite number of statements. A final screening and selection was carried out by smaller group of Steering Committee members who analyzed all statements for duplication and cross-national, cross-cultural efficacy. This resulted in a final instrument of 106 items including 60 trend statements, 20 characteristics and 26 suggested strategies/innovations/approaches for implementation. The panelists were then asked to rate each of the trends on a six-point scale both with respect to the *desirability* of the stated trend and the *probability* of it actually occurring during the next 25 years. They were asked to do the same with regards to the strategies, innovations and approaches. With the 20 identified characteristics, they were asked to select five characteristics in terms of their importance. The instrument was then organized and sent to the various teams and team members for translation into the relevant languages, i.e. Dutch, German, Greek, Hungarian, Japanese and Thai. Backtranslation was carried out in each instance to assure validity of the instrument for use in the native language.

The second round survey instrument was then sent to all of those who participated in the initial interview round plus 154 more who had indicated initially that they could not be interviewed but would consider participating in the survey rounds. A total of 264 second round survey instruments were mailed during August and September, 1995. A total of 182 were returned for analysis. Consistent with the Cultural Futures Delphi method, all instruments were coded and analyzed and then a revised instrument was prepared based upon these results.

The third and final round survey instrument was mailed back to the panelists in early January, 1996 with a specified return date of February 10. One reminder was sent to the panelists indicating that failure to return the instrument by the final date would be taken by the researchers as

an indication that the responses on the second round instrument were the panelist's final answers. In the third round instrument, the panelists received both the interquartile range and the statistical median indicating where most other panelists responded as well as their own personal response to each item. They were then encouraged to consider this new evidence in terms of possibly modifying their final response.

With respect to the citizen characteristics section of the instrument, in the second round the panelists were asked to identify what they believed to be the five characteristics most in need of urgent attention by policy shapers. In the third and final round, nothing further was required of the panelists with respect to this category. The data were simply reported back to them for their information.

Once the final round data were received, they were analyzed and prepared for use in beginning to develop policy recommendations at the Third International Project Meeting in Hiroshima, Japan, in June, 1996.

III. FINDINGS

The informed responses of experts from a variety of fields (business, industry, and labor; education; government; the arts, etc.) regarding the global trends likely to significantly impact the lives of people during the next 25 years, as well as the characteristics and educational strategies to prepare citizens for the 21st century, were solicited in order to assist policy makers in developing policies that:

1. encourage the desirable trends, characteristics, and strategies identified herein, and
2. seek to change the direction of the undesirable trends, as they consider their particular national and cultural contexts.

As indicated earlier in this Report, the expert panelists participating in this study addressed three specific areas:

1. global trends likely to have a significant impact upon the lives of people during the next 25 years;
2. citizen characteristics needed to help people cope with and manage these global trends; and,
3. educational strategies/approaches/innovations required to develop these characteristics during the next 25 years.

Reported in this findings section are the 19 trends, eight characteristics, and 16 strategies/approaches/innovations that achieved consensus among the respondents. These findings

constitute those trends, characteristics and educational strategies most important for shaping educational policy to prepare citizens for the 21st century. Again, recall that the expert panelists were asked to rate the trends and strategies with respect to both their *desirability* and *probability* of occurring on six-point scales and to select five characteristics in terms of their importance. The consensus criteria established by the researchers for acceptance can be found in Appendix 3 and aggregate summary data tables in Appendix 4.

Global Trends Findings

The 19 global trends on which the 182 expert respondents reached consensus have been grouped into three categories: *increasingly significant challenges*, *areas to monitor*, and *areas to encourage*. Each category constitutes a particular level of consideration and attention required on the part of policy makers, as well as citizens, to ensure that educational policies are developed to encourage desirable trends and counter the negative direction of undesirable ones.

Increasingly Significant Challenges

The first category, termed *increasingly significant challenges*, is composed of seven trends identified by the experts as undesirable but highly probable. These trends require the highest priority and greatest attention by policy makers during the next 25 years.

- The economic gap among countries and between people within countries will widen significantly.
- Information technologies will dramatically reduce the privacy of individuals.
- The inequalities between those who have access to information technologies and those who do not will increase dramatically.
- Conflict of interest between developing and developed nations will increase due to environmental deterioration.
- The cost of obtaining adequate water will rise dramatically due to population growth and environmental deterioration.
- Deforestation will dramatically affect diversity of life, air, soil, and water quality.
- In developing countries population growth will result in a dramatic increase in the percentage of people, especially children, living in poverty.

A dominant theme emerging across these seven trends is that of increased inequalities, defined in terms of a widening economic gap, unequal access to informational technologies, environmental resource depletion, and an increased number of people in developing countries,

especially children, living in poverty. Inequality, as depicted in the trends above, is not limited to one sphere of influence impacting citizens' lives but operates in a variety of contexts, including the economic, technological, and environmental realms. In other words, these trends do not stand alone but rather are interrelated.

If these seven undesirable and highly probable trends are not addressed and if thoughtful, informed action is not taken, then the data suggest that citizens are highly likely to face a future characterized by greater social conflict, increased inequities, reduced privacy, and an increasingly endangered environment.

Areas To Monitor

The second category, termed *areas to monitor*, is composed of seven trends identified by the experts as either undesirable but only moderately probable or moderately desirable but highly probable. These trends listed below, along with those just described above, must be key priority areas for policy makers to address during the next 25 years.

Undesirable and moderately probable:

- Individuals, families, and communities will lose political influence due to the increased level of regulation and control by governments.
- It will be increasingly difficult to develop a shared belief in the common good.
- Drug-related crime will increasingly dominate social life in urban areas.
- People's sense of community and social responsibility will decline significantly.
- Consumerism will increasingly dominate social life.

Moderately desirable and highly probable:

- Migration that flows from poor to rich areas, both within countries and between countries, will have a major impact on the internal and external order of nations.
- The increased use of genetic engineering will create increasingly complex ethical questions.

Trends identified in this area are also negative in direction and are most directly related to some of the most important areas of citizens' daily lives, i.e. values and ethical behavior, political and economic choices, and critical issues which cut across national borders. If these trends are not carefully monitored, the data suggest that increases in drug-related urban crime, consumerism, and regulation and control by governments will be accompanied by declines in citizens' political

influence, social responsibility, community bonds, and ability to develop a shared belief of the common good. They speak to a declining sense of efficacy among citizens and this confidence, once lost, is very difficult to restore. Moreover, migration patterns are highly likely to have an impact, internally and externally, upon the stability of nations, while the increased use of genetic engineering will raise ethical questions for citizens living in the 21st century.

The dominant theme emerging from these trends is citizen disempowerment, as evidenced by a lack of unity and community among people and an inability on the part of citizens to change the forces (governmental, social, and economic) that influence their lives. To safeguard personal autonomy and to increase citizen participation and involvement in public affairs, these trends must be monitored carefully and attended to by policy makers. Education must be a key part of the solution but significant involvement of the community and government agencies will be required as well.

Areas To Encourage

The third category, termed *areas to encourage*, is composed of five trends identified by the experts as highly or very highly desirable and highly to moderately probable . These trends provide some grounds for optimism and constitute areas which policy makers need to nurture and develop.

Highly desirable and highly probable:

- Economic growth will be fueled by knowledge (ideas, innovations, and inventions) more than by natural resources.

Very highly desirable and moderately probable:

- Corporations will increasingly adopt measures of environmental conservation in order to remain competitive.
- Systematic inequalities (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, sexism) will decrease significantly.

Highly desirable and moderately probable:

- Previously marginalized groups of individuals (e.g., women, ethnic minorities, etc.) will occupy more positions of power.
- More regional alliances will be developed as a way of achieving peace and security.

The trend identified as both highly desirable and probable by the experts, that knowledge and ideas, as opposed to natural resources, will generate economic growth, is an important one in the economic sphere. This, coupled with the moderate probability that corporations will increasingly adopt environmentally-conscious measures to remain competitive, may be potentially helpful in protecting the environment and in addressing those increasingly significant challenges, such as deforestation and increasing costs of obtaining adequate water.

In the social sphere, the experts concur that it is desirable for societies to strive toward greater equality with more positions of power being occupied by individuals who have previously been denied access and promotion, such as women, ethnic minorities, and other marginalized groups. In the governmental or political sphere, the experts highly desire a future characterized by peace and security and view the development of regional alliances as a possible approach to realizing this goal.

Peace and security, equity and fairness, and environmental conservation are the themes emerging from these trends identified as *areas to encourage*. These themes may serve as indicators by which policy makers can measure the degree to which citizens are experiencing an acceptable quality of life during the next 25 years.

