JSSE
Volume 11, Number 1, © JSSE 2012 ISSN 1618-5293

Carolyn Barber, Judith Torney-Purta

Comparing Attitudes in the 1999 and 2009 IEA Civic and Citizenship Education Studies: Opportunities and Limitations Illustrated in Five Countries[1]

Both the 1999 IEA Civic Education Study (CIVED) and the 2009 IEA International Civics and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) sought to examine young people's attitudes and behaviors as related to civic engagement in addition to their civic knowledge. Now that both studies are completed, questions can be asked about the extent to which the averages of outcomes across countries have stayed consistent or changed. The purpose of this article is to review the CIVED and ICCS studies to examine the potential for, and potential limitations to, such a comparison extending beyond the cognitive domain to some attitudinal and participatory outcomes. We compared guiding frameworks for each study, examined the similarities and differences among items in scales appearing in both studies, and provided a general discussion of the pitfalls of comparing IRT scales across cohorts. An item-level analysis explored whether young people's average attitudes toward immigrants' rights and institutional trust changed between 1999 and 2009 in five Nordic countries. Stability in support for immigrants' rights and increasing trust are apparent in most countries, although exceptions to this pattern exist. Recommendations for secondary analysis of CIVED and ICCS are discussed.

Keywords
Attitudes toward immigrants, CIVED, ICCS, political trust, adolescents, Nordic countries

1 Introduction

Studies in the area of civic education conducted by IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) are unique in comparison to other studies conducted by this organization because they focus on attitudinal and participatory outcomes of schooling relating to young people's civic development in addition to knowledge and cognitive outcomes. The International Civics and Citizenship Education Study of 2009 (ICCS) was the most recent of three such studies. The predecessors of ICCS were the 1971 study (Torney, Oppenheim, Farnen 1975) and the 1999 IEA Civic Education Study [CIVED] (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, Schulz 2001), to which the ICCS study is more comparable. In IEA studies in other

1 We are grateful to Professor Erik Amna whose YeS Project at Orebro University (Sweden) organized a Workshop on Cluster Analytic Techniques in Political Socialization Research (funded by the Swedish Research Council) for representatives from the Nordic region in June 2011. We are also grateful to Wolfram Schulz, who contributed to the first sections regarding changes made between CIVED and ICCS.

subject areas, notably the Trends in International Mathematics and Sciences Studies (TIMSS), comparisons across cohorts have become commonplace (e.g., Mullis, Martin, Foy 2008), and the ability to establish such trends in cognitive outcomes is a key rationale for repeating subject-area assessments. To create a cross-cohort comparison in the area of civics, Schulz et al. re-scaled responses to 17 items of civic content knowledge[2] that were kept secure by IEA and used in both the CIVED and ICCS data sets. The scale scores were compared across the CIVED and ICCS datasets to identify increases or decreases in average civic content knowledge among young people in a country (Schulz et al. 2011, 83). Among the 17 countries that could be compared, only Slovenia improved its test performance, while other countries had either stable or lower performance in 2009 compared to 1999.

A similar analysis has not yet been conducted with other civic-related outcomes, despite its importance and appeal to social scientists interested in the relation between sociocultural context and young people's development of civic engagement. Now that the ICCS data and reports are available, researchers in education and social science can use this new data source to explore outcomes other than cognitive achievement for two cohorts of youth. However, these comparisons are not straightforward, largely because some changes were made in the instruments measuring civic-related attitudes and behavior. The purpose of this article is to provide an overview of the opportunities for, and limitations in, conducting cross-cohort comparisons of attitudes, values, and behaviors between the CIVED and ICCS studies.

The first international reports from the ICCS study (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito 2010) focused on describing the knowledge, values, attitudes, and current or expected participation of eighth-graders in 2009 in 38 countries. The presentation of mean scale scores by country and of multilevel models to identify contextual predictors of some outcomes provides an important basis for more targeted secondary data analyses. We begin with a broad overview of similarities and differences between the CIVED and ICCS studies, in terms of their general purposes and the more specific frameworks guiding the creation of the questionnaires. This discussion of similarities and differences in the broader conceptualization of the two studies is important to ensure that the general purpose and approach of the studies were similar enough to warrant cross-cohort comparisons. We then move to a discussion of the feasibility of comparing students' attitudes between the 1999 and 2009 cohorts. Several considerations echo the concerns when conducting trend analysis of civic knowledge, while others are unique to the study of attitudes. Taking these issues into consideration, we present an exploratory cross-cohort analysis of two civic attitudes (trust and immigrant rights attitudes) in five countries (Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Norway and Sweden) that are in a common region. We conclude with recommendations for further secondary analysis employing these studies.

2 Civic content knowledge (also referred to as KNOWLMLE in CIVED) was one subscale of total civic knowledge, along with skills in interpreting political material. Only items pertaining to civic content knowledge were used again in ICCS; therefore, comparisons can only be made on this subscale.

2 Comparison of Purposes for the CIVED and ICCS Studies

Prior to comparing across the two studies, a simple question can be asked about whether two studies were designed to meet similar goals in their assessment of attitudes. Torney-Purta et al. (2001) described the beginnings of the CIVED study in the international report on the survey of 14-year-olds in 28 countries. The IEA General Assembly voted to conduct a study of civic education in 1994. The resulting study was the first study conducted by IEA in the area of civic education in almost 30 years, and assessed knowledge and attitudes in about three times as many countries as the 1971 study. The primary impetus for a civic education study in the 1990s came from the recent political shifts in Eastern Europe, as countries that had previously been under Communist rule were transitioning to democratic forms of government. Another source of concern was the lack of interest in politics among many young people in Western Europe.

In the major international report from the ICCS 2009 study, Schulz et al. (2010) describe several sociocultural shifts that occurred between 1999 and 2009 that served as an impetus for an updated study of civics and citizenship. These include terrorism threats, persistent social inequality, migration and immigration, the importance of non-governmental groups in defining social participation, and globalization. ICCS includes new questionnaire items regarding participation in more localized forms of engagement (including those in the school context) as well as additional items regarding threats to democracy. In addition, the ICCS study includes regional modules (Schulz, Ainley, Friedman, Lietz 2011 for Latin America; Kerr, Sturman, Schulz, Burge 2011 for Europe; Fraillon, Schulz, Ainley in press, for Asia). These modules provide an opportunity to assess students' views on civic engagement in relation to specific issues in a region.

Although Schulz et al. describe the background of the ICCS study in a way that highlights the differences between it and CIVED, there are in fact many similarities between the purposes of the two studies that are conducive to cross-cohort analyses. Most important here, both studies state that civic education is focused not only on the development of knowledge, but on the formation of attitudes and values that support democratic principles and individual participation. This means that both studies were committed to examining students' attitudes, values, and participatory behavior (current or expected).

