# The roles of schools and communities in civic and citizenships education

Elisa Caponera,
National Institute for the Evaluation of Educational System
Italy
elisa.caponera@invalsi.it

Bruno Losito
Roma Tre University
Italy
losito@uniroma3.it

## Introduction

The ICCS contextual framework underlines that a study of the outcomes of civic and citizenship education and indicators of civic engagement needs to take account of all the different factors that may somehow have an influence on them.
These factors can be identified at several levels: wider community contexts, school and classroom contexts, home environment, student contexts. Besides the relevance endorsed to considering these different levels, the ICCS contextual framework emphasizes the distinction between antecedents (factors affecting student learning and their acquisition of knowledge, skills and competencies as well as the development of certain attitudes and dispositions) and processes (e.g. the whole factors related to civic learning and development).

For each of the contexts above mentioned, ICCS has identified the constructs and the variables that previous studies and researches showed as having, in broad terms, an impact on student learning (Scheerens 1990; Hanushek, 1994, 1997; Schereens, Glas, Thomas, 2003; Birzea et al., 2004; Cox et al., 2005; Reezigt & Creemers, 2005), and more specifically on civic and citizenship education (Torney, Oppenheim, & Farnen, 1975; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, and Schulz 2001; Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt, e Nikolova's 2002). These constructs and variables provided the basis for constructing the instruments designed to collect data and information in the survey: student, school and teacher questionnaires.

The first part of the present paper is an overview of school and community roles in students' civic and citizenship education across ICCS countries. Data from school and teacher questionnaires were used to describe how schools and communities contribute to the development of students' civic knowledge.

The second part investigates, through multi-level analysis, the relationship between a selection of variables at student and school levels and a selection of student attitudes. More specifically, the attitudes taken into account are: attitudes toward equal gender rights, toward equal rights for immigrants, and toward equal rights for ethnic/racial groups.

## Background

### Schools, communities, and student civic knowledge: main ICCS findings

The data collected through student, school and teacher questionnaires were used to answer the following research question: "What aspects of schools and education systems are related to achievement in and attitudes to civics and citizenship?".
As far as the wider community and its relationship with the school is concerned, particular attention was devoted, on the one hand, to the opportunities that schools give to target grade students to participate in civic related activities in the community and to the characteristic of these activities, and, on the other hand, to the existence of issues of social tension in the community, their impact on student knowledge and the availability of cultural resources in the community.

With regards to school and classroom contexts, greater attention was drawn both to classroom and school climate, and to the ways in which civic and citizenship education was being delivered in schools (approaches to civic and citizenship education and importance that principals and teacher attribute to different aims of civic and citizenship education).

*The context of wider community*

According to their teachers and principals, the participation of target grade students in civic-related activities in the community turned out to be quite widespread across ICCS countries. It is worth notice how among the civic related activities (activities related to the environment, geared to the

local area; human rights projects; activities related to underprivileged people or groups; cultural activities; multicultural and intercultural activities within the local community; campaigns to raise people's awareness, such as AIDS World Day, World No Tobacco Day; activities related to improving facilities for the local community; participating in sport events) the most common were found to be participation in sport events and cultural activities. Besides, participation in national campaigns on specific issues (such as AIDS World Day, No Tobacco Day) and activities in the local area related to the environment appeared, as well, to be fairly widespread. Only minorities of teachers and principals reported school-based student involvement in human rights projects or activities to help the underprivileged.
It is likely that these outcomes have a close association with target grade and students' age (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010).

The local community characteristics and the availability of cultural and social resources (such as public libraries, cinemas, theatres or concert halls as well as language schools, museums or art galleries, public gardens, religious centers and sport facilities) vary significantly across ICCS countries. These differences were associated with country different levels of economic and social development, but they were, as well, found within countries.
The bivariate analyses conducted for the International report showed that there is an association between the availability of resources in the local community and student civic knowledge.
National tertiles were calculated for schools with low, medium or high average scores of principals' reports on availability of resources in the local community and subsequently student test score averages were compared across tertile groups.
The results of this comparison showed that, on average, across ICCS countries there is a positive association between presence of resources in the community and level of student civic knowledge. In addition to that, when comparing the lowest and the highest tertiles, the average in the highest tertile is significantly higher than that in the lowest tertile in several countries (Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Poland, Sweden, Thailand).