Discussion of the Global Trends Findings

It is interesting to compare the global trends that met consensus in these particular spheres of influence with those that did not among the 182 expert respondents.

Economy

Although agreement existed among the experts that the economic gap among countries and between people within countries will widen, consensus was not achieved in areas such as employment, the labor market, or the globalization of markets. To illustrate, there was no clear indication from the data that the labour market might be increasingly divided into a small number of high-skilled and a large number of unskilled, temporary jobs or that the globalization of markets will lead to more standardization in terms of economic, social, political, and cultural relations among societies.

Government

Although the experts found the development of more regional alliances as a way to achieve peace and security highly desirable and moderately probable, there was no indication from the data that powerful transnational corporations will play a larger role and take over functions of nation-states. Thus, the experts still view nation-states as the organizing structure of societies during the

next 25 years. There was also no consensus among experts that the public will become more effective in preventing their governments from using war as a means of solving conflict.

Environment

The expert respondents did achieve consensus on four trends dealing specifically with the environment. They saw three of these trends as undesirable but highly probable, including an increasing level of conflict of interest between developing and developed nations due to environmental deterioration, a sharp rise in the cost of obtaining adequate water due to population growth and environmental deterioration, and the adverse effect of deforestation on the diversity of life, air, soil, and water quality.

The fourth environmental trend agreed upon by the experts should be strongly encouraged by policy makers, government and industry officials and educators alike, i.e. that corporations increasingly adopt measures of environmental conservation in order to remain competitive. Educational programs both in and out of school could play a crucial role here

Both the consensus and non-consensus trends findings regarding the environment point towards the importance of helping people become more knowledgeable about and willing to protect the environment. The data suggest that concern for the environment is a factor that must figure largely in any educational policy for the 21st century. Citizens must see the relationship between protecting and enhancing the environment and the quality of their own lives and wellbeing.

Technology

The experts agree only on the negative trend statement regarding the possibility that technology might reduce individual privacy. Consensus was not achieved among the experts on more positive trend statements about technological innovations, such as the ability of technology to slow environmental deterioration or to result in more opportunities for marginalized groups and individuals in the work force. The data suggest that the role technologies will play in the future, as well as the outcomes of technological innovations, is uncertain.

Other Issues

The role that conflict will play in the future also seems to be an area of uncertainty. There was no consensus among the experts that inter-group, e.g., ethnic, regional, and religious, conflict will increase dramatically within and among nations during the next 25 years. Neither was there agreement that the influence of extremism, e.g., regimes, sects, movements, will increase. Nor was there any clear indication from the experts that cultural diversity will increasingly become a focal point for world and national politics.

Specific areas on which there was no expert consensus and, which therefore are missing from the portrait of citizenship during the next 25 years include: the role of social services, religion, and the family. For example, no consensus was reached on whether aging populations in developed countries will dramatically increase the pressure on social services, especially with respect to health care and pensions, or whether privatization of public social systems, e.g., health care, education, social services, will increase dramatically. Most surprisingly, there is no clear indication from the data as to whether the family will increasingly rely on other institutions for the care and education of children.

Finally, regarding the trends specifically addressing the role of education, the experts reached no consensus as to whether investment in education will become the primary strategy for national development, whether the control and regulation of formal educational systems will become increasingly decentralized, or whether the majority of the world population will achieve basic literacy.

In conclusion, the trends findings draw dramatic attention to the interconnectedness of what the experts agree to be the most pressing issues facing citizens during the next 25 years. These issues concern economic and social inequalities, unequal access to informational technologies and reduced privacy, environmental deterioration, and threatened peace and security. In the next section, the key characteristics to help citizens cope with and manage these global trends are discussed.

Citizen Characteristics

The experts reached consensus on eight citizen characteristics and these constitute the traits, skills, and specific competencies citizens living in the 21st century will need if they are to cope with and manage the undesirable trends and to cultivate and nurture the desirable ones. (See Appendix 3 for consensus criteria for the acceptance of characteristics) The eight characteristics are presented in descending order of importance as identified by the panelists and include the:

- ability to look at and approach problems as a member of a global society.
- ability to work with others in a cooperative way and to take responsibility for one's roles/duties within society.
- ability to understand, accept, appreciate and tolerate cultural differences.
- capacity to think in a critical and systemic way.
- willingness to resolve conflict in a non-violent manner.
- willingness to change one's lifestyle and consumption habits to protect the environment.

- ability to be sensitive towards and to defend human rights (e.g., rights of women, ethnic minorities, etc.).
- willingness and ability to participate in politics at local, national, and international levels.

The traits or attributes of 21st century citizens outlined above can best be understood in terms of participatory competencies. This means that people living during the next 25 years will need to be actively engaged, both personally and socially, in their local, regional, national, and global environments. The data suggest that the way citizens can fully participate in and contribute to their environments is by possessing abilities to think critically and systemically, to understand cultural differences, and to approach problems or challenges as members of a global society.

However, the findings suggest that merely having the abilities to think, problem solve, and understand cultural diversity are inadequate by themselves. Citizens must also be inclined, willing, and able to, cooperate with others and take responsibility for their roles and duties within society, resolve conflict in non-violent ways, be sensitive towards and defend human rights, change their lifestyles and consumption habits to protect the environment, and participate in politics at local, national, and international levels.

Discussion of the Citizen Characteristics Findings

Because the trends that will significantly impact the lives of people during the next 25 years are global in nature, e.g., inequalities, informational access, environmental deterioration, and threats to peace and security, individual nations will not be able to face and resolve these pressing issues on their own. Rather, these challenges require participatory competencies that enable citizens to work cooperatively toward mutual ends and to make personal decisions on an everyday basis with the human family in mind.

By comparing the global trends with the citizen characteristics that can help to counter negative trends and foster desirable ones, it becomes more apparent that the development of the eight characteristics or participatory competencies requires urgent attention and action by policy makers during the early part of the 21st century.

As discussed in the trends findings section, the data suggest that nation-states will still serve as the organizing structure for societies during the next 25 years. Thus, it seems critical that citizens be willing and able to participate in politics at local, national, and international levels.

Further, the environmental concerns raised in the trends findings indicate that it is paramount that citizens be willing to change their lifestyles and consumption habits to protect the environment.

Moreover, the development of citizens' ability to be sensitive towards and to defend human rights may serve to address the increasingly significant challenges posed by economic and social inequalities outlined and discussed earlier.

The characteristic least chosen by the experts was loyalty to one's nation, suggesting that the respondents are very much aware that national allegiance alone is inadequate in light of global realities, future trends, and the needs of the planet. Or perhaps they just take it for granted. The panelists judged characteristics, such as the ability to look at and approach problems as a member of a global society and to understand, accept, and tolerate cultural differences, as essential if citizens are to successfully address and resolve the challenges of the next 25 years. Educational policy leaders should take special note of these and examine current curricular frameworks for their inclusion.

In the next section, the findings regarding the educational strategies/approaches/innovations which will provide specific ways in which the eight citizen characteristics, understood as participatory competencies, can be developed and fostered.

Educational Strategies/Approaches/Innovations

There was consensus among the expert respondents that 16 strategies, approaches, or innovations should be very highly or highly recommended for urgent consideration and action by educational policy makers during the next 25 years. The consensus criteria for acceptance of educational strategies, approaches and innovations can be found in Appendix 3.

Very highly recommended:

- Support the teaching of subject matter in a manner that encourages children to think critically.
- Emphasize students' ability to critically assess information in an increasingly media-based society.

Highly recommended:

- Establish a curriculum which uses the potential of information-based technologies.
- Establish extensive international links among educational institutions at all levels to support international studies, and research and curriculum development focusing on citizenship education.
- Cultivate a population of teachers with international experience and cross-cultural sensitivity.

- Implement programs of international student exchange in order to promote mutual understandings among different cultures.
- Increase attention to global issues and international studies in the curriculum.
- Establish extensive liaisons and joint projects among schools and other social institutions (e.g., industry, NGOs, churches, community groups) to support education. ← *
- Require that opportunities for community action and involvement be an important feature of the school curriculum. ← *
- Promote schools as active centers of community life and as agents for community development. ← *
- Decentralize decision making so that local communities and individual schools have considerable control of curriculum and educational administration.
- Increase opportunities for students to be involved in cooperative learning activities.
- Require that mass media act in a socially responsible, educative manner.
- Implement programs that effectively use the talents and skills of an aging population.
- Demand that all major social institutions and their officials set high standards of civic responsibility. ←
- Ensure that all social institutions (including the family, and educational and religious institutions) have an abiding respect for the basic rights of children and contribute to their well-being.

