

Emilian Colceru

The Impact of Civic Education on the Citizenship of Romanian Youth

Keywords

civic education, Romania, post-communism, youth

This paper discusses the contribution of the public system of citizenship education to the development of civic attitudes of the youth in post-communist Romania. As one of the goals of the state is to create “good citizens”, there is a discipline called Civic culture in the compulsory system of education. However, the fact that the discipline lacks consistency determines young people not to manifest the desired civic attitudes, as shown in public surveys targeted on youth. Therefore, the paper discusses the failure of the state to develop “good citizenship” through citizenship education.

1 Introduction: “good citizenship” acquired through state education

Being “a good citizen” throughout the world is a matter of the relationship between each state and its population (Ricci 2004). State policies are important in determining the quality and features of citizenship. Amongst these policies, most important are those regarding the field of education (Ramirez & Boli 1987).

The quality of citizen is earned when fulfilling a series of conditions, which are well codified by laws (e.g. in Romania, according to law 21/1991, Romanian citizenship is granted by birth, adoption or at request).

There is, nevertheless, a difference between being a simple citizen and being “a good citizen”, as the latter is subjective. There is no law that defines “good citizenship”. This concept varies, as it is an answer to the expectations of the state regarding its citizens. Each state has its own policy regarding its citizens and each state perceives the quality of “good citizen” in a specific manner. It is, thus, obvious that being “a good citizen” varies according to the political regime of each state. For instance, a good citizen in a communist regime is different than a good citizen in a democracy.

The construction of the idea of “good citizen” is made throughout state policies. Primarily it is made through the system of compulsory education. The system itself is conceived following a model of “educational ideal” that must be applied to the children that grow up to be citizens. Thus, education creates behavioral patterns for the population.

We start from the premise that this certain notion of “good citizenship” is inflicted by the state to the population through the system of public and compulsory education. As it is an ideal followed by the state, it should, in the eyes of the state, determine a desirable behavior of its citizens. This is the type of “good citizenship” that will be discussed throughout the paper.

Emilian Colceru, PhD in Political Science, University of Bucharest and in Sociology, University of Paris X - Nanterre. *Str. Schitului nr. 2, bl. 6B1, sc. 2, ap. 30, sector 3, 032043, Bucharest*
email: ecolceru@yahoo.com

Citizenship education has become recently a topic of research for academics (see for instance Heater 2004). Various papers discuss the state of this subject in Romania in the context of post-communism (Bunescu et al 1999, Birzea 2002, Freyberg-Inan & Cristescu 2006, Mincu 2009). The contribution of this paper to the general research on the topic is given by the attempt to make a link between the system of citizenship education and sociological surveys in contemporary Romania.

The success of disciplines on civic education can be measured through the attitudes shown by students in sociological surveys (polls of opinion). The hypothesis of this research is that a weak civic education system could be an explanation for the failure of the state to forge a population which shows the required features of “good citizenship”. The paper will attempt to determine if this hypothesis applies in present-day Romania.

2 Being a “good citizen” in communist and post-communist Romania

During the period Romania has been subjected to the communist regime (1948-1989), the goal of the state was to create a “new person”, whose model originates from the Soviet Union. According to the official ideology, the new communist man is interested in constantly improving his own performances, as well as the well-being of society. He is characterized by the will to work (out of pleasure, not out of obligation) and intellectual self-improvement.

With the aid of the propaganda system, people were exposed throughout their life to communist ideology, which was bound to transform them into new persons. Starting with childhood, education system involved children in organizations (such as the Pioneers) in which they received teachings on socialist society. Once involved in the field of work, they became responsible for the fate of Socialist Romania. Their responsibility was put into practice by involvement in mass organizations (Syndicates), even the Party, by collaborating with the structures of direction of the state (Party activist, agent of the political police), by its determination to defend the country in front of external menace (since 1978 there was a high-school subject called Preparing the Youth for Defending the Country – PTAP; adults were integrated in formations of civil defense).