3 Comparison of Assessment Frameworks in CIVED and ICCS

The potential for cross-cohort comparison can also be assessed through a comparison of the assessment frameworks guiding the CIVED and ICCS studies. After outlining the general purposes of their respective studies, researchers associated with the CIVED and ICCS studies developed a framework to guide the assessment of civic and citizenship knowledge and engagement. In this section, we describe the content of these frameworks. There are several areas of common ground between the two studies that

support cross-cohort comparisons. There are also differences that result in limitations and caveats.

3.1 Creating a Framework for the CIVED Study

The CIVED study consisted of two phases: a qualitative study (Phase I) and quantitative survey (Phase II). In Phase I, researchers conducted a series of structured qualitative case studies in 24 countries (21 of which took part in the quantitative survey study in Phase II). Results from these case studies (Torney-Purta, Schwille, Amadeo 1999) were used along with the recommendations of National Research Coordinators to identify three core domains of topics and concepts: Democracy and Citizenship; National Identity and International Relations; and Social Cohesion and Diversity (Torney-Purta et al. 2001, 191-194). The National Research Coordinators met to define the types of items to be included in the instrument to assess each of these domains. Two item types (knowledge of content and skills in interpretation of political material) were included in the test of civic knowledge. These items included one correct response and three incorrect distracters. Three additional item types assessed understanding of concepts of democracy of citizenship, a large number of attitudes, and several participatory actions (current and expected). These items were included in the questionnaire and were not keyed with right answers.

The results from the case studies were also important in elaborating a theoretical framework for explaining how students developed civic knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Titled the "Octagon Model," this framework situated the student at the center of a complex social context in which multiple and overlapping social settings, both proximal and distal, shape the processes of civics education. Reports from the CIVED study (including Torney-Purta et al. 2001; Schulz, Sibberns 2004) describe this model as informed by ecological models of human development (e.g., Bronfenbrenner 1979) and by theories of communities of practice that serve to situate or contextualize cognition (e.g., Lave, Wenger 1991). Wilkenfeld, Lauckhardt, Torney-Purta (2010) further discuss the relation of the IEA assessments to developmental psychological theories.

3.2 The Assessment Framework for the ICCS 2009 Study

Fraillon (2011) described the conceptual framework guiding ICCS as "designed to subsume and broaden the conceptual model underpinning IEA's 1999 Civic Education Study (CIVED) test items" (21). Earlier, Schulz, Fraillon, Ainley, Losito, Kerr (2008) presented the Octagon Model from the CIVED study as an illustration in their overview of the assessment framework, suggesting close conceptual and theoretical ties between the two studies. In the same overview, the contextual framework that is presented describes multiple levels of influence (e.g., wider community, school/classroom, and home environments) as they relate to individual

outcomes, but distinguishes pre-existing "antecedents" from active "processes."

In the assessment framework itself, differences as well as many similarities between the ICCS study and the CIVED study are apparent. Four content domains were identified in ICCS: Civic Society and Systems, Civic Principles, Civic Participation, and Civic Identities. The term "civic" is described as referring to "any community where the shared connections between people at a level larger than that of the extended family, including the state" (Schulz et al. 2008, 15). Whereas the CIVED report describes "item types," ICCS describes the cognitive processes required by specific test items (Knowing or Reasoning/Analyzing), or in the affective/behavioral domain by specific questionnaire items (Value Beliefs, Attitudes, Behavioral Intentions, and Behaviors).

3.3 Similarities and Differences between the CIVED and ICCS Assessment Framework

A comparison of the CIVED theoretical and assessment frameworks as discussed by Husfeldt, Torney-Purta (2004) and the ICCS assessment framework, discussed by Schulz et al. (2008) sheds further light on the possibilities for comparison between the two studies. The ICCS domain of Civic Society and Systems is quite similar to the CIVED domain of Democracy and Citizenship relating to institutions and rights and duties of citizenship. Similarly, the ICCS domain of Civic Principles includes sub-domains related to equity and social cohesion, similar to the CIVED's Social Cohesion and Diversity. Further, the ICCS domain of Civic Identities, which includes considerations of civic self-image and connectedness, encompasses the concepts captured in the CIVED domain of National Identity and International Relations. Given these similarities in frameworks, it is not surprising that many of the same attitudinal items and scales were used in both studies, thus allowing cross-cohort comparisons.

There are differences as well. The ICCS domain of Civic Identities suggests a focus on the multiple identities that students have in their communities, be they local, national, or international. As another example, "democracy" is considered a "key concept" under the general domain of Civic Society and Systems in ICCS, but is included in the CIVED domain of Democracy and Citizenship. This suggests a shift in focus to a broader range of civic institutions: formal and informal, state-sponsored or not. Most notable, however, is the addition of Civic Participation as a fourth content domain in ICCS. These concepts had previously been captured under the CIVED Domain of Democracy and Citizenship, under the sub-domain of "rights and duties of citizenship," but the identification of this as a domain in itself in the ICCS study illustrates its increased importance. Accordingly, there was an increase in the number of questionnaire items (and resulting scales) pertaining to students' participation (both current and expected), which corresponds to the addition of civic participation as a separate content domain. Although possibilities for cross-cohort comparisons are limited in this domain, these new items will allow further secondary analysis of

activism, such as that reported by Hart, Gullan (2010).

Similarities and differences also exist in the cognitive or affective/behavioral domains represented in test and questionnaire items. The two domains of knowledge and skill are represented in both studies (although operationalized quite differently), as are considerations of civic attitudes and behaviors. For the purpose of our current focus on attitudinal items, the re-conceptualization of "concept" items as items assessing "value beliefs" is the most important to consider. The CIVED student questionnaire included 25 items titled "concepts of democracy." This part of the assessment pertained to the domain of Democracy and Citizenship and presented items in which students were asked to indicate how "good for democracy" or "bad for democracy" they believed a behavior or situation to be (e.g., "when courts and judges are influenced by politicians"). In ICCS these were replaced by a few items all about positive situations (such free expression of opinion) and were labeled "endorsement of basic democratic values" (Schulz et al. 2008, 22). These items were phrased as attitudes or beliefs, and were widely endorsed. These differences aside, however, there is considerable overlap between the two studies in their assessment of attitudes that warrants cross-cohort comparison.

4 Methodological Considerations in Comparing Attitudinal Responses

While some changes in focus resulted in the addition or deletion of items between the studies, our review of the intended purpose and frameworks guiding the two studies suggests that there is enough conceptual overlap to support a cross-cohort comparison of attitudes. Our attention now turns to more technical considerations in comparing the responses from 1999 and 2009. We begin by examining similarities and differences between the wordings of the items appearing in each questionnaire, before raising issues related to comparing scales that incorporate these items.