To cultivate people's capacity to think critically and systemically, a characteristic deemed important for 21st century citizens, the expert respondents very highly recommend that subject matter be taught in ways that encourage children to think critically. Because societies are becoming increasingly media-based, the experts also very highly recommend that attention and emphasis be given to helping students critically assess information. The extent to which students possess and use critical thinking abilities will have implications for the role technology will play in the future and the extent to which consumerism is allowed to dominate social life. Thus, the two strategies the experts very highly recommend to prepare citizens for 21st century life support the need for an education that will develop and nurture people's critical thinking capacities.

The experts also reached consensus on 14 strategies highly recommended for consideration and action by policy makers during the next 25 years. These 14 strategies can be divided into four major areas of reform:

- (1) making an international component an integral part of teaching and learning;
- (2) embracing a community-oriented concept within educational institutions;
- (3) creating education-social institutional collaborations; and,
- (4) requiring that other spheres of influence (those existing outside educational systems) recognize and share in the responsibility of citizen development.

First, the strategies data suggest that an international component be made an integral part of formal education. To illustrate, the experts concur that extensive international linkages among educational institutions at all levels be established to support international studies. In addition to creating an international network, the respondents highly recommend that a teaching population with international experience and cross-cultural sensitivity be cultivated, as well as international student exchange programs to promote mutual understandings among different cultures. The experts also highly recommend that increased curricular attention be given to both global issues and international studies and that a curriculum which uses the potential of information-based technologies be established.

These findings support the conclusion that an international component should be made a significant, integral part of citizen development by infusing an international focus throughout school curriculum, pedagogy, teacher education, and educational institutions. The purpose of international infusion in educational settings is to promote international awareness, cross-cultural experiences, and cross-cultural sensitivity.

These strategies serve as specific ways to foster the development of the desirable citizen characteristics identified in the previous section, e.g., the ability of individuals to understand, accept, and tolerate cultural differences; to see the interconnectedness of global issues; and to foster a willingness to approach problems as members of a global community. Using the potential of information-based technologies within schools may help facilitate the study of global issues and international events, while also fostering students' critical assessment of the information obtained.

Second, the strategies findings suggest that schools embrace a community-oriented concept composed of action and involvement. This is demonstrated by the consensus among experts that opportunities for community action and involvement be an important feature of the school curriculum. However, the experts do not view a community-oriented concept as being limited to school curriculum. Rather, the respondents highly recommend that schools serve as active centers of community life and as agents for community development. A possible first step in instituting a community-oriented concept may be to involve students in cooperative learning activities, another strategy highly recommended by the experts and also a characteristic viewed as urgent for policy makers to cultivate during the next 25 years.

While the first two areas of reform, i.e. making an international component an integral part of teaching and learning and embracing a community-oriented concept of action and involvement, focus on strategies geared toward schools themselves, the third and fourth areas require the support of social institutions outside the schools. The data suggest that if the negative global trends are to be reversed and the desirable citizen competencies developed, then collaborations between education and other social institutions are necessary. Thus, education-social institutional collaborations constitute the third area of reform emerging from the strategies findings. To illustrate, the experts agree that extensive liaisons and joint projects among schools and other social institutions, e.g., industry, NGOs, churches, community groups, be established to support education. The respondents also highly recommend decentralizing decision making so that local communities and individual schools have considerable control of curriculum and educational administration. A need to draw upon the human resources available within communities can also be interpreted from the findings, for the experts favor the implementation of programs that effectively use the talents and skills of an aging population.

The fourth area of reform is the involvement of other spheres of influence outside education systems that contribute to the well-being of citizens but are not necessarily in partnership or collaboration with the schools. Specifically, consensus was reached among the experts that the mass media be required to act in a socially responsible, educative manner and that all major social institutions and their officials set high standards of civic responsibility.

Finally, the experts highly recommend that all social institutions, including the family, and educational and religious institutions, have an abiding respect for the basic rights of children and contribute to their well-being. The data strongly suggest that educating the 21st century citizen is everyone's responsibility. Therefore, it is recommended that all social institutions and spheres of influence, including mass media, recognize and share this responsibility in contributing to citizens' well-being.

Discussion on the Educational Strategies Findings

The strategies that did not reach consensus among the experts provide some interesting insights as well. First, there was no agreement that a large proportion of available resources should be allocated to the education of disadvantaged students or gifted students, possibly suggesting that the distribution of available resources be based on egalitarian principles as opposed to increasing provision based on particular learning needs.

Second, no consensus was achieved among the experts as to whether there should be increased opportunities for learners to shape their own education, e.g., to decide what they learn, how they learn, and when and where it is learned. This finding could suggest that the expertise of

educators, policy makers, and other professionals be brought to bear on school curriculum, pedagogy, and governance, as opposed to giving more opportunities for learners themselves to make decisions regarding their own education.

Third, there was no indication from the data that schools should be organized into smaller units to provide supportive environments for students or that a radical redesign of schooling should be encouraged. These findings seem to suggest that classrooms units, and schools in general, are still viewed as favorable arenas for fostering atmospheres conducive to learning and that schools are still places where formal citizenship education is to take place.

Fourth, although the experts highly recommend that increased attention be given to global issues and international studies, consensus was not reached as to whether both Western and non-Western cultures and languages should receive attention in the school curriculum or whether education programs that respect and preserve cultural traditions should be implemented. However, there was consensus among the experts that one of the characteristics deserving most urgent attention and action by policy makers during the next 25 years is the ability of citizens to understand, accept, and tolerate cultural differences.

Conclusion

The consensus trends, characteristics, and strategies provide a portrait of the significant trends facing people during the next 25 years, the specific characteristics citizens must possess to manage and cope with these trends, and the proposed educational strategies to help develop and foster these citizen characteristics.

By gathering the informed opinions of experts from a variety of fields, it is our hope that policy makers will use these findings to create policies that encourage the desirable trends, characteristics, and strategies identified in this Report and seek to change the direction of the undesirable trends, bearing in mind their own particular national and cultural contexts in relation to this multinational citizenship portrait.

In the next section of this Report, the major educational policy recommendation emerging from this Study, that of *multidimensional citizenship*, is presented and described.

IV. MULTIDIMENSIONAL CITIZENSHIP AS THE GOAL OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The thoughtful responses of the 182 policy experts and scholars who took part in this study provide the foundation for a rich, complex, and coherent vision of citizenship necessary to prepare people to respond effectively to the challenges and demands of the 21st century. We describe this vision of citizenship as *multidimensional* and believe that its development must become the central priority of education policy.

Our panelists agree that major challenges await us as we enter the early decades of the 21st century. They include threats to the physical and natural environment, and to the social order, both nationally and internationally. The respondents in this study believe that the gap is likely to widen between those who have access to material resources and to information technology and those who do not, with the result that we could well find ourselves in a world increasingly characterized by competition, conflict and social and political unrest. In addition, natural resources will become more scarce, population growth will continue to increase, more people will be displaced from their physical surroundings, and more children will continue to live in conditions of poverty. Advances in science and technology will, at the same time, fuel economic growth, at least in some parts of the world, but will also raise new and difficult ethical questions, for example, regarding issues of genetic engineering, privacy and the use of information. In one sense, this is a gloomy picture, but the respondents to this study do not believe that these problems are insurmountable. They are best seen not so much as problems, but rather as challenges. Men and women, in their capacity as citizens, must be prepared to anticipate, grapple with and overcome the challenges they will face, and in this task education and schooling will play an essential role.

Thus, the overall recommendation of this study is that educational policy must be based upon a vision of *multidimensional citizenship* appropriate to the challenges of the early 21st century. This vision must shape all aspects of education, including curriculum and pedagogy, governance and organization, funding and the allocation of resources, teacher education and school-community relations. Moreover, if this vision is to become reality, the education of citizens must be seen as a responsibility shared among schools and other elements of society. The concept of *multidimensional citizenship* must be articulated and accepted outside the professional education community by other decision makers whose policies and actions impinge upon education, by government leaders, by opinion makers, and by the community at large. In

order to provide a fruitful ground in which effective policy can be rooted, we need a continuing and vibrant public debate on the nature and qualities of successful citizenship for the 21st century.

Citizenship, of course, is not a new concept in education. As noted earlier in this Report, public schools have, from their beginnings, been assigned a citizenship function. However, most conventional approaches to citizenship and citizenship education have been unnecessarily narrow. For example, they have emphasized national priorities to the neglect of multinational; they have often been confined to formal instruction in certain subjects, rather than being infused throughout the schools as a whole; they have often taken too passive a view of what citizenship entails. Instead, to meet the challenges of the 21st century, we need a more comprehensive vision of citizenship, which we have chosen to describe as *multidimensional* because it views citizenship as addressing a series of interconnected dimensions of thought, belief and action. We describe these various dimensions as personal, social, spatial, and temporal, and explain them in the paragraphs that follow.