The desired model of citizen was, to the limit, a combination between Pavel Morozov (the adolescent

who denounced his father) and Alexey Stakhanov (the worker that constantly exceeded production targets). This ideal has never, fortunately, been accomplished.

In fact, the process of social engineering attempted by the communist regime never succeeded, as it only accomplished the forging of a different type of "new person" than the one officially desired. The new person during the communist regime was familiarized with the "double language" (the difference between what is said and what is thought) and did not show a real interest in work or socialist competition.

Nevertheless, despite the extreme cases aforementioned, it must be said that most of the requests of the regime on the population (e.g. keep clean, do not throw garbage on the streets etc.) were simply of common sense. In fact, the "socialist" model of education did not contradict with any other model of education known through-out the world (see Ramirez & Meyer 2002). The difference would be that this model was enforced with a power of coercion that would not be possible after 1989.

The democratic regime that followed gave citizens their rights and liberties (as mentioned by the Constitution of 1991), but also kept some of their duties (Title III, chapter 4 of the Constitution on the Fundamental duties mentions fidelity towards the country, defense of the country, financial contributions and the exercise of rights and liberties with good-will, without violating the rights and liberties of the others).

Living in a democratic society meant the disappearance of the coercion system that dominated throughout the communist regime. This and the lack of a general vision regarding citizenship have created an atmosphere of incertitude regarding the "good citizen" behavior. Communist propaganda which was highly developed and offered people "the right vision" concerning their behavior was left aside, as it was hardly replaced by any vision at all.

In the following sections we will try to analyze the system of compulsory civic education in present-day Romania (section 3) and the civic attitudes of the Romanian youth (section 4) as to understand if there is a determination between the two.

3 Civic education in Romania

Regime change in Romania also favored a change in the approach of civic education, reintegrating Romania to a global trend which meant the passing from nation-based education to a more globalised vision of citizenship (see Shafir & Brysk 2006). The discipline's study opened to new themes, such as the treatment of human rights from a global perspective (Ramirez & Mayer 2012). This new approach in contents was intended to be complemented by a new approach in the methods of teaching the discipline. The authoritarian approach would be replaced with an egalitarian one, focusing on acquiring skills and competences instead of simple information (Bromley et al. 2011).

The compulsory system of education in Romania includes a discipline called Civic culture, studied in the last two years of junior secondary school (approximately at the age of 12 to 14), one hour / week (it can be extended to two hours / week). According to the curriculum,

"through the discipline Civic culture, civic education of students, initiated in the primary education, is continued and deepened, regarding the practice of a civic behavior in a democratic society, defined through democratic values and principles, through democratic practices and through active citizenship" (Consiliul Național pentru Curriculum 2008, 3).

The Civic culture curriculum is based on a series of values and attitudes that the students should internalize through its study:

"respect towards the dignity and the rights of human, towards the Constitution and laws; tolerance and respect towards persons and groups that support different values, opinions and beliefs; self-confidence and trust in the others; inclination towards dialogue, positive relationships with the others and cooperation; assuming responsibility for his own actions and the responsibilities of all citizens; critical and flexible thinking; equality in front of the law; freedom of expression, of opinions, of conscience; civic involvement in the life of the community, active citizenship" (Consiliul Național pentru Curriculum 2008, 11).

After the study of this discipline, students should acquire a series of competences, such as:

"using the concepts specific to social sciences to organize the demarches of knowing and explaining facts, events, processes from real life; applying the knowledge specific to social sciences in solving problem-situation, as well as in analyzing opportunities for self development; cooperating with the others in solving theoretical and practical problems, within different groups; manifesting an active and responsible social behavior, adequate to a changing social and political climate; participating in decision-making and in resolving community problems" (Consiliul Național pentru Curriculum 2008, 5).