4.1 Overlap in Specific Items between the CIVED and ICCS Studies

The first step in assessing the technical feasibility of cross-cohort comparison was to map the similarities and differences in how specific items were worded in the CIVED and ICCS studies, with a focus on items that appear in attitudinal scales developed for these studies (Schulz, Sibberns 2004; Husfeldt, Barber, Torney-Purta 2005; Schulz et al. 2010). Most of these scales correspond to the civic affective/behavioral domains in the framework described above; however, two widely-used scales pertaining to school context (confidence in school participation and openness of classroom climate) are also included in this overview. The Appendix contains detailed comparisons of items wordings, and is organized according to the order in which they appear in the CIVED student

questionnaire. Further, within each questionnaire section, a discussion of the items is organized by the scale in which the item appears.

Drawing on our extensive experience with the CIVED study, we made a joint judgment as to whether items appearing in each of the two studies could be considered "the same" in both studies. Items were included as they appeared in the Technical Report of the CIVED Study (Schulz et al. 2004) and in the Supplement to the ICCS 2009 User Guide (Brese, Jung, Mirazchiyski, Schulz, Zuehlke 2011). These judgments were then sent to an author of the major ICCS reports for his comment, with additional changes in response to his recommendations. In many cases, the wording of individual items is identical. These items appear in the middle column of each table in the Appendix. The majority of items included in the attitude scale of Support for Immigrants' Rights, for example, did not change at all.

In other cases, we judged the items to be essentially the same in meaning despite a few minor changes. These items appear in the middle column of the Appendix as written in the CIVED study, with the adapted wording from ICCS appearing in brackets. An example of this appears in the section on Support for Women's Rights. In each study, an item asks how strongly students agree that there should be gender equality in rights. In CIVED, this item is worded to ask whether "women should have the same rights as men," while in ICCS it is worded as "men and women should have equal rights," removing the assumption that men have rights that women may not. The general focus of the item, however, was judged to remain the same. Many items relating to conventional citizenship values also fell into the category of minor changes.

There were also instances where changes to the wording of an item were extensive enough that we judged the item to be incomparable across the two studies. In these cases the wording for the CIVED version of the item appears in the left column of the table, and the wording of the ICCS version of the item appears on the same row in the right column of the table. An example of this pertains to national attitudes. Both studies included an item that assessed the extent to which students agreed that their country was a good one to live in. In CIVED, this item was worded so that students indicated how much they would want to live permanently in another country. (This item was reverse-coded, so that disagreement with this item indicated more positive national feelings.) In ICCS, this item was revised to ask students whether, "generally speaking," their country was a good one to live in. This change from a personal preference to a more general assessment of the country was judged to change the item enough that they could not be considered comparable.

A number of questions were added to or deleted from the ICCS questionnaires. In the Appendix, this is represented by an item appearing in only the left (CIVED) or right (ICCS) column. Many of the items that appeared in CIVED but were removed from ICCS were part of factors that were not scaled in the CIVED study (Schulz, Sibberns 2004). These include items pertaining to anti-democratic groups, protective nationalism, exposure to school experiences such as cooperative learning and the use of traditional class activities such as lectures/textbooks. The CIVED study also included several specific items pertaining to trust in the media, whereas the

ICCS study only included a single item assessing "trust in the media." To contrast, items were added to ICCS that allowed researchers to examine new dimensions. Several items were added relating to intended participation that allowed for a scale of intended participation in legal protest activities. The scale of national attitudes had a core set of common questions along with several additional questions that were unique to one study or the other.

Finally, there were cases where, even if the wording of individual items remained the same, the common stem or instructions for a section of the questionnaire changed. When examining norms of conventional citizenship, for example, the CIVED study began with the stem "A good citizen…," with the implication that the items that followed completed that sentence (e.g., "A good citizen obeys the law"). In the ICCS studies, this was changed to "How important are the following behaviors for a good citizen?" In general, however, the meaning is the same. Another important example can be found in the section pertaining to classroom climate, where in the CIVED study students were asked to think about what happens in civics, social studies, or history classes. In the ICCS version of this section, the instructions prompt students to think about their classes more generally. Although many of the items are the same, this change needs to be kept in mind.

In summary, by mapping similarities and differences in questionnaire sections common to CIVED and ICCS, we see that, even if a concept or construct was included in both studies, there are varying degrees to which the items themselves are the same. This may have affected international comparability of items, and as a result have implications for the extent of work needed to make valid comparisons across the two studies. Some approaches to addressing these implications are addressed in the next section.

4.2 Limitations in Comparing Attitudes across Cohorts Using IRT Scales

The large majority of items we have been discussing are part of IRT scales (that is, those based on Item Response Theory: see Schulz 2004; Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon 2011 for additional detail). Given that the primary reports of both CIVED and ICCS data focus on cross-national comparisons of these IRT Scale scores, it may be tempting to take scale scores from CIVED and compare them directly to scores from ICCS, particularly if the items appear generally similar. The most apparent limitation to this approach is that the scaling itself is different: the CIVED scales are set to have an international mean of 10 and SD of 2 (Torney-Purta et al. 2001, Schulz, Sibberns 2004), while the ICCS scales are set with an international mean of 50 and a SD of 10 (Schulz et al. 2010). Even if one were to put the scales on the same metric, however, direct comparisons would be inappropriate.

The first limitation is that the scale scores (derived through IRT methodology) are designed to indicate a student's or country's average

attitude relative to the international average of students across all countries participating in a given study. The scale scores only represent how much one deviates from the average of one's own cohort. Since the scales for CIVED were constructed separately from the ICCS scales, an "average" score on a scale in CIVED may represent stronger or weaker endorsement of items than an "average" score on the same scale in ICCS. In short, the IRT mean scores provided in the reports cannot be used to compare the absolute strength of attitudes in the two cohorts. A more technical and related limitation is that the exact methods for scaling changed from one study to the next as methods preferred by psychometric specialists changed over the last decade.

A second consideration is that the CIVED and ICCS had different groups of countries who participated, and country scores on average are compared to different reference groups. Even if one wanted to discuss changes in relative (rather than absolute) attitudes, the reference group has changed. To illustrate this, a list of countries appearing in the CIVED study only, the ICCS study only, and both studies is provided in Table 1.[3] CIVED scale scores reference students' attitudes to 28 countries, including Australia and the United States as well as several additional European countries. To contrast, ICCS scores reference attitudes to 38 countries, including 4 additional Latin American countries and 4 additional Asian countries (regions with very limited representation in CIVED). If countries added or deleted have systematically more or less positive attitudes on a scale, it changes what either a ranking or an "average" scale score indicates.

In summary, scale development processes were conducted separately for each study, and each study used a different set of countries and somewhat different scaling techniques to compute scale scores. An important next step is the extensive work required to re-scale these attitudes items using the set of countries that is common across the two studies, common scaling techniques, and common item parameters, as was done by Schulz et al. in creating a comparable civic content knowledge score to compare 17 countries. Until this type of analysis takes place, statements comparing attitude scales across CIVED and ICCS should be broad and descriptive in nature, focusing on the relative ranking based on countries that participated in both studies. This is the approach taken in the ICCS reports, where results on cross-national comparisons of attitudes in CIVED were described very broadly before reporting on ICCS findings.