In presenting this vision of *multidimensional citizenship*, we are well aware that over the years there have been many attempts to educate citizens who would be active participants in social and political life. The history and philosophy of education contains many discussions of the nature of democratic citizenship. To take only a few relatively recent examples of curriculum projects, there have been approaches to "political literacy" in the United Kingdom (Crick & Porter, 1978); to "environmental competence" in the United States (Newman, 1975); to "anticipatory learning" in the Club of Rome (Botkin, 1979); to "global education" in a number of countries; and so on. Our concept of *multidimensional citizenship* shares many of the emphases and values of such approaches, but, in our view, also goes beyond them by defining citizenship as incorporating the four dimensions noted above: the personal, the social, the spatial, the temporal.

The Personal Dimension

① The *personal dimension of citizenship* involves developing a personal capacity for and commitment to a civic ethic characterized by socially responsible habits of mind, heart and action. As citizens we must enhance our capacity to think critically and systemically; our understanding of and sensitivity to cultural differences and issues of human rights; our repertoire of responsible, cooperative and non-violent conflict-resolution and problem-solving; and, our willingness to protect the environment, to defend human rights, and to engage in public life. None of this will be possible unless individual citizens are personally committed to this way of living in the world and unless they govern their personal lives accordingly.

To actualize this personal dimension of citizenship, education must develop and strengthen in all students the determination to shape their personal lives in ways that enable them to attain the

characteristics described in the preceding paragraph. This requires an attention to the teaching and learning of appropriate knowledge, skills and values which must be the task of the schools as a whole, both in their explicit curricula and courses of study and in the other many ways, both direct and indirect, they influence students. Citizenship is not something that can be confined to a specific course, or to classes in civics, or to exhortations to behave properly. It must infuse the whole atmosphere of the school and be identified as a priority by everyone involved in the conduct of education. Moreover, schools can achieve only so much on their own. Thus, society at large, and especially those social institutions that influence the lives of students, must reinforce the schools' work in developing the concept and practice of *multidimensional citizenship*.

The Social Dimension

The *social dimension of citizenship* recognizes that although personal qualities are essential, they are not sufficient in themselves. Citizenship is a social activity. It involves people living and working together. Thus, citizens must be able to work and interact with other people in a variety of settings and contexts. They must be able to engage in public debate and discussion, to participate in public life, to deal with the problems and issues that face them, in ways that at the same time equip them to deal respectfully with people whose ideas and values differ from their own. Social involvement is an important element of citizenship. The strictly political arena of political issues, elections, and political parties is only one element of this social dimension of citizenship, which also encompasses the wide variety of activities and engagements usually described as civil society. To cope with the challenges of the 21st century, citizens will be called upon to extend their civic participation to encompass thoughtful involvement in a broad and complex configuration of economic, cultural, social, and political domains.

Social involvement must also be combined with a commitment to action. Citizenship cannot be confined to speculation and contemplation. If we are to cope with the challenges of the 21st century, all citizens must be willing to act. In this regard, *multidimensional citizenship* draws on the tradition that good citizens are actively involved in the social life and public affairs of their communities. Traditionally, citizenship education has often defined the good citizen as the loyal servant of the state or the informed voter, both of which are largely passive roles. By contrast, *multidimensional citizenship* embraces those progressive approaches to citizenship education which see citizenship as entailing a commitment to participation in public life. At the same time, this participation is not an end in itself. Activity for its own sake is not the goal. Rather, citizen action must be the result of reflection and deliberation and be undertaken with full respect for the rights of others.

3

The Spatial Dimension

Citizens must also see themselves as members of several overlapping communities: local, regional, national and multinational. We refer to this as *the spatial dimension of citizenship*. What emerges from this study, and indeed from the relevant literature, is that the world is becoming increasingly interdependent and the world of the 21st century will be even more so. This is in part the result of changes in technology, in communications, in trade patterns, in immigration, and so on. It means that the challenges of the next century transcend national boundaries and will require multinational solutions. It is also true, however, that people's sense of identity is and will remain rooted in the local and the personal, in terms of nation and culture.

Though the world is and will be increasingly interconnected and interdependent, it will most likely remain a world of nations and national governments well into the future. Thus, the task is not to dismiss the claims of patriotism and national identity but to ensure that they are combined with the realization that we live in an interdependent world and that nations must work together if the challenges of the 21st century are to be successfully overcome. *Multidimensional citizenship* must include the local and the national but must also go beyond them to include the multinational. *Multidimensional citizenship* requires that citizens should be able to live and work at a series of interconnected levels, from the local to the multinational.

4

The Temporal Dimension

By the *temporal dimension of citizenship*, we mean that citizens, in dealing with contemporary challenges, must not be so preoccupied with the present that they lose sight of the past and the future. The personal and social dimensions of citizenship are in the large part historically conditioned. Heritage and tradition are influential in helping citizens understand what citizenship entails. Thus, *multidimensional citizenship* requires that we pay appropriate attention to the past. Citizens need a rich knowledge of their own and the world's history to give them the sense of connectedness and rootedness, and the depth of understanding, that are essential to the practice of *multidimensional citizenship*. At the same time, in dealing with contemporary challenges, citizens must always remember that their actions will have an impact upon the citizens of the future. *Multidimensional citizenship* requires that the present and its challenges be located in the context of both the past and the future, so that purely short-term solutions to problems can be avoided wherever possible. As we move into the 21st century, it is important to formulate our thoughts and actions in as broad a timeframe as possible, enhancing our knowledge and understanding of the present with that of the past and of the future. As citizens, we will be called upon to balance our readiness to explore and innovate with respect for the knowledge and values that constitute our heritage and with the realization that we are also stewards for the future.

The Interconnectedness of the Dimensions

Although these four dimensions of citizenship—the personal, the social, the spatial, and the temporal—have been discussed separately in the above paragraphs, in reality they are all closely interwoven, so that education policy must address them more or less simultaneously. A concrete example might clarify this, while also showing how teachers can take advantage of seemingly ordinary, routine classroom events to teach the concept and the practice of *multidimensional citizenship*.

The example comes from a class of thirteen year old students studying geography in Canada. They were studying the rainforests of the world and had learned that the rainforests play an important role in regulating the world's climate and also that the forests contain many valuable and unique flora and fauna, some of them still unknown. They had also learned that the rainforests were being cut down at a rapid rate and, with the certainty of thirteen year olds, they quickly reached the conclusion that this was a selfish and thoughtless action on the part of the people in the countries involved. What they did not take into account was that those people who were cutting down the rainforests were doing so not because they were silly or selfish, but because often they had little choice. Poverty, land hunger, patterns of international trade, economic development constraints, all serve to increase pressure on the rainforests. The students' teacher pointed out that Canada had largely destroyed its own forests, and indeed was continuing to do so, and suggested that Canadians' own standard of living was implicated in the destruction of the rainforests of other countries. As the students absorbed this information and thought about it, the teacher also suggested that perhaps Canadians and others should pay a rainforest tax, say on coffee, imported timber products, and cheap beef grown on pasture from cleared rainforests for fast food restaurants, in order to protect the rainforests, which led to further student discussion. The students did not resolve the problems involved, but they had been encouraged to think about some of the challenges they would face as citizens, and to do so in ways that were appropriate to their age and their level of maturity.

This everyday example illustrates how the four dimensions of citizenship can be addressed in a classroom. The students had been led to think about the present in the context of past and future; to think about how their everyday, personal lives intersected with a much broader problem; and about how their living in Canada, many miles away from the tropical rainforests, nonetheless still involved them in the problems of the world. In the process, the personal, social, spatial and temporal dimensions of citizenship were all addressed. This example is taken from a geography class, but every subject in the curriculum contains possibilities for this kind of learning.

It is perhaps worth noting that the four dimensions of citizenship are not dissimilar from the elements of citizenship and citizenship education described in the introduction to this Report. There it was argued that, historically, citizenship education has been concerned with the development of a sense of identity, usually at the national level; understanding of rights and duties; adoption of societal values; and involvement in public affairs. The data obtained in this study indicate that in the 21st century citizens' sense of identity must be located at a variety of levels, ranging from the local through national to the multinational. This concept of multiple, interlocking identities clearly pervades all four dimensions of citizenship. So do the rights and duties of citizenship which have obvious personal roots and social consequences, as well as being based in the context of time and space. Participation in public affairs and the adoption of appropriate societal values also cuts across all four dimensions.