Similarly, an association – but this time a negative one – was found, on average, across ICCS countries between student civic knowledge and issues of social tension in the community where the school was located (such as immigration, poor quality of housing, unemployment, religious intolerance, ethnic conflicts, extensive poverty, organized crime, youth gangs, petty crime, sexual harassment, drug abuse, alcohol abuse).

National tertiles were calculated for schools with low, medium or high average scores of principals' perceptions of social tension in the community. When comparing the lowest and the highest tertiles, statistically significant differences were found in favor of students in the lowest tertile in the majority of participating countries (Bulgaria, Chile, Chinese Taipei, Colombia, England, Estonia, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand).

*School and classroom contexts*
As already highlighted by previous studies, classroom climate appeared to be associated with student knowledge. CIVED results highlighted the importance of classroom climate in civic and citizenship education (Torney-Purta et al., 2001). With respect to other variables, classroom climate seemed to be one of the factors more directly related to student performance and to student willingness to engage in civic-related activities. Torney-Purta et al. (2007) found that open classroom climate explains a portion of differences on political topics and democratic ideals. Questions on classroom climate were included both in student and teacher questionnaires.

Teachers were asked to rate how many students ("all or nearly all", "most of them", "some of them", "none or hardly any"): got on well with their classmates, were well integrated in the class, respected their classmates even if they are different, had a good relationship with other students. National tertiles were calculated for schools based on low, medium or high average score of teachers' perceptions of classroom climate. On average, across ICCS countries, there was a positive association between teachers' perceptions of classroom climate and students' civic knowledge. In addition to that, when comparing the lowest and the highest tertiles a statistically significant difference in favour of students of the highest tertile was found for several participating countries (Bulgaria, Chile, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Malta and Sweden).
In their questionnaire, students were asked to rate the frequency ("never", "rarely", "sometimes", "often"), with which, during lessons when discussing political and social issues, the following events may occur: teachers encouraging students to make up their own minds; teachers encouraging students to express their opinions; students bringing up current political events for discussion in class; students expressing opinions in class even when their opinions are different from most of the other students; teachers encouraging students to discuss issues with people having different opinions; teachers presenting issues from different points of view, when presenting them to the class.
On average, across countries, students reported that most of these events occurred at least "sometimes."

The multilevel analysis conducted for the International Report (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010) showed that student perception of openness of classroom climate is a significant positive predictor of student knowledge across most ICCS countries.[1]

*Civic and citizenship education at school*
Both the National Contexts Survey and the school principal answers to the questions included in the school questionnaire showed that – regardless of different approaches to delivering civic and citizenship education - in almost all of the ICCS countries, the majority of students were attending schools whose principals reported that civic and citizenship education was regarded as part of the educational purpose of the school and as an outcome of the students' school experience as a whole. This result provided valuable insights especially when considering that CIVED showed civic education as a "low-status" subject in the 1999's (Torney-Purta, Schwille and Amadeo, 1999) and a number of other studies (e.g. Birzea et al., 2004) highlighted the gaps between the intended and the implemented curriculum in relation to civic and citizenship education at individual school levels.

As for the aims of civic and citizenship education, ICCS showed an extensive accord across countries. As said by majorities of the school teachers and principals who completed the relevant ICCS questionnaires, the most important aims of civic and citizenship education are those relating to the development of knowledge and skills such as promoting knowledge of social, political, and civic institutions; developing students' skills and competencies in conflict resolution; promoting knowledge of citizens' rights and responsibilities; promoting students' critical and independent thinking).
Across countries, only minorities of principals and teachers viewed supporting the development of effective strategies for the fight against racism and xenophobia and preparing students for future political participation as among the three most important objectives of civic and citizenship education (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010). It is interesting to note the substantial agreement between teachers and principals.[2]

[1] The positive effect was significant in 27 countries. See chapter 8 of the international ICCS report.
[2] The same question was included both in school and teacher questionnaire.

The ICCS teacher questionnaire included an international option consisting of a set of questions administered only to target-grade teachers teaching subjects identified as more directly related to civic and citizenship education[3]. When asked about their confidence in teaching specific topics, teachers indicated they are more confident in teaching subjects such as human rights, citizens' rights and responsibilities, voting and elections, and the environment. On average, they were less confident about teaching topics related to the economy and business and to legal institutions and courts, as already highlighted by CIVED '99 findings.