Leaving aside the issue of the wooden language specific to this kind of educational documents, we can see that the intentions of this curriculum are noble. However, the competences required from students after the accomplishment of the study are somehow vague, as they are competences specific to all disciplines of the area *Human and society*, including history or geography. In fact, it is through the subjects of the discipline and to the practice of the study that we can measure the success rate of studying the discipline.

In 7th grade (ages 12-13), the curriculum proposes three great subjects to be treated. The first one, *Life in society*, discusses Being a person: *uniqueness and dignity of humans; Man as a social being (Group attitudes and interpersonal relationships; Family as a social group; Local, national and international community); Human rights*. The longest subject (in term of number of hours dedicated) studied is *Political*

system in Romania, which covers *Modern states and constitutions; The Constitution of Romania, Democratic institutions and practices* (Separation of powers, Authorities of the Romanian state). The final subject is *Relationship between citizen and state: power of public opinion and force of the individual*; it includes *Active citizenship and democratic practices* (The right to association; Political parties; Civil society, citizen initiatives and NGOs; Elections and voting), *Mass-media and public opinion*.

The curriculum for the 8th grade (ages 13-14) is more abstract. It deals with a series of principles that are explained to students in five great chapters: *Authority*, including *the relationship between citizens and state authorities*; *Liberty and responsibility*, including *the relationship between liberty and the respect for the law, citizen involvement and responsibility*; *Justice and equality*, including *Justice as institution of defense and making of right and Equality of chances, equality in front of the law*; *Property*, including *The right to property*; *Public and private property and market economy*; *Patriotism*, including *Local, national and European identity and Alterations of patriotism – xenophobia, chauvinism, demagogu*.

When looking at these contents, we can observe that the relationship between citizen and state authorities is emphasized. The first subject in the second year of study is entitled *Authority*, dealing with the right way of relating to the institutions of the state. The second subject reminds students that *Liberty* comes only with *Responsibility*. The third chapter is somehow interesting: *Justice* and *Equality* are put together as if one of them originates in the other. Finally, at the end of studying *Civic culture*, students learn how to be patriotic.

Another interesting fact is that some of the issues from the curriculum appear in italics, as to be studied only if the discipline is extended (two hours / week instead of only one hour, which is the average). The choice of these issues that exist in the curriculum but are not to be studied normally speaks for itself. Amongst them, *Civil insubordination, Participating of citizens in decision-making, prejudices and stereotypes* in the first year of study, *Consequences of the lack or excess of authority, juvenile delinquency, Alterations of patriotism* in the second year of study.

The textbooks of the discipline (according to the law of education, there can be more than one textbook for the disciplines in a year of study, if they pass the evaluation of the ministry) are generally fair, well designed, containing the subject descriptions, as well as exercises. One of them in particular (Nedelcu & Morar 2005) provides more information, as well as text excerpts, but lacks practical exercises. Another series of manuals (Georgescu & Ionescu 2003a, 2003b) emphasizes on practical exercises, but also has more content information. The choice of the authors regarding images is interesting: they have chosen to illustrate the content through caricatures made by Ion Barbu, one of the most appreciated artists in contemporary Romania.

In fact, the real issue to be discussed is whether students are prepared to process this kind of abstract information at such a young age. Some of the issues taught may be too hard to understand or to retain. It is, certainly, beneficial that students are familiarized with these issues at a young age. However, the practice of teaching reveals a generally low interest of students in the discipline. It is regarded as a less important one (together with artistic education, music or technologic education) in contrast with the "highly important disciplines" such as literature, mathematics, history or geography. Another bothering fact regarding the practice of the discipline is that most teachers are either history or social sciences teachers; there aren't teachers specialized in teaching only *Civic culture*, which means that their interest in teaching this discipline is also quite low.