However, in our view, the concept of *multidimensional citizenship* also represents something new and distinctive in that it builds upon and goes beyond these more traditional conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education and speaks directly to what are anticipated to be the challenges of the 21st century in a multinational context.

At the same time, *multidimensional citizenship* requires that citizens possess certain competencies, as indicated by the data presented elsewhere in this Report. These include:

- approaching problems as a member of a global society.
- working cooperatively with others.
- taking responsibility for one's roles and responsibilities in society.
- thinking in a critical and systemic way.
- resolving conflict in a non-violent manner.
- adopting a way of life that protects the environment.
- respecting and defending human rights.
- participating in public life at local, national and international levels.
- making full use of information-based technologies.

The Core Dimensions and Key Questions

We must begin to assess the capacity of our societies to implement this vision of citizenship for the 21st century. What follows is a framework of questions that might assist educational policymakers to initiate a process of identifying both strengths and weaknesses of citizenship education related to achieving *multidimensional citizenship*. This is then followed by a

series of "Citizenship Education Self-Assessment Checklists" (CESAC) aimed at specific levels within the educational system to enable individuals working at those levels to judge the effectiveness of their current programmes and ascertain where changes need to be made.

As our data suggest, citizenship education is not created in a vacuum. Our vision of a *multidimensional citizenship* requires an acceptance of the dynamic nature of the interaction between the school and the larger society. Policy confined to one or the other of these domains will not be sufficient for the creation of multidimensional citizens for the 21st century. Each domain must be examined as well as the interaction between the two. Therefore, there are at least two domains which must be addressed: the schools and the larger communities within which schools exist. Therefore, when we refer to the *education system* below, we mean this term to include both schools and the larger contexts within which they exist.

Using the four dimensions described in the previous section, the following questions provide a broad framework for initiating an analysis of the extent to which *multidimensional citizenship* is or can be realized within a particular educational setting; namely a Ministry or Department of Education, a school district, a school, a classroom, or teacher education institutions.

The Personal Dimension

To what extent is *multidimensional citizenship* reflected in an educational program aimed at developing students with a personal commitment to socially responsible habits of mind, heart and action? That is, to what extent does the educational system create students with:

- a capacity to think critically and systemically?
- an understanding of and sensitivity to cultural differences and issues of human rights?
- a repertoire of responsible, cooperative and non-violent problem solving and conflict resolution skills?
- a commitment to protect the environment, to defend human rights, and to engage in political processes?
- a commitment to shape their personal lives in ways that enable them to attain these qualities?

The Social Dimension

To what extent is *multidimensional citizenship* reflected in an educational program aimed at developing students with the ability to participate effectively and thoughtfully in civic life? That is, to what extent does the educational system create students with:

- the ability to act in a reflective and deliberative manner in a variety of civic settings, including economic, cultural, educational, social, political, spiritual and aesthetic domains?

The Spatial Dimension

To what extent is *multidimensional citizenship* integrated into all aspects of the system, i.e., the curriculum, pedagogy, governance and organization, and school-community relations? That is, to what extent does the educational system create students with:

- an ability to think and act as members of several overlapping communities, i.e., local, regional, national, and multinational?
- to what extent does the educational system require/promote multinational linkages?

The Temporal Dimension

To what extent is *multidimensional citizenship* reflected in an educational program aimed at developing students with the ability to take account of both the past and the future? That is, to what extent does the educational system create students with:

- the ability to think and act within a broad timeframe that encompasses both past heritage(s) and the potential impact of their actions upon the future?

Citizenship Education Self-Assessment Checklist

In attempting to give policy makers and other educators a tool to assess their current citizenship education programmes in light of our recommendation that such programmes in the future need to emphasize *multidimensional citizenship*, we have settled on a Citizenship Education Self-Assessment Checklist or CESAC. The effective use of the CESAC depends upon three conditions:

First, that all education personnel, from the most senior governing board members and administrators through classroom teachers, are familiar with the concept of *multidimensional citizenship*, as described in this Report;

Second, that these personnel support the concept of *multidimensional citizenship*; and

Third, that they are prepared to review what they now do in order to see if it is congruent with the attainment of *multidimensional citizenship* and to revise existing practices where necessary.

It is impossible to formulate a CESAC of questions that would cover every contingency and circumstance at all levels of the education system across nine nations. Such a checklist would be too detailed for successful use and would, in any case, fail to take into account local circumstances. Moreover, the research on the reform of education programmes demonstrates that effective implementation depends upon the support and cooperation of all those involved. As Michael Fullan has noted, change is a process, not an event (Fullan, 1991, 1993). It takes time, effort, persistence, and mutual goodwill and understanding on the part of all involved. Simple prescription or command does not work. Thus, it seems most useful to offer a self-assessment checklist with questions that can be used by people involved in schools so that they can survey their existing practices and change them, where necessary, in order to achieve the goal of *multidimensional citizenship*. Needless to say, the questions suggested in the following might well need further refinement in particular circumstances and should certainly be seen as *suggestive* rather than prescriptive. They are aimed at five levels:

- National or state/provincial level educational governance bodies, e.g. Ministries or Departments of Education
- Regional or local level governance bodies, e.g. North American or Japanese prefectural boards of education
- School level
- Classroom level
- Teacher education levels, including both initial licensure and inservice continuing professional development

Policymakers, administrators and teachers are encouraged to shape this CESAC to their own purposes according to their local circumstances. It is offered as an aid to establishing *multidimensional citizenship* as a key goal of education. How this is done in any particular setting is a matter that is *best decided* at each appropriate level. The CESAC is *intended only as a guide* and is aimed at five specific educational levels.

The National Ministry/Department, Provincial or State Department of Education

- To what extent is the concept of *multidimensional citizenship* identified as a/the goal of education? For example, in policy documents, goal statements, curriculum frameworks, etc.?

- Are ministry/department officials at all appropriate levels aware and supportive of *multidimensional citizenship*?
- Is the concept and practice of *multidimensional citizenship* taken into account when policy is discussed and formulated?
- What is done to ensure that the key elements of national/provincial/prefectural/state policy are consistent with and supportive of *multidimensional citizenship*, specifically: curriculum, pedagogy, textbooks and resources, financing, student evaluation, teacher education, and access to education?
- What is done to ensure that all levels of the education system are aware and supportive of the goal of *multidimensional citizenship*, specifically: regional and local officials, school heads/principals, and teachers?
- What is done to inform the community-at-large, e.g. parents, employers, the media, etc., of the importance of *multidimensional citizenship* as the key education goal?
- What is done to alert relevant policy-makers and officials in ministries/departments other than education of the importance of *multidimensional citizenship*?

The Local or Regional Levels

- Are all relevant personnel, e.g. school superintendents/directors, inspectors, regional authorities, etc., aware and supportive of *multidimensional citizenship*?
- Are local/regional policies, priorities and practices consistent with the achievement of *multidimensional citizenship*, e.g. in such cases as curriculum, selection of learning resources, teachers' professional development, allocations of resources among schools, personnel policies?
- Are non-teacher groups informed about the importance of *multidimensional citizenship* as a goal of education, e.g. parents, employers, local media, etc.?
- To what extent are existing policies and practices consistent with the goal of *multidimensional citizenship*, e.g. curriculum, pedagogy, selection of learning resources, student evaluation, school-community linkages, etc.?
- Where these existing policies are not consistent with the goal of *multidimensional citizenship*, what can be done to change them?

The Level of the Individual School

- Is the school head/principal, deputy/vice-principal, etc., aware and supportive of *multidimensional citizenship* as an important educational goal?
- Are the teachers and the school staff as a whole aware and support of *multidimensional citizenship* as a key school goal?
- To what extent are school practices supportive of the attainment of *multidimensional citizenship*, e.g., in local curriculum decisions, instructional strategies, selection of textbooks and resources, student discipline, links with parents and the community, links with future employers, etc.?
- If school practices are inconsistent with the attainment of *multidimensional citizenship*, what can be done to change them?
- When school policies are established or revised, is their impact on the attainment of *multidimensional citizenship* kept in mind?
- Does the school as a whole model the concept of *multidimensional citizenship*? If not, what can be done to ensure that it does so?
- What can be done on a continuing basis to ensure that the concept of *multidimensional citizenship* is constantly kept in mind by teachers, students, parents and the wider community as a whole?