*The influence of community and school contexts on student knowledge*

The two previous surveys on civic and citizenship education carried out by IEA allowed the recognition of the factors associated with student civic knowledge.

IEA first survey, *Civic Education Study(CivEd),* conducted in 1999, identified gender (male), socio-economic background and classroom climate as the main predictors of student civic knowledge (Torney, Oppenheim, & Farnen, 1975).

The analyses undertaken on CIVED '99 outcomes (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, and Schulz 2001) highlighted a moderate negative effect of gender (female) in 11 countries, a negative association between civic knowledge and spending evenings outside the home (in all but four countries), a positive association between civic knowledge and watching TV news (almost half the countries).

Similar results were observed also for CIVED older population (Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt, e Nikolova's 2002) .

Multilevel analyses carried out for the ICCS international report[4] showed that a number of variables related to the learning context at school are associated with student knowledge. There was some evidence that there is a positive association with student perception of openness in classroom discussions (about a third of the ICCS participating countries). As for school-level variables, indicators for school characteristics, the existence of issues of social tension in the local community was negatively associated with student knowledge, exclusively for two countries (Czech Republic and Estonia).

No significant associations were found in any other country. Principals' perceptions of students' sense of belonging to the school had a significant positive association with student knowledge in five countries (Bulgaria, the Dominican Republic, the Republic of Korea, Malta, and Poland) and a significant negative association in one country (Mexico).

The average socioeconomic background of students was the most important school characteristic in term of effect on civic knowledge.

It had a significant effect in 24 countries, with an average school-level effect of almost 15 points per national standard deviation.

**Community and school contexts and students' attitudes.**

**Data and methods**

The ICCS framework underlines that both student knowledge and student attitudes and dispositions are influenced by the wider community (at local, national, and supra-national levels) as well as by school and classroom contexts (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, Kerr 2008).

Several studies showed that the outcomes of civic and citizenship education may be influenced by cognitive as well as by affective-behavioral dimensions.

The building and development of attitudes and dispositions consistent with a democratic society and its principles are part of the objectives of civic and citizenship education (Birzea et al., 2004; Eurydice, 2005).

[3] As for teacher identification and selection criteria, see Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010.

[4] See Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, Losito, 2010, chapter 8.

Among the student attitudes included in the survey there were students' attitudes towards gender equality, students' attitudes towards equal rights for immigrants, and students' attitudes towards equal rights for all ethnic groups.
The decision to consider said attitudes in relation to some variables of school and community contexts derives from the importance that, in many countries, phenomena related to gender and specific group rights has gradually taken over the past years. The increase of migration, connected to globalization processes, in many countries has led, and is leading, to the need of dealing with the specific problems of multicultural and multiethnic societies, provoking reactions and generating conflicts (Card, Dustman, Preston, 2005; Husfeldt, 2006). Hence the interest in investigating whether and to what extent a number of school and community characteristics may have an effect (and what type) on student attitudes.
The analysis of the data collected on the attitudes as dependent variables took place in four steps.
Firstly, it was estimated the variance between schools and within schools[5] in relation to the attitudes identified as dependent variables (Model 0, with no explanatory variables).
Secondly, the model was modified by introducing student level variables (Model 1, where the effects on student level were treated as a fixed, assuming no variation across schools).
The following step consisted in introducing school-level variables in the model (Model 2).
The model was completed by adding the school average index of socio-economic background (Model 3).
The variables used at a student level were as follows:

- Gender (individual student level)
- Student socio-economic background (student home background). The index of socio-economic background was standardized to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 within each country (as in ICCS).
- Student perception of openness in classroom discussions (individual learning context)

The variables used at a school level were as follows:

- Principals' perception of issues of social tension in the community
- Principals' perception of social problems at school
- School average of socio-economic background

We used the software package HLM 6.0 to estimate the models and data. Countries not meeting ICCS sample requirements or countries where there were less than 50 schools were excluded from the analyses.[6]
The selection of the variables used as predictors was founded on the findings of ICCS International Report and on the hypothesis that students' attitudes towards gender differences are related to the economic, social, and cultural background in which they live, both at a community level and a school level.

**Results**

*Students' attitudes towards gender equality*

As expected, the results at the student level showed that student attitudes towards gender equality is significantly and positively associated with gender for all ICCS countries. However, support for gender quality