5 Comparing ICCS and CIVED at the Item Level: Procedures and an Example

The broad comparison of where a country ranks in CIVED and ICCS does not allow for an assessment of how much attitudes have changed on average, for the reasons discussed in the last section. In the absence of extensive re-scaling, the most reasonable option is to conduct an item-level analysis that compares responses across the two cohorts within individual countries. In this section, we describe such an analysis and present results for two sets

3 For Table 1 see Appendix.

of items (support for immigrants' rights and trust) in each of five countries.

5.1 Selection of Sample and Items for Cross-Cohort Comparisons

In this analysis, we chose to focus on a comparison of CIVED and ICCS cohorts in five countries: Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Norway, and Sweden. A factor in our selection is that the five countries can all be considered part of the Nordic region. Recent workshops conducted in Sweden have called on researchers across this region to take advantage of ICCS and other large-scale studies of youth development to understand how civic-related attitudes (especially concerning issues of intergroup relations) are shaped. By focusing on this set of countries, we are reporting exploratory work in this area. It should be noted that Denmark was not included in the cross-cohort analysis of civic knowledge conducted by Schulz et al. (2010) because several major changes were made in how civic knowledge items were translated in ICSS from CIVED. Because these changes in translation were limited to cognitive items, Denmark can be included in this cross-cohort analysis of attitudes (Jens Bruun, personal communication).

We also narrowed our focus to two sets of items: Support for Immigrants' Rights and Trust in Institutions. As previously described, there is extensive overlap between the items presented on these topics in CIVED and ICCS. Each of these item sets has been the focus of extensive secondary analyses using CIVED data (typically using IRT scale scores). Support for immigrants' rights has been examined across 27 CIVED countries as related to human rights knowledge and national policies by Torney-Purta, Wilkenfeld, Barber (2008), while predictors of extreme negative immigrant attitudes have been examined in five CIVED countries by Husfeldt (2006). In the United States, a comparison of support for immigrants' rights among Latino and non-Latino youth has been conducted by Torney-Purta, Barber, Wilkenfeld (2006, 2007). Trust was a similar focus of early secondary analysis of the CIVED data (e.g., Torney-Purta, Barber, Richardson 2004), presented in a special issue for the Belgian Political Association's journal *Acta Politica.* Support for immigrant rights attitudes and trust also each featured prominently in the identification of attitudinal clusters, including a small but virulent "alienated" clusters of young people with extreme negative attitudes and an extreme lack of trust (Torney-Purta 2009; Torney-Purta, Barber 2011). Recent secondary analyses have justified the examination of 1999 CIVED data because of the insight provided into the development of today's young adults; however, the ICCS data provide an opportunity to describe how attitudes have changed in this area, thus providing new relevance to these data.

As a connection to the previous section, we examined the countries' rank order for average attitudes of trust and toward immigrants (from most to least positive) using only the 21 countries appearing in both the CIVED datasets. In general, the ranking are quite similar across the ten year period. The item-level analyses that follow will add to the information available from rank-ordering countries by examining the absolute levels of

change in attitudes between cohorts in each of the five countries.

5.2 Data Cleaning Required for Cross-Cohort Comparisons

Prior to comparison across cohorts, we cleaned the CIVED and ICCS data sets separately so that they could be merged into a common data set. This required addressing several differences between items in the two datasets. The first issue was that the coding of response options in ICCS was changed to the opposite of the coding employed by CIVED. The purpose was closer alignment with procedures and formats employed by other IEA studies such as TIMSS (Wolfram Schulz, personal communication). In CIVED, a response of 1 indicated the lowest possible endorsement of an item, while 4 indicated the highest possible endorsement. In ICCS, the reverse was the case, with a response of 1 indicating the highest endorsement and 4 indicating the lowest endorsement. In the analysis here we chose to recode the ICCS data to match the CIVED data, such that higher numbers were indicative of stronger endorsement in both cohorts. This was also the approach taken by ICCS researchers when responses to individual attitudinal items were used to create IRT scales, where higher numbers indicate more positive attitudes (Schulz et al. 2010).

From the perspective of the respondents, there is little evidence in the survey methodology literature that making this change in labeling responses would affect respondents (Weng, Cheng 2000). However, from the perspective of a researcher conducting secondary analysis, it is important to keep in mind that on the ICCS data files the item response of strongly agree is coded 1, of agree is coded 2, of disagree is coded 3 and of strongly disagree coded 4. This coding is opposite to that on the CIVED data files.

The second issue was that the CIVED questionnaire included a “don’t know” option for each attitudinal item, while the ICCS questionnaire did not. Research on survey methodology suggests that “don’t know” responses are especially common for items that are cognitively complex (Shoemaker, Eichholz, Skewes 2002). Preliminary work on the ICCS study revealed only small differences in response patterns between pilot forms including and without a “don’t know” response, supporting the decision to leave this option out (Wolfram Schulz, personal communication). For the purposes of the analysis reported here “Don’t know” responses were coded as missing data. Including “don’t know” responses from CIVED, total missing data across all countries and both cohorts ranged from 3.9% (for trusting the police) to 9.0% (trusting local government). Given the exploratory nature of this analysis, we did not impute data. Additional analysis of attitudes should address this limitation and examine missing data in more depth (including the “don’t know” option).

5.3 Analytic Techniques

Several options exist for conducting item-level analyses of CIVED and ICCS data. In our presentation of results, we chose to treat items as continuous variables. In addition to examining each item individually, we also created an average score of each person by taking the mean of their responses on individual items. A mean score was assigned if students had valid data on one or more of the items in the set. Tables 2 and 3 report the mean item scores and overall scale score in each country for each cohort on Support for Immigrants' Rights and Trust (respectively). Within each country, the statistical significance of any changes in attitudes from CIVED to ICCS was assessed by conducting t-tests for comparisons of independent means. Statistical analyses were conducted using SAS PROC SURVEYMEANS (SAS Institute Inc. 2008), which adjusted for the unequal probabilities of sampling by taking into account sample strata and cluster, and by employing normalized population weights (referred to as "house weights" in the CIVED and ICCS data sets).[4] Weights are designed to allow us to say that these results are nationally-representative; however, in this analysis bias still exists, especially when substantial numbers of students did not answer individual items.

We chose to present means and standard deviations for ease in interpretation. Given the ordinal nature of the Likert-scale response options, we could have compared the frequency of response in each scale category. We ran a second set of analyses taking this approach, using SAS PROC SURVEYFREQ (SAS Institute Inc. 2008) to conduct chi-square analyses to determine whether, within each country, the distribution of response options was significantly different for the CIVED and ICCS cohorts, also taking into account the survey design. The results of the chi-square analyses were generally the same as those for the t-tests.