The Level of the Individual Classroom

- Is the classroom teacher aware and supportive of *multidimensional citizenship*?
- Does the classroom model the practice of *multidimensional citizenship*, e.g., in teaching strategies, use of learning resources, student evaluation, rules of discipline and conduct, establishment of classroom climate, etc.?
- What is done to make students aware of the importance of *multidimensional citizenship*?
- To what extent does the teacher act as a model of *multidimensional citizenship*?
- How can students be required to practice *multidimensional citizenship* at whatever level is appropriate to their age and maturity?

The Level of Teacher Education

- Are teacher education institutions/programs aware of how other levels of the education system are organized to attain *multidimensional citizenship*?
- Is *multidimensional citizenship* an explicit part of teacher education programmes for all teachers?
- Is there a regular, two-way flow of information between teacher education institutions and the rest of the educational system regarding *multidimensional citizenship*?
- In what ways do teacher education personnel act as models of *multidimensional citizenship*?
- Do the research and development programs of teacher education institutions pay systematic attention to the concept and practice of *multidimensional citizenship*?
- Is *multidimensional citizenship* a component of professional development inservice education programmes for teachers?
- Is evidence of a focus upon *multidimensional citizenship* one of the key areas/ components in the criteria of agencies responsible for the accreditation of teacher education institutions?

V. CHALLENGES AND CONCLUSIONS

Children and youth in schools today can expect to live and work in a century much different from ours in many respects. The pace of change is enormously rapid; the list of problems and issues to be confronted and resolved long and challenging. The findings of this study strongly suggest that a fundamentally different approach to citizenship education, one centered in the vision of *multidimensional citizenship* model presented here is necessary.

This approach suggests that schools can no longer be expected to be the sole source of citizenship education within societies. Schools simply do not have the resources or the requisite time available to mold the citizen of the 21st century. If the *multidimensional citizenship* model we have outlined above is to become reality, then the entire community in which schools exist, including *all* of its agencies, institutions and organizations, must become involved in the educative process. Everyone from family members to business and government leaders must take a proactive role. Citizenship education for the 21st century requires that political and social institutions, including families, reinforce the work of schools.

We are also under no illusions that this transformation can be accomplished quickly. It took us a very long time to get to the present condition; it will take time and a strong commitment to the goals and the processes of *multidimensional citizenship* to implement these needed changes. We shall need the help of everyone, especially policy shapers such as those who participated so actively in the conduct of this study, to ensure that our will does not falter. We have some ideas regarding *what* must be done; but most important now is the *will* to implement it.

Thus, we wish to suggest a number of key implementation strategies which are critical to ensure that the *multidimensional citizenship* outlined in the preceding section is actualized. We begin with the school as an institution itself. We realize that by and large schools are not transformative institutions, but rather tend to reflect the existing values and socioeconomic structures of their societies. The findings of this study indicate that schools now face a major challenge. They are asked to embody a new set of standards based on a vision of the world in the 21st century. We recognize that this is a formidable task for schools. Nonetheless, it is a task that must be addressed, not by schools alone, but rather by a concerted effort of schools and their communities.

The underlying premise of the implementation strategies to follow is that the school, first and foremost, must model the vision of *multidimensional citizenship* we propose in this Report. Further, we believe that the school must become a center for change. Accordingly, the school and its communities, must respect the uniqueness of each individual and her/his history while also being aware of larger issues of mutual concern to the world community.

The School as a Model Community

We believe that the task of preparing citizens for the future can best be addressed by structuring the school itself in such a way that it becomes a model of *multidimensional citizenship*, i.e. that the whole atmosphere and functioning of the school models equitable policies and practices, environmental stewardship, ethical uses of informational technologies, and global awareness. That is to say, that the school structure and organization, its faculty and staff, the curriculum, assessment measures and the general ethos within the school, must be focused upon:

- the development of cooperative working relationships
- the development of critical and systemic thinking
- the development of appreciation and tolerance for multiple perspectives
- the development of respect, appreciation and tolerance for multiple points of view
- the defense of human rights

- the development of the ability to view problems and issues from a global perspective
- the willingness to change one's lifestyle and consumption habits to protect the environment
- the willingness and ability to participate in civic and public affairs at multiple levels

In effect, we are suggesting a redefinition of both the socializing and academic functions of the school. Although schools have always played a socializing role, generally understood as the maintenance of traditional values and norms for societal continuity and stability, we believe that the school's socialization function must also be understood in terms of encouraging students, as well as adults, to critically evaluate societal norms and to develop the attitudes, skills, and abilities to help change global trends that lead citizens and their communities in undesirable directions.

The particular type of socialization advocated in the *multidimensional citizenship* school is one in which the school and its community respects the uniqueness of each individual and one's history while also being cognizant of larger issues of mutual concern to the global community. Our expert panelists suggest that the most significant challenges facing citizens in the early 21st century will be those of increasing economic disparities, social inequities, information access and privacy issues, and environmental concerns. These must be addressed in large part through revised educational policies and practices designed to prepare citizens who are *multidimensional* in their outlook. Added to this is the need to empower these citizens to become knowledgeable about and active in civic and public affairs. That is, they must not confine their learning only to schools but must increasingly apply what they have learned in their communities.

The School Within the Larger Community

Given the need for increased linkage between school and community, we recommend that the school and community recognize and act upon their shared responsibility to contribute to the education of citizens with a global and future-oriented vision by developing a school culture in which students experience and participate in an environment that embodies the values, knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for the development of *multidimensional citizenship*. In this context, schools and their communities should assess their educational culture with respect to the following questions:

To what extent does local school policy and practice foster and/or demonstrate:

- sound environmental practices?
- sensitivity to human rights?

- respect for the opinions and ideas of others?
- cooperative, collaborative working relationships?
- open communication and the peaceful resolution of conflict?

The School as an Environmental Model

Given the concerns of the panelists for issues and problems surrounding the environment, we recommend that schools formally adopt and abide by a code of environmentally-minded behaviors including the careful use of water, energy, and other resources, as well as appropriate waste disposal and recycling procedures. Teachers and students within schools must also be willing to play active roles in their communities in promoting awareness and action to support sustainable development to ensure the future of the planet. The area of the environment provides multiple opportunities to become actively involved in ongoing projects in the community as well as to establish new ones. Those involved in work to protect and restore the environment are constantly seeking the involvement of new citizens to help in their work. It would also provide a natural avenue for these community activists and experts to be brought into the school curricular activities in this important area. This would expedite dialogue and debate regarding key environmental issues and how they might be resolved. It would further the process of deliberation within the formal school curriculum and thus help to develop critical thinking and analytical skills.

A Deliberation-Based Curriculum

In order to achieve the above, we recommend that a deliberation-based curriculum be implemented within the school. The goal is the development of global and civic-minded citizens. It would apply to all grade levels and, as appropriate, to all subject areas. Further, we would suggest that this curriculum be organized around six major ethical questions or issues which cut across the breadth of the curriculum. They would include:

- What should be done in order to promote equity and fairness within and among societies?
- What should be the balance between the right to privacy and free and open access to information?
- What should be the balance between protecting the environment and meeting human needs?
- What should be done to cope with population growth, genetic engineering, and children in poverty?

- What should be done to develop shared universal values while at the same time respecting local values?
- What should be done to empower learners to act upon the above, both in their schools and wider communities?

We believe that these questions are best addressed in multiple learning environments and through interdisciplinary studies both in school and in the wider communities in which students live. The underlying foundation of this learning, however, must be deliberation. Students of all ages must be given the opportunity to examine in depth the great issues of our day which will most certainly impact their lives fully in the coming years. The kinds of knowledge, skills and attitudes noted above do not develop by chance; they must be learned through inquiry and discourse about key civic and public issues. And they must have the opportunities to put their learning to practical application, again within the school and/or in the wider community. Thus, we strongly recommend a deliberation-based curriculum within a school learning environment which models the attributes of *multidimensional citizenship*.

This underlines our earlier point regarding the need for a fundamental transformation not only in the socialization role of schools but in the academic role as well. To be sure, the established disciplines will continue to occupy central roles within the curriculum. However, they must be taught in an increasingly interdisciplinary manner. The kinds of global trends which our panelists identified are not the domain of single disciplines but rather cut across a number of them. Thus, in order to truly get to the resolution of these issues and problems, they cannot be studied through just one discipline but rather in an interdisciplinary manner which draws upon the key concepts and processes of each and every relevant field of study. This is the way the world really is and the way in which it works. One of the major stated reasons by youth for their lack of interest in civic and public issues is that in their school learning, the relevance of in-school work is never brought to bear upon the real issues of the day in their own communities. Students don't feel they are really studying things which will impact them, or at least the relevant linkages are seldom pointed out or made obvious. This must change, and a deliberation-based curriculum which is interdisciplinary and gets students actively involved in projects in their communities is the direction we strongly recommend. We believe that the six key ethical questions raised above should be the advanced organizers for this deliberation.