One of the most concerning problems of this matter in the educational system in Romania is that there is not such a discipline in theoretical high-school (higher secondary education). Students that follow high-schools are, instead, taught social sciences, such as *Logic, Psychology, Economy and Philosophy*. Some of the issues discussed previously at the discipline of *Civic culture* appear, certainly, in the study of social sciences, but not as a coherent, integral set of knowledge. At an age that would be more suitable for a discipline as such, it is inexistent.

History and social sciences teachers attempt to cover this lack of the official curriculum, but they are constrained by their own discipline's contents. Having studied *Civic culture* only for two years, at a very young age, students are not familiarized in high-school with the set of knowledge that would allow them to be educated citizens.

It would appear that the case is better in technological high-schools, as there is a discipline, called *Civic and entrepreneurial culture* in the first two years (9th and 10th grade, at the age of 14 to 16), which has the intention to replace social sciences, not studied in the technological education system. However, this discipline focuses more on economical, rather than civic issues. The contents of the curriculum (Consiliul Național pentru Curriculum 2004a, 2004b) include an introduction to social sciences in the first chapter, *Individual and society*, which includes *Relationship between individual and the democratic society; Individual exercising the quality of citizen; Rights and responsibility in society* and the discussion on the political system of Romania in the second chapter, *Democratic institutions and practices, including Relationship between citizen and governmental institutions/ NGO's and Electoral system and voting procedure*. From the third chapter on, the curriculum focuses on entrepreneurial education: *Individual as consumer and entrepreneur, Initiating and maintaining a business, Business ethics, Risks and success in business*.

As the discipline's reason of existence is to give students the basis of social education, the practice of teaching the discipline shows that it hardly accomplishes its goal. The students are more oriented to technological education, this discipline

coming somehow as an unnecessary burden for them. The discipline is taught by social sciences teachers which show less interest in the act of teaching. The situation is somehow similar to lower secondary education, but accentuated by the fact that everybody perceives the discipline as being useless.

It would appear, despite the lacks aforementioned, that the state has fulfilled its "duty" to impose civic education to its young generation. The next section will discuss whether the youth of Romania acquires the civic attitudes desired by the state.

4 Civic attitudes of Romanian youth

In describing student's perception of citizenship in post-communism we base our research on two studies. The first one was conducted at the request of the Soros foundation and was published in December 2010 under the name Civic and political involvement of youth (Fundatia Soros România 2010). The other one was conducted by Institutul de Marketing i Sondaje (Institute for Marketing and Polls, from now on called IMAS) in November - December 2011, on Civic activism and attitudes towards protest amongst Romanian youth (IMAS 2011). Both studies are based on surveys targeting young people (Soros involves high-school students aged 14 to 18, IMAS involves students in high-school and the University) and the results are quite similar.

In both cases students are unsatisfied with Romania: 38% are not proud to be Romanian, as opposed to 10% of the adult population (Fundatia Soros România 2010, 10). 74% believe that Romania is going in a wrong direction (IMAS 2011, 27). 26% consider that the democratic system is not good for Romania (as opposed to 16% of the adult population) and 40% would rather Romania be ruled by a military regime, as opposed to only 26% of the adults (Fundatia Soros România 2010, 15). The proportion of students that trust a military regime is higher at technological schools (47%) than theoretical high-schools (34%). This could show that the subjects involving patriotism in civic education are not convincing enough for students. They tend to base their opinion on democracy more on the surrounding environment (media, family and friends) than the disciplines studied in class.

Authoritarian institutions, based on strict hierarchies are more trusted than democratic institutions. According to the IMAS research, students trust the army (69%) and the church (53%). There is a high rate of trust in the European institutions (58%) that could be explained by the recent admission of Romania in the EU. 29% trust the NGOs, 38% the education system, 35% the Police, 30% the justice system and 22% mass-media. The least credited are political institutions: only 5% trust the Presidency, 3% the Government, 2% the Parliament and 2% political parties (IMAS 2011, 27). In the Soros study, the church (82%), the army (59%) and the police (52%) are the most trusted institutions. Half of the respondents (50%) trust the education system and 39% the justice system. The Presidency is trusted by

17%, the Government by 10%, the Parliament by 9% and the political parties by 13% of the respondents. Surprisingly, in this poll mass-media is one of the least trusted: only 14% of the responses trust the press (Fundatia Soros România 2010, 24). These results are in total contradiction with the vision promoted by the subjects of the Civic culture discipline, which emphasizes on democratic institutions rather than the army and the church.