5.4 Results of Cross-Cohort Item Analyses

Table 2[5] presents a comparison between CIVED and ICCS of the mean scores on items pertaining to support for the rights of immigrants in the five countries of interest. These analyses reveal statistically significant differences in the attitudes toward immigrants in Denmark. Compared to the levels of endorsement observed in CIVED, the ICCS cohort demonstrated more agreement with each of the presented statements (higher support for immigrants' rights). Accordingly, the average score across items is also significantly higher for Danish participants in ICCS (2009), compared to their CIVED (1999) counterparts. In the other four countries (Estonia, Finland, Norway and Sweden), average score differences are not statistically significant, suggesting relative stability in attitudes within each country.

Looking at individual items, however, provides a more nuanced description. In all countries except Denmark, there was a decrease in support for

4 The analysis employed Taylor series approximations to account for the sampling design. While the IEA reports employ jackknife estimation techniques instead, the two techniques yield similar results (Stapleton 2008).
5 For Table 2 see Appendix.

immigrants being allowed to continue to speak their own language. In Norway and Sweden, there was also a decrease in support for immigrants being allowed to continue practicing their own customs. Estonia and Finland saw some increased support for immigrants at the item level, particularly as related to the opportunity to vote in elections (Finland only) and general attitudes toward having the same rights as "everyone" (both Finland and Estonia). These attitudes deserve additional attention from researchers and the policy community. Although general attitudes about rights are relatively stable when data from 2009 are compared with ten years earlier, there is an increase in the belief that immigrants should assimilate with respect to their language and customs.

Table 3[6] presents a similar comparison of items pertaining to trust. Table 3 shows that the Danish ICCS cohort reported significantly less trust in all institutions than did their CIVED counterparts in 1999; accordingly their mean trust score was also significantly lower. The opposite can be said for Finland, where the ICCS cohort was significantly more trusting. All the institutions were more trusted by Finnish students in 2009 than they had been in 1999. This pattern of greater trust in the 2009 cohort also characterized Sweden (although not their attitudes toward the Police) and Estonia (although not their attitudes toward Police, Political Parties, and National Parliament, the latter of which declined). There was less change over the ten year period in Norway, although the ICCS cohort was significantly more trusting of Local Government and Political Parties than their CIVED counterparts.

6 Discussion and Conclusions

In sum, the work of the ICCS study builds in many ways upon the work of the CIVED study, and many opportunities for cross-cohort analyses of attitudes are present. Although changes in the past decade were reflected in some changes in focus in ICCS, the overall purpose of assessing both cognitive and non-cognitive civic-related outcomes remains. In fact, many items to assess these attitudinal, value, and behavioral outcomes of interest remain the same (or appear with only limited changes to wording) in each of the two studies.

That said, there are notable differences between the studies (even in scales with the same title) that warrant careful consideration prior to making comparisons. First, any changes to an item's wording may change the likelihood that students will agree with it. Second, the IRT scales reported in the major CIVED and ICCS reports are meant to facilitate comparisons among the countries within a study, not between cohorts. They are not directly comparable across studies, even if scales are referred to by the same name. Some potential for comparability of the rank-order of countries appearing in both studies exists, but the conclusions that can be drawn are limited.

We reported results from an analysis that attempted to address these limitations by focusing on individual items and average scores calculated

6 For Table 3 see Appendix.

across these items. This analysis provided some initial insight into ways that attitudes have changed among young people from 1999 to 2009. We see generally that attitudes toward immigrants' rights have stayed stable among young people in four of these five countries, while institutional trust appears to be increasing in three of the five. Denmark provides a notable and intriguing exception in that immigrant rights support was higher in the more recent cohort, yet institutional trust was lower. In the ICCS cohort, Denmark appears more similar to the other Scandinavian countries (Norway and Sweden) in its average levels of trust and immigrant rights. Exceptions to this general pattern, particularly decreasing support for immigrants' rights to keep their own language and customs in several of these countries, are worthy of further analysis.

While this analysis provides a descriptive overview of patterns, it does not go into depth. Changes in the demographic profile of young people in these countries, including those due to changes in migration patterns, may account for the some differences in responses across the cohorts. Similarly, changes in the social context of these countries, including (but not limited to) persistent income inequality and disappointment with democratic reforms may explain some of these differences. Yet another possibility is that some reported differences are due to "differential item functioning" for attitudinal items (similar to that described by Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon 2011 for some cognitive items). In pursuing any of these paths, it is especially important that researchers interested in conducting similar analyses note the data cleaning procedures necessary to ensure comparability in the datasets, especially the reverse-coding of items (i.e., 1 represents strongly disagree in CIVED; while 1 represents strongly agree in ICCS) and the different meaning of some IRT scales, even those which may have the same name.

At the same time, several limitations to item-level analyses are clearly apparent. One relates to the issue of missing data. Several individual items (particularly relating to trust) have high rates of missing data. This is especially the case in the CIVED study, where "don't know" was presented an option and coded in this analysis as missing. One advantage of using IRT scales for attitudinal items is the precision of their estimates using few items, even when missing data are present (Schulz, Sibberns 2004). If respondents are missing on one item, then the responses on other items can be used to estimate the attitudes. When one is working at the item level (and without imputation), however, this is not a possibility.

Thus, while item level analyses are an important and approachable first step in conducting cross-cohort analysis, additional work is clearly needed. Ideally, this would involve the use of analyses similar to those employed by Schulz et al. (2010) when comparing content knowledge between CIVED and ICCS. Scales with common items in both studies would be re-scaled to fit the same model on a common metric using IRT techniques, and would use data only from those countries that participated in both studies. There are more than enough "anchor items" to make such rescaling possible. Tests could be conducted to assure consistent item functioning across both countries and cohorts. This would address both the concerns over comparability as well as the more technical measurement issues.

Additional work is also needed to compare and contrast CIVED and ICCS in other ways. While Schulz et al. focused on a comparison of content knowledge, and this overview focused on attitudinal and participatory outcomes, much of the CIVED and ICCS studies are devoted to obtaining background information about the nature of national, school, home, and out-of-school contexts. Researchers could use this information to develop complex, multilevel analyses predicting various civic outcomes. However, a comparison of two contextual scales included in the student questionnaire of CIVED and ICCS (referred to in CIVED as Confidence in the Value of Participation and Openness of Classroom Climate for Discussion) reveal some important differences between the two studies. Notable, as discussed before, is the change from prompting students to consider the openness of their civic (or social studies or history) classroom climate to having them consider the openness of their class climates more broadly across the school. This shift is echoed in the way that the teachers were sampled; in CIVED only civic-related teachers participated, while in ICCS teachers were sampled without respect to subject matter taught (Torney-Purta et al. 2001; Schulz et al. 2010). Cross-cohort comparisons of context variables have not yet been explored.