Teachers as Exemplars

If the above are to be implemented to further the policy recommendation of *multidimensional citizenship*, then it is essential that teachers be prepared in the theory and practice of *multidimensional citizenship* as well. Without teachers as living models of what the students

Appendix 3

CONSENSUS CRITERIA The Citizenship Education Policy Study

Trends

To analyze the Trends section composed of 60 questionnaire items, the mode, median, and interquartile range scores were calculated based on the policy experts' responses to each item. For a trend to be considered as having reached consensus among the experts, the item had to meet the following two criteria:

1. mode - median \leq 1.0; and,
2. interquartile range score \leq 1.5

The consensus trends were then categorized by their median score to distinguish: a) very high desirability and/or probability; b) high desirability and/or probability; c) medium, low, very low desirability and/or probability; and d) undesirability and/or improbability. The following categorization criteria were established:

1. Very Highly Desirable or Probable Trend: median score \geq 5.5
2. Highly Desirable or Probable Trend: median score \geq 4.5, but $<$ 5.5
3. Medium, Low, Very Low Desirable or Probable Trend: median score $>$ 1.5, but $<$ 4.5
4. Undesirable or Improbable Trend: median score \leq 1.5

Characteristics

To analyze the Characteristics section of 20 questionnaire items, frequencies and percentages were calculated to identify the characteristics the policy makers viewed as most urgent for attention and action during the next 25 years. An item was considered as having reached consensus among the experts if it met the following two criteria:

1. the characteristic appeared in the top 10 list for three out of four research teams (Europe, Japan, North America, and Thailand); and,
2. the characteristic was selected by 25% or more of the policy experts.

Strategies

To analyze the Strategies section of 26 questionnaire items, the mode, median, and interquartile range scores were calculated based on the policy experts' responses to each item. For an item to be considered as having reached consensus among the experts, the item had to meet the following two criteria:

1. mode - median \leq 1.0; and,
2. interquartile range score \leq 1.5

The consensus strategies were then categorized by their median score to distinguish which strategies were very highly recommended and which ones were highly recommended by the policy experts. The following categorization criteria was established:

1. Very Highly Recommended Strategy: median score ≥ 5.5
2. Highly Recommended Strategy: median score ≥ 4.5 , but < 5.5

are to embody, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to succeed. Thus, teacher preparation institutions, both at the initial licensure and inservice professional development levels, must reorganize and restructure their curricula and clinical programmes in order to ensure the development of the knowledge base, skills and attitudes of *multidimensional citizenship* as outlined above. Without teachers who are first and foremost multidimensional citizens, it will be impossible to help children and youth to develop the four dimensions of *multidimensional citizenship*.

Specifically, we recommend that professional development programmes for teachers be based upon and model the application of the following:

- deliberation based curriculum and pedagogy
- information and media based curriculum and pedagogy
- multiple uses of technology for teaching, learning and researching
- focus upon environmental issues and problems of a global nature which have local manifestations
- a globally-oriented curriculum, that is to say one which uses examples, readings, illustrative pedagogical activities, etc., from other parts of the world
- democratic decision-making processes and values
- the development of cooperative, collaborative working relationships, and
- practice in the application of one's learning in the wider community

Only with teachers prepared in this manner can we ever expect the *multidimensional citizenship* model we have outlined to be implemented. Students must see their teachers as living examples of what they are professing, i.e. personally involved in their communities, working on projects of a civic or public nature, knowledgeable about developments in other parts of the nation and world, able to debate key civic and public issues with other colleagues in the school as well as those in the community at large, aware of the historical antecedents of these issues so that they have a context for their discourse, and a vision of what might be done to resolve or at least improve the situation.

The Challenge to Develop Models

Finally, we must encourage policy leaders, educators and members of the communities-at-large in the nations which participated in this study and beyond to begin, at the very least, several

pilot projects in the respective nations to get the process of implementing *multidimensional citizenship* underway. Large-scale projects with lofty goals and ideals seldom achieve the kinds of success anticipated at the outset. But if we expect entire communities to become involved in this reconceptualization of the 21st century citizen, then we should begin appropriately with models developed in local communities from which others might learn and replicate.

VI. REFERENCES

NOTE: There is a vast and increasing literature on the subjects of citizenship and citizenship education and global trends. The references listed here form only a small part of what is available but were the specific resources utilized in compiling this report. The full bibliographies developed as part of the national case studies in the first year of the Project are available through the ERIC Social Sciences Clearinghouse system.

Andrews G. [ed.]. [1991] *Citizenship*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Anyon, J. [1980] "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work." *Journal of Education*. 162: 67-92.

Apple, M. [1979] *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. [1982] *Education and Power*. New York: Routledge.

Banks, J.A. [1996] *Multicultural Education: Transformative Knowledge and Action*. New York: Teachers College Press

Barbalet, J.M. [1988] *Citizenship: Rights, Struggle and Class Inequality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Barber, B. [1984] *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley; University of California Press.

Beiner, R. [ed.]. [1995] *Theorizing Democracy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bell, D. [1993]. *Communitarianism and its Critics*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Bissoondath, N. [1994] *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Penguin.

Botkin, J.W., M. Elmandjira, J. Malitza. [1979] *No Limits to Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Boulding, E. [1990] *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Bourdieu, P. & J-C. Passeron. [1977] *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Boyte, H. [1980] *The Backyard Revolution: Understanding the New Citizen Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Boyte, H. and Kari, N. [1996] *Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Center for Civic Education. [1991] *CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education*. Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education.
- Cogan, J.J. [1989] "Citizenship Education for the 21st Century: Observations and Reflections", *Social Education*, 53:4, 243-45.
- Cohen, J. [1989] "Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy." in A. Hamlin & P. Pettit [eds.]. *The Good Polity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Commission on Global Governance. [1995] *Our Global Neighbourhood*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Commonwealth of Australia. [1991] *Active Citizenship Revisited: A Report by the Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training*. Canberra: Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia.
- Commonwealth of Australia. [1994] *Whereas the People...Civics and Citizenship Education*. A report of the Civics Expert Group. Canberra: Government of Australia.
- Crick, B. & A. Porter. [eds.]. [1978] *Political Education and Political Literacy*. London: Longman.
- Crick B. & D.B. Heater. [1978] *Essays on Political Education*. Ringmer: Falmer Press.
- Curtis, B., D.W. Livingstone & H. Smaller. [1992] *Stacking the Deck: The Streaming of Working Class Kids in Ontario Schools*. Toronto: Our Schools Ourselves.
- Drucker, P.F.. [1994] *The New Realities*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Drysek, J. [1990] *Discursive Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Engle S. & A. Ochoa. [1988] *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Decision Making in the Social Studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Etzioni, A. [1993] *The Spirit of Community: The Reinvention of American Society*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Fullan, M. [1991] *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Fullan, M. [1993] *Change Forces*. London: Falmer.
- Galston, W.A. [1991] *Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues and Diversity in the Liberal State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, A. [1994] *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gould, C. [1988] *Rethinking Democracy: Freedom and Social Cooperation in Politics, Economy and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Gutmann, A. [1987] *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gwyn, R. [1995] *The Unbearable Lightness of Being Canadian*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Hauchler, I. & P.M. Kennedy, Eds. [1994] *Global Trends: the World Almanac of Development and Peace*. New York: Continuum.
- Heater, D.B. [1990] *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World Politics, History and Education*. London: Longman.
- Held, D. [ed.]. [1993] *Prospects for Democracy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hess, R.D. & J.V. Torney. [1968] *The Development of Political Attitudes in Children*. Chicago: Aldine Press.
- Hirst, P. [1994] *Associative Democracy: New Forms of Economic and Social Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hodgetts, A.B. [1968] *What Culture? What Heritage?* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Holmes, S. [1993] *The Anatomy of Illiberalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ichilov, O. [ed.]. [1990] *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century. [1996] *Learning: the Treasure Within*. UNESCO: Paris.
- Janowitz, M. *The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for Civic Consciousness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kaplan, R.D. [1994] The Coming Anarchy. *The Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 274, No. 8; 44-76.
- Kaplan, W. [ed.]. [1993] *Belonging: The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Kennedy, P.M. [1993] *Preparing for the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Random House.
- Kidder, R.M. [1987] *An Agenda for the 21st Century*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- _____. [1989] *Reinventing the Future: Global Goals for the 21st Century*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- _____. [1994] *Shared Values for a Troubled World: Conversations with Men and Women of Conscience*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kymlicka, W. [1992] *Recent Work in Citizenship Theory*. Ottawa: Government of Canada, Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship.
- Kymlicka, W. [1995] *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Macedo, S. [1990] *Liberal Virtues*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