Only 19% of the high-school students are very satisfied or satisfied by the functioning of democracy, as opposed to 41% of the adult population (Fundatia Soros România 2010, 19). The percent decreases as students grow: if 26% of the students aged 14 are satisfied with democracy, only 13% of the students aged 18 agree. The result is similar when discussing the ancient regime: an average of 38% consider that the communist period was better than the present, but no less than 43% of the students aged 18 (Fundatia Soros România 2010, 65). This is another example of the youth's radicalism as opposed to the subjects they are supposed to be familiarized in school, not only through Civic culture, but also through the discipline of History.

When it comes to civic attitudes and involvement, interest in politics is not necessarily important in being "a good citizen". The IMAS study has a qualitative component, focused on University students, which reveals the following attitudes: young people do not speak of politics when they socialize, as they avoid confronting their political options; they are more interested in NGO activity than the process of government; they consider that civic involvement does not include a political dimension, with the exception of voting; for them, social activism means mainly charity and environmental actions; their involvement in student organizations is not mainly intended to defend the rights of the students, as it is to promote other kinds of activities; if the students are involved in political parties, this involvement has more of a practical dimension, which does not contribute to developing abilities of civic participation (IMAS 2011, 12-23).

Thus, political dimension seems not to be important in defining civic involvement or the concept of "good citizen" (IMAS 2011, 16)¹. Speaking in percentages, 40% of the IMAS respondents could not define the term "civic involvement" (IMAS 2011, 31). As for the Soros study, it notices that, as high-school students grow up, the idea of "good citizen" implies less a political dimension than a social one (Fundatia Soros România 2010, 36)².

According to the Soros study, for students, a "good citizen" is mostly the one who obeys the law, for 88% of the respondents (Fundatia Soros România 2010, 33). Also, a "good citizen" votes (65%) and is politically informed (55%). For less than half of the respondents, a "good citizen" discusses politics (33%) or involves in politics (21%). Observing the law is crucial in being "a good citizen" for 33% of respondents of the IMAS research. 82% consider that if they were involved in the field of fighting for the human rights they would be "good citizens".

Nevertheless, only 13% are members of any organization, either NGO or political party (IMAS 2011, 29-37). These results show a vision on "good citizenship" which is more likely inherited from the Communist period (through family and media) than pointed out in present-day schools: being faithful to the country rather than showing concern for politics.

This analysis of these two studies leads to somehow worrying conclusions. Students tend to be more intolerant than grown-ups, as the percentage of those who do not agree with the democratic regime is higher. Their level of intolerance increases in function of two factors: their field of study and their age. Students that attend technological education are more oriented towards an authoritarian regime than students that attend theoretical high-school. Students aged 18 are less satisfied with democracy and tend to regret the communist period (which they did not experience personally) more than students aged 14.

There is a high ratio of intolerance towards minorities, of any kind. Students show adversity to ethnic minorities (especially Roma people, but also Hungarians), to religious minorities (such as Muslims), to sexual minorities (such as homosexuals), to people suffering from AIDS. Reminiscences from the past of the XXth century can be detected: one third of the students show adversity towards the Jews who cannot be found in Romanian society of our days.

The student's attitude towards citizenship is confused. They cannot define the concept of "good citizen" or "civic involvement". They perceive "good citizenship" as a feature that obeys the rule of the state (respecting the law, voting). However, they are not interested in being politically involved. We can find here more reminiscence from the communist regime: students do not tend to consider the action of protest as an important feature of citizenship.