To conclude, an overview of the two studies suggests that the potential exists for comparison of attitudes between the CIVED and ICCS cohorts. This opens the doors for high-quality analyses assessing changes in attitudes, values, and behaviors from 1999 to 2009 that would add to the utility of the civics and civic education studies of IEA—a series of studies that is gaining extensive attention from educators, policymakers, and social scientists in a variety of fields (Torney-Purta, Amadeo, in press). Other IEA studies have the ability to track trends over time, and the ICCS researchers have examined changes in civic content knowledge. Similarities and differences in the civic attitudes and practices of young people over a decade can also be tracked and provide important information to the public as well as to scholars.

References

Brese, Falk; Jung, Michael; Mirazchiyski, Plamen; Schulz, Wolfram; Zueklke, Olaf. 2011. ICCS 2009 Users Guide for the International Database. Amsterdam.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1979. The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design. Cambridge.

Fraillon, Julian. 2011. ICCS 2009 Test Development. In: Schulz, Wolfram; Ainley, John; Fraillon, Julian, eds. ICCS 2009 Technical Report. Amsterdam, 21-31.

Fraillon, Julian; Schulz, Wolfram; Ainley, John. In press. ICCS 2009 Asian Report. Civic Knowledge and Attitudes among Lower Secondary Students in Five Asian Countries. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Hart, Daniel; Gullan, Rebecca. 2010. The Sources of Adolescent Activism: Historical and Contemporary Findings. In: Sherrod, Lonnie; Torney-Purta, Judith; Flanagan, Constance, eds. Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth. Hoboken, NJ, 67-90.

Husfeldt, Vera. 2006. Extreme Negative Attitudes towards Immigrants: An Analysis in Five Countries. In: Prospects (a UNESCO Journal), Vol. 36, No. 5, 355-374.

Husfeldt, Vera; Barber, Carolyn; Torney-Purta, Judith. 2005. Students' Social Attitudes and Expected Political Participation: New Scales in the Enhanced Database of the IEA Civic Education Study. College Park, MD.

Husfeldt, Vera; Torney-Purta, Judith. 2004. Development of the CIVED Instruments. In: Schulz, Wolfram; Sibberns, Heiko, eds. IEA Civic Education Study Technical Report. Amsterdam, 17-26.

Lave, Jean; Wenger, Etienne. 1991. Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge.

Kerr, David; Sturman, Linda; Schulz, Wolfram; Burge, Bethan. 2011. ICCS 2009 European Report: Civic Knowledge and Attitudes among Lower-Secondary Students in 24 European Countries. Amsterdam.

Mullis, Ina; Martin, Michael; Foy, Pierre. 2007. TIMSS 2007 International Mathematics Report: Findings from IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study at the Fourth and Eighth Grades. Chestnut Hill, MA.

SAS Institute, Inc. 2008.SAS/STAT ® 9.2 User's Guide. Cary, NC.

Schulz, Wolfram; Ainley, John; Fraillon, Julian, eds. 2011. ICCS 2009 Technical Report. Amsterdam.

Schulz, Wolfram; Ainley, John; Fraillon, Julian; Kerr, David; Losito, Bruno. 2010. ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic Knowledge, Attitudes, and Engagement among Lower-Secondary Students in 38 Countries. Amsterdam.

Schulz, Wolfram; Ainley, John; Freidman, Tim; Lietz, Petra. 2011. ICCS 2009 Latin American Report: Civic Knowledge and Attitudes among Lower-Secondary Students in Six Latin American Countries. Amsterdam.

Schulz, Wolfram; Fraillon, Julian; Ainley, John; Losito, Bruno; Kerr, David. 2008. International Civic and Citizenship Education Study Assessment Framework. Amsterdam.

Schulz, Wolfram; Sibberns, Heiko, eds. 2004. IEA Civic Education Study Technical Report. Amsterdam.

Shoemaker, Pamela J.; Eichholz, Martin; Skewes, Elizabeth A. 2002. Item Nonresponse: Distinguishing between Don't Know and Refuse. In: International Journal of Public Opinion Research, Vol. 14, No. 2, 193-201.

Stapleton, Laura. 2008. Variance Estimation Using Replication Methods in Structural Equation Modeling with Complex Sample Data. In: Structural Equation Modeling, Vol. 15, 183-210.

Torney, Judith; Oppenheim, Abraham; Farnen, Russell. 1975. Civic

Education in Ten Countries: An Empirical Study. Stockholm.

Torney-Purta, Judith. 2009. International Psychological Research that Matters for Policy and Practice. In: American Psychologist, Vol. 64, 822-837.

Torney-Purta, Judith; Amadeo, Jo-Ann. In press. The Contribution of International Large-Scale Studies in Civic Education and Engagement. In: von Davier, Matthias; Kirsch, Irwin; Yamamoto, Kentaro; Gonzalez, Eugenio, eds. The Role of International Large Scale Assessments. New York.

Torney-Purta, Judith; Barber, Carolyn. 2011. Fostering Young People's Support for Participatory Human Rights through their Developmental Niches. In: American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 81, No. 4, 473-481.

Torney-Purta, Judith; Barber, Carolyn; Richardson, Wendy. 2004. Trust in Government-Related Institutions and Political Engagement among Adolescents in Six Countries. In: Acta Politica, Vol. 39, No. 4, 380-406.

Torney-Purta, Judith; Barber, Carolyn; Wilkenfeld, Britt. 2006. Differences in the Civic Knowledge and Attitudes of U.S. Adolescents by Immigrant Status and Hispanic Background. In: Prospects (a UNESCO Journal), Vol. 36, No. 3, 343-354.

Torney-Purta, Judith; Barber, Carolyn; Wilkenfeld, Britt. 2007. Latino Adolescents' Civic Development in the United States: Research Results from the IEA Civic Education Study. In: Journal of Youth and Adolescence, Vol. 36, No. 3, 111-126.

Torney-Purta, Judith; Lehmann, Rainer; Oswald, Hans; Schulz, Wolfram. 2001. Citizenship and Education in 28 Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age 14. Amsterdam.

Torney-Purta, Judith; Schwille, John; Amadeo, Jo-Ann. 1999. Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-Four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project. Amsterdam, NL.

Torney-Purta, Judith; Wilkenfeld, Britt; Barber, Carolyn. 2008. How Adolescents in Twenty-Seven Countries Understand, Support, and Practice Human Rights. In: Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 64, No. 4, 857-880.

Weng, Li-Jen; Cheng, Chung-Ping. 2000. Effects of Response Order on Likert-Type Scales. In: Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 60, No. 6, 908-924.