- Marshall, T.H. [1950] *Citizenship and Social Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, D. [1996] "Reviewing and Previewing Civics." in W.C. Parker [ed.]. *Educating the Democratic Mind*. Albany: State University of New York Press: 265-286.
- McRae, H. [1995] *The World in 2020*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Miller, D. [1993] "Deliberative Democracy and Social Choice." in D. Held. *Prospects for Democracy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press: 74-92.
- Mouffe, C.[ed.]. [1992] *Dimensions of Radical Democracy*. London: Verso.
- Newmann, F. [1970] *Clarifying Public Controversy*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Newmann, F. [1975] *Education for Citizen Action*. Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Nussbaum, M. [1996] *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Books.
- Oakes, J. [1985] *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ohmae, K. [1987] *Beyond National Borders: Reflections on Japan and the World*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- _____. [1990] *The Borderless World*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Okin, S.M. [1992] "Women, Equality and Citizenship." in *Queen's Quarterly*, 99[1]: 56-71.
- Oppenheim, A., J.V. Torney, et al. [1975] *Civic Education in Ten Countries*. New York: Wiley.
- Osborne, K.W. [1994] *Teaching for Democratic Citizenship*. Toronto: Our Schools Ourselves.
- Parker, W. [ed.]. [1996] *Educating the Democratic Mind*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Phillips, C. [1989] *Engendering Democracy*. University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Phillips, C. [1993] *Democracy and Difference*. University Park: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pocock, J.G.A. [1992] "The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times." in *Queen's Quarterly*, 99[1]: 33-55.
- Ramphal, S. [1991] *Our Country the Planet: Forging a Partnership for Survival*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Reich, R.B. [1992] *The Work of Nations*. New York: Vintage.
- Riesenberg, P. [1992] *Citizenship in the Western Tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- Schlesinger, A.M. [1991] *Disuniting America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. New York: Norton.
- Senate of Canada [1993] *Canadian Citizenship: Sharing the Responsibility*. Ottawa: Senate of Canada Standing Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology.
- Shaver, J. [ed.]. [1977] *Building Rationales for Citizenship Education*. Washington: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Shklar, J. [1991] *American Citizenship: The Quest for Inclusion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Snyder, H.A. [1995] *EarthCurrents*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Snyders, G. [1976] *Ecole, classe, et lutte des classes*. Paris: Les presses universitaires de France.
- Taylor, C. [1992] *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Trend, D. [ed.]. [1996] *Radical Democracy*. London: Routledge.
- Turner, B.S. [1986] *Citizenship and Capitalism*. London: Sage.
- Turner, B.S. [1989] "Outline of a Theory of Citizenship" in *Sociology*, 24: 189-217.
- Waters, M. [1995] *Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Whitty, G. [1985] *Sociology and School Knowledge: Curriculum Theory, Research and Politics*. London: Methuen.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. [1987] *Our Common Future*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zhou N. [1996] Implications of the Delors' Report "Learning: The Treasure Within" for Re-engineering Education: An Asia-Pacific Perspective. Keynote Address of the 2nd International UNESCO-ACEID Conference on Re-engineering Education for Change, 12 December 1996, Bangkok, Thailand.

Appendix 1

PANEL EXPERTS

The Citizenship Education Policy Study

Note: Those expert panelists who wish to have their names revealed in the final Report are listed below. Other expert participants chose, for a variety of reasons, not to have their names revealed.

Europe

Hedy d'Ancona
Imre Bak
Zoltán Báthory
Alan Blyth
Wisse Dekker
Marie Eliou
István Eörsi
Eleftherios Geitonas
Herman van Gunsteren
Antónia Hága
Barbara John
Alexander Rinnooy Kan
András Kereszty
Ildikó Lendvai
Han Leune
G. Lycklama a Nijehout
György Marx
Ottó Mihály
Arie Oostlander
Sybren Polet
Ernö Rubik
Günter Spur
Ingrid Stahmer
Miklós Szabó
Tibor Vámos
István Várhelyi
Vassilis Vassilikos
Tamás Vitray
G. Wagner

Japan

Isao Amagi
Hiroyuki Aoki
Kiku Fukuda
Fuki Fushida
Yasuo Harada
Keitaro Hasegawa
Otohiko Hasumi
Kazo Hirata
Ikuo Hirayama
Heiwa Hoshimura
Hiroshi Ishihara
Kazuo Ishizaka
Satoshi Kawanobe
Hiroshi Kida
Toshio Kita
Kiyoshi Kogane
Masataka Kosaka
Mizue Maeda
Tetsuro Matumoto
Motonori Matsuyama
Yasushi Mizoue
Takao Mizuno
Kenji Mizutani
Hirokazu Monden
Masashi Moroi
Kazuji Nagasu
Shigeto Nakano
Nobuo Sakagami
Yasuo Sasaki
Keiji Shima
Michiya Shimbori
Tsugiyoshi Takayama
Ken Terawaki
Mamoru Uchinyama
Akira Yamagishi
Kakuji Yanagawa
Shinji Yoneda

North America

Harry Boyte
Robert Brown
Sharon Carstairs
Ronald Duhamel
John Eldredge
Donald Fraser
Joe Freedman
Jean Friesen
Geneva Gay
John Goodlad
Carole Hahn
Pamela Hawthorn
Josie Johnson
Kevin Kavanagh
Noel Kinsella
Susan Hart-Kulbaba
Gloria Ladson-Billings
Milton McClaren
Terry Morrison
Fraser Mustard
Cornel D. Pewewardy
Paul Quie
Karen Ridd
Heather-Jane Robertson
Patricia Roman
Alan Sears
G. Edward Schuh
Sheila Valencia
Mary Wynne-Ashford

Thailand

Sumon Amornvivat
Kothorn Ar-reeya
Siriporn Boonyanunt
Nikom Chandravithun
Chomploen Chandr-Ruang-Phen
Amrung Chantavanich
Chaiyot Hamarachata
Rung Kaewdaeng
Sippanondha Ketudat
Banthoon Lamsam
Tipavadee Makesawon
Piamsak Menasavet
Narong Nitayaporn
Oonta Nopakun
Sawai Parmanee
Valai na Pombejr
Pichit Ratakul
Amara Ruksasataya
Wichit Srisa-an
Kamol Sudprasert
Padoongchart Suwanawongse
Chumnong Thongprasert
Sumeth Tuntivejkul
Apisit Vechacheva
Nongluk Viratchai
Sermsak Visalaporn
Kovit Vorapipatana
Kasem Watanachai
Tong-In Wongsorthorn
Laddawan Wongsriwong

Appendix 2

CEPS PROJECT RESEARCH TEAM MEMBERS

JAPAN *

Mizoue Yasushi, Naruto University of Education, Co-Team Leader
Ninomiya Akira, Hiroshima University, Co-Team Leader
Nakayama Shuichi, Hiroshima University
Otsu Kazuko, Hokkaido University of Education
Uozumi Tadahisa, Aichi University of Education

THAILAND

Somuwung Pitiyanuwat, Chulalongkorn University, Co-Team Leader
Chumpol Poolpatarachewin, Chulalongkorn University, Co-Team Leader
Arungsi Anantrasirichai, Ministry of Education
Walai Panich, Chulalongkorn University
Chanita Rukspollmuang, Chulalongkorn University
Suchin Visavateeranon, Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University

EUROPE

Sjoerd Karsten, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands, Team Leader
Raymond Derricott, University of Liverpool, U.K.
Athan Gotovos, University of Ioannina, Greece
Zsuzsa Matrai, National Institute of Public Education, Hungary
Hans Merkens, Frei Universitat, Berlin, Germany

NORTH AMERICA

John J. Cogan, University of Minnesota, Project Director and Team Leader
Patricia K. Kubow, University of Minnesota, Project Research Coordinator
Patricia Avery, University of Minnesota
Roland Case, Simon Fraser University, Canada
Fred Finley, University of Minnesota
David Grossman, Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong, SAR, PRC **
Ruthanne Kurth-Schai, Macalester College
Kenneth Osborne, University of Manitoba, Canada
Walter C. Parker, University of Washington
Kathy Skau, University of Calgary, Canada

* Japanese names appear with family names listed first as is customary.

** Dr. Grossman began the CEPS project with the North American team in his position as Director of the Center for Teaching Asia and Pacific Studies at the East-West Center in Honolulu. He subsequently moved to his present post in Hong Kong in late 1995.