There are multiple reasons for these attitudes. Dissatisfaction towards the state of the Romanian society is, certainly, a primary issue and it can lead to civic disengagement (as shown by Snell 2010). At their age, young people tend to be more radical than the grown-ups, which can explain their inclination towards authoritarianism. Reminiscences from the communist period, either translated to them by their parents or simply collected from society, can also explain their lack of interest towards politics. Another explanation comes from the change of the society that young people face (e.g. the informational and technological evolutions, see Lupia and Philpot 2005).

All these issues should have been dealt with in school. The fact that students, just after finishing the study of civic education, express the opinions mentioned above is an indication of the failure of the discipline to inflict the kind of attitudes requested by the curriculum and thus desired by the state. When it comes to the teacher-student relationship, these responses may suggest that teaching civic education does not yet follow the global trend to a student-centered and participatory pedagogy which would determine more tolerant attitudes (as shown by Torney-Purta & Schwille 1986).

5 Conclusions: failure of the state to develop "good citizenship"?

The contradiction between "good citizenship" as outlined by civic education curriculum of the public education and the attitudes shown by young people in sociological surveys originate in more than one determinant. The explanations for this contradiction can be attributed either to 1) society, 2) the state, or 3) public citizenship education.

Most of the studies which have treated civic education and its problems have focused on (1) social factors, such as the post-communist state of transition in terms of mentality, economics or cultural gaps. This paper suggests an explanation of the difference between what is desired and what is acquired focusing mostly on the bad policies of the state in the field of civic education.

Basically, the failure of the state to develop "good citizenship" behaviors to its youth can be credited mostly on (2) the state itself, as it shows a notable difference between theory and practice regarding civic behaviors. Students are subjected to various types of information from society (in media, in the local community, even in school) that outlines the weakness of the state, the same state that demands them to be "good citizens". The fact that civic education is promoted only verbally from the top generates a rejection of its discourse at the bottom.

The other issue to be taken into consideration is (3) the lack of consistence of the discipline Civic culture. As opposed to the communist period, when students were openly required to obey the rules of the state, civic education in present-day Romania, as shown by the contents of the curriculum, is a mix of requirements to submission (such as submission to state authority) and rules of participatory democracy (such as free speech and civil insubordination). This contradiction makes the discipline less credible and therefore contributes to its failure.

References

- Birzea, César. 2002. "Education policy in Education for Democratic Citizenship and the Management of Diversity Policy in South East Europe. Stocktaking Research Project Country Report: ROMANIA"
- Bromley, Patricia; Meyer, John W.; Ramirez, Francisco O. 2011. "Student-Centeredness in Social Science Textbooks, 1970-2008: A Cross-National Study", in: *Social Forces*, Vol. 90, No. 2, 547-570.
- Bunescu, Gheorghe; Stan, Emil; Albu, Gabriel; Badea, Dan, Oprica, Octavian. 1999. "Cohesion and Diversity in National Identity: Civic Education in Romania", 505-522, in: *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*, edited by Judith Torney-Purta, John Schwille, and Jo-Ann Amadeo. Amsterdam: IEA Secretariat.