Wilkenfeld, Britt; Lauckhardt, James; Torney-Purta, Judith. 2010. The Relation between Developmental Theory and Measures of Civic Engagement in Research on Adolescents. In: Sherrod, Lonnie; Torney-Purta, Judith; Flanagan, Constance, eds. Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth. Hoboken, NJ, 193-220.

Appendix: Tables

Table 1. Comparison of countries participating in CIVED (1999) and ICCS (2009) civic education studies

CIVED (1999) Only	CIVED and ICCS	ICCS (2009) Only
Australia	Bulgaria	Austria
Belgium (French)	Chile	Belgium (Flemish)
Germany	Colombia	Chinese Taipei
Hungary	Cyprus[1]	Dominican Republic
Portugal	Czech Republic	Guatemala
Romania	Denmark[1]	Indonesia
United States	England[2]	Ireland
	Estonia	Korea, Republic of
	Finland	Liechtenstein
	Greece	Luxembourg
	Hong Kong (SAR)[1]	Malta
	Italy	Mexico
	Latvia	Netherlands
	Lithuania	New Zealand
	Norway	Paraguay
	Poland	Spain
	Russian Federation[1]	Thailand
	Slovak Republic	
	Slovenia	
	Sweden[2]	
	Switzerland	

1. Changes to the target population or to the test instrument meant that comparable data on civic content knowledge are not available. Such changes may or may not affect the comparability of attitudinal comparisons.
2. Due to differences in the time of school year when tests were administered, the Swedish and English cohorts from ICCS and CIVED may have limited comparability. Schulz et al. (2010) presents comparisons of civic knowledge levels from 1999 to 2009 in a separate section to qualify conclusions.
Note: Israel also participated in the CIVED study, but only in testing the upper secondary cohort. Israel did not participate in ICCS.

Table 2. Agreement with Items Pertaining to Support for Immigrants Rights in Five Countries across CIVED and ICCS Cohorts

	Denmark				Estonia				Finland				Norway				Sweden			
	CIVED		ICCS		CIVED		ICCS		CIVED		ICCS		CIVED		ICCS		CIVED		ICCS	
	(n = 3125)		(n = 4329)		(n = 3375)		(n = 2696)		(n = 2747)		(n = 3241)		(n = 3239)		(n = 2795)		(n = 2986)		(n = 3402)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Should be allowed to speak their own language	2.47	0.96	2.62*	0.82	2.87*	0.71	2.68	0.81	2.89*	0.82	.74	0.79	2.95*	0.90	2.68	0.87	3.10*	0.87	2.96	0.89
Should have same opportunities for education	3.23	0.79	3.38*	0.64	3.22	0.61	3.37*	0.65	3.22	73	3.31	0.72	3.32	0.78	3.39	0.73	3.40	0.74	3.43	0.75
Should have the opportunity to vote in elections	3.03	0.87	3.14*	0.75	2.96	0.72	2.96	0.75	2.91	0.84	3.01*	0.80	3.06	0.86	3.10	0.84	3.28	0.78	3.21	0.82
Should be allowed to continue their customs	2.70	0.95	2.94*	0.76	2.95	0.69	2.90	0.75	2.92	.81	2.84	0.81	3.01*	0.88	2.78	0.89	3.12*	0.84	3.01	0.88
Should have the same rights as everyone	3.03	0.86	3.24*	0.72	2.96	.72	3.19*	0.76	3.07	0.80	3.23*	0.75	3.22	0.83	3.25	0.80	3.32	0.78	3.39	0.78
Average Score	*2.90*	*0.70*	*3.06**	*0.56*	*2.99*	*0.48*	*3.02*	*0.53*	*3.00*	*0.65*	*3.03*	*0.62*	*3.11*	*0.69*	*3.04*	*0.65*	*3.23*	*0.67*	*3.20*	*0.69*

Notes: Sample sizes pertain to the average score; Cohort score is significantly greater than the other cohort score within the same country, * $p < .05$

Table 3. Trust in National Institutions in Five Countries across CIVED and ICCS Cohorts

	Denmark				Estonia				Finland				Norway				Sweden			
	CIVED		ICCS		CIVED		ICCS		CIVED		ICCS		CIVED		ICCS		CIVED		ICCS	
	(n = 3104)		(n = 4132)		(n = 3381)		(n = 2692)		(n = 2745)		(n = 3283)		(n = 3260)		(n = 2780)		(n = 2968)		(n = 3387)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
National Government	2.92*	0.64	2.84	0.69	2.33	0.74	2.68*	0.76	2.58	0.75	2.94*	0.63	2.74	0.69	2.75	0.73	2.50	0.72	2.80*	0.72
Local Government	2.79*	0.62	2.65	0.70	2.50	0.76	2.67*	0.73	2.52	0.74	2.85*	0.64	2.65	0.73	2.74*	0.72	2.34	0.76	2.71*	0.70
Courts	3.22*	0.70	3.00	0.76	2.69	0.82	2.79*	0.76	2.71	0.80	2.94*	0.66	2.88	0.73	2.82	0.71	2.86	0.76	2.95*	0.75
Police	3.28*	0.71	3.03	0.79	2.68	0.87	2.66	0.87	3.06	0.84	3.15*	0.77	3.13	0.83	3.11	0.82	2.92	0.83	2.97	0.89
Political Parties	2.65*	0.69	2.57	0.69	1.98	0.75	2.04	0.70	2.03	0.71	2.61*	0.68	2.33	0.74	2.51*	0.73	2.24	0.73	2.60*	0.74
National Parliament	2.83*	0.71	2.74	0.73	2.47*	0.84	2.38	0.79	2.44	0.80	2.83*	0.70	2.88	0.75	2.79	0.76	2.71	0.79	2.81*	0.76
Average Score	*2.97**	*0.47*	*2.81*	*0.55*	*2.45*	*0.53*	*2.54**	*0.53*	*2.57*	*0.55*	*2.89**	*0.52*	*2.78*	*0.51*	*2.79*	*0.57*	*2.60*	*0.55*	*2.81**	*0.61*

Notes: Sample sizes pertain to the average score; Cohort score is significantly greater than the other cohort score within the same country, *p <.05

Appendix: Map of CIVED and ICCS Items

A1. Section B: Good citizens (Corresponds to ICCS Q21)*

Appears in CIVED (1999) only	Appears in both instruments	Appears in ICCS (2009)
	Norms of Conventional Citizenship	
	Votes in every [national] election	
	Joins a political party	
	Knows [learns] about the country's history	
	Follows political issues in the newspaper, on the radio, or on TV [or the internet]	
	Shows respect for government representatives	
	Engages in political discussions	
	Norms of Social Movement Citizenship	
	Would participate in a peaceful protest against a law believed to be unjust	
	Participates in activities to benefit people in the community	
	Takes part in activities promoting human rights	
	Takes part in activities to protect the environment	
	Other Items	
	Obeys the law	
	Works hard	
Would be willing to serve in the military to defend the country		
Is patriotic and loyal to the country		
Would be willing to ignore a law that violated human rights		

*(CIVED asked "an adult who is a good citizen…" with a response scale of Very Important= 4to Not important (1) ICCS asked "How important are the following behaviors for being a adult citizen: with the same response scale reverse-coded).

A2. Section D: Trust in institutions (Corresponds to ICCS Q27)

Appears in CIVED (1999) only	Appears in both instruments	Appears in ICCS (2009)
	Trust in Government Institutions	
	The national government	
	The local council or government	
	Courts [of justice]	
	The police	
	Political parties	
	National Parliament	
	Trust in the Media	
News on television		The Media
News on the radio		
News in the press		
	Other Items	
	United Nations	
	Schools	
	The people who live in this country [in general]	
		The Armed Forces
		European Commission
		European Parliament
		State/Provincial Government

A3. Section E: Our Country (Corresponds to ICCS Q28)

Appears in CIVED (1999) only	Appears in both instruments	Appears in ICCS (2009)
	Positive Attitudes towards One's Nation	
	The flag of this country is important to me	
	I have great love [respect] for this country	
	This country should be proud of what it has achieved	
		I am proud to live in this country
I would prefer to live permanently in another country (reversed)*		Generally speaking this country is a better country to live in than most other countries
		The political system in this country works well
		This country shows a lot of respect for the environment
	Other Items	
To protect jobs in this country we should buy products made in this country**		
We should keep other countries from trying to influence political decisions in this country**		
We should always be alert and stop threats from other countries to this country's political independence**		
This country deserves respect from other countries for what we have accomplished		
There is little to be proud of in this country's history		
People should support their country even if they think their country is doing something wrong		
The national anthem of this country is important to me		
We should stop outsiders from influencing this country**		

*Item appears in ICCS Q28 but is not included in the scaling.
** Appeared in CIVED scale assessing Protective Attitudes toward One's Country. No comparable items were included in ICCS.

A4. Section G: Opportunities (Corresponds to ICCS Q24 and Q25)

Appears in CIVED (1999) only	Appears in both instruments	Appears in ICCS (2009)
	Support for Women's Rights [Gender Equality]	
Women should run for public office and take part in the government just as men do		Men and women should have equal opportunities to take part in government
	Women should have the same rights as men [Men and Women should have the same rights] in every way	
	Women should stay out of politics	
	When jobs are scarce [when there are not many jobs available], men should have more right to a job than women	
	Men and women should get equal pay when they are in the same jobs.	
	Men are better qualified to be political leaders than women	
	Support for Ethnic Minority Rights	
	All ethnic groups should have equal chances to get a good education in this country	
	All ethnic groups should have equal chances to get good jobs in this country	
	Schools should teach students to respect members of all ethnic groups	
	Members of all ethnic groups should be encouraged to run in elections for public office	
		Members of all ethnic groups should have the same rights and responsibilities.
	Other Items*	
		Women's first priority should be raising children

*4 other items assessed tolerance of anti-democratic groups (scaled in Husfeldt et al. 2005); nothing comparable was included in ICCS.

A5. Section H: Immigrants (Corresponds to ICCS Q26)

Appears in CIVED (1999) only	Appears in both instruments	Appears in ICCS (2009)
	Positive Attitudes toward Immigrants	
	Immigrants should have the opportunity to keep their own language	
	Immigrants' children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have	
	Immigrants who live in a country for several years should have the opportunity to vote in national elections	
	Immigrants should have the opportunity to keep their own customs and lifestyle	
	Immigrants should have all the same rights that everyone else in a country has	
	Other Items	
Immigrants should be forbidden to engage in political activity		
Having many immigrants makes it difficult for a country to be united and patriotic		
All countries should accept refugees who are trying to escape from wars or political persecution in other countries		
		When there are not many jobs available, immigration should be restricted

A6. Section J: School (Corresponds to ICSS Q19)*

Appears in CIVED (1999) only	Appears in both instruments	Appears in ICCS (2009) only
	Confidence in [perceptions of] the Value of Participation in School	
Electing student representatives to suggest changes in how the school is run makes schools better		Student participation in how schools are run can make schools better
	Lots of positive changes happen in this school when students work together	
	Organizing groups of students to state their opinions could help solve problems in this school	
	Students acting together can have more influence on what happens in this school than students acting alone	
		All schools should have a school parliament

* Three additional items in CIVED pertaining to students' self-confidence in school matters; these items were never scaled and are not included in ICCS.

A7. Section M: Political Action 2 (Corresponds to ICCS Q31, Q32, and Q33)*

Appears in CIVED (1999) only	Appears in both instruments	Appears in ICCS (2009)
	Informed Voting	
	Vote in national elections	
	Get information about candidates before voting in an election	
		Vote in local elections
	Political Activities	
	Join a political party	
	Be a candidate for local or city office (local elections)	
Write letters to a newspaper about social or political concerns (issues)**		
		Join a trade union
		Help a candidate or party during an election campaign
	Community Participation	
	Volunteer time to help people in the community	
Collect money for a social cause		
Collect signatures for a petition***		
	Illegal Protest Activity	
	Spray-paint protest slogans on walls	
	Block traffic as a form of protest	
	Occupy (public) buildings (as a form of protest)	

*Only those categories of items originally in CIVED are included, not items added in ICCS.
**Item appears ICCS Q31 (participation in protest activity in the future) and is included in the scale of Legal Protest Activity Expectations
***Item appears in Q31 (participation in protest activity in the future) in ICCS and is included in the scale of Legal Protest Activity Expectations

A8. Section N: Classrooms*

Appears in CIVED (1999) only	Appears in both instruments	Appears in ICCS (2009)
	Openness of Classroom Climate for Discussion	
Students are encouraged to make up their own minds about issues		Teachers encourage students to make up their own minds
Teachers respect our opinions and encourage us to express them during class		Teachers encourage students to express their opinions
Students feel free to disagree openly with their teacher about political and social issues during class**		
	Students feel free to express opinions in class even when their opinions are different from most of the other students	
	Teachers encourage us to discuss political or social issues about which people have different opinions	
	Teachers present several sides of an issue when explaining it in class	
		Students bring up current political events for discussion in class***
	Other Items	
Students bring up current political events for discussion in class***		Students feel free to disagree openly with their teacher about political and social issues during class**
Teachers place great importance on learning facts or dates when presenting history or political events		
Teachers require students to memorize dates or definitions		
Memorizing dates and facts is the best way to get a good grade from teachers in these classes		
Teachers lecture and students take notes		
Students work on material from the textbook		

* CIVED asked about history, civic education or social studies classes while ICCS asked about discussing political issues during "regular lessons."
** Item also appears in ICCS but is not included in the Openness of Classroom Climate scale
*** Item also appears in CIVED but is not included in the Openness of Classroom Climate scale