- Consiliul Național pentru Curriculum. 2004a. Program școlar la disciplina Cultură civic / antreprenorial, clasa a IX-a, coala de arte și meserii (School Curriculum for Civic/ Entrepreneurial Culture, 9th Grade), Bucharest: Ministerul Educației, Cercetării și Tineretului.
- Consiliul Național pentru Curriculum. 2004b. Program școlar la disciplina Cultură civic / antreprenorial, clasa a X-a, coala de arte și meserii (School Curriculum for Civic/ Entrepreneurial Culture, 10th Grade), Bucharest: Ministerul Educației, Cercetării și Tineretului.
- Consiliul Național pentru Curriculum. 2008. Program școlar revizuit. Cultura Civic. Clasele a VII-a – a VIII-a (Revised School Curriculum. Civic Culture. 7th and 8th Grades), Bucharest: Ministerul Educației, Cercetării și Tineretului.
- Freyberg-Inan, Annette, Cristescu, Radu. 2006. *The Ghosts in Our Classrooms, or John Dewey meets Ceausescu. The Promise and the Failures of Civic Education in Romania.* Stuttgart: Ibidem Verlag.
- Fundația Soros România. 2010. *Implicarea civic și politică a tinerilor (Civic and Political Involvement of Youth)*, Constanța: Dobrogea.
- Georgescu, Dakmara; Ștefănescu, Doina-Olga. 2003a. *Cultură civic. Manual pentru clasa a 7-a (Civic Culture. 7th Grade Manual)*, București: Humanitas.
- Georgescu, Dakmara; Ștefănescu, Doina-Olga. 2003b. *Cultură civic. Manual pentru clasa a 8-a (Civic Culture. 8th Grade Manual)*, București: Humanitas.
- Heater, Derek. 2004. *A History of Education for Citizenship.* London: Routledge Falmer.
- IMAS. 2011. *Activism civic și atitudini față de protest în rândul tinerilor din România (Civic Activism and Attitudes towards Protest amongst Romanian Youth).*
- Lupia, A.; Philpot, T. S.; 2005. "Views from inside the net: How websites affect young adults' political interest", *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 67, 1122-1142.
- Marshall, Thomas Humphrey. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class, and Other Essays.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mincu, Monica E. 2009. "Myth, Rhetoric, and Ideology in Eastern European Education. Schools and Citizenship in Hungary, Poland, and Romania", in: *European Education* Vol. 41, No. 1, 55-78.
- Nedelcu, Elena; Morar, Ecaterina. 2005. *Cultură civic. Manual pentru clasa a 7-a (Civic Culture. 7th Grade Manual)*, București: All.
- Ramirez, Francisco O.; Boli, John. 1987. "The Political Construction of Mass Schooling: European Origins and Worldwide Institutionalization", in: *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 60, No. 1, 2-17.
- Ramirez, Francisco O.; Meyer, John W. 2002. "National Curricula: World Models and Historical Legacies", pp. 91-107, in: *Internationalisation: Comparing Educational Systems and Semantics*, edited by Marcelo Caruso and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Ramirez, Francisco O.; Meyer, John W. 2012. "Toward Post-National Societies and Global Citizenship", *Multicultural Education Review*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1-28.
- Ricci, David M. 2004. *Good citizenship in America*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shafir, Gershon; Brysk, Alison. 2006. "The Globalization of Rights: From Citizenship to Human Rights", *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 275-287.
- Snell, Patricia. 2010. "Emerging Adult Civic and Political Disengagement: A Longitudinal Analysis of Lack of Involvement With Politics", *Journal of Adolescent Research* March 2010, Vol. 25, 258-287.
- Torney-Purta, Judith, Schwille, John. 1986. "Civic Values Learned in School: Policy and Practice in Industrialized Nations", *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 30-49.

Endnotes

¹ The study's theoretical premises are based on the 1950 classic work of T.H. Marshall, which separates "citizenship" into three dimensions: civil (the rights necessary for assuring individual liberty), political (the right to participate to the exercise of political power) and social (the whole sphere of rights, from the right to welfare and security to the right to a civilized life) - cf. IMAS 2011, p 16.

² The study defines "social involvement" as participating to actions in the field of supporting the other citizens (promotion of rights, social volunteering, environmental actions, protest against an incorrect law) and "political involvement" as acquiring information and discussing on political issues, respecting the factors of power, quality of member in a political party and participating to the vote - cf. Mircea Comănaș, "Bunul cetățean și avatarurile sale" ('Good Citizen' and its Avatars), in *Fundația Soros România*, 2010, p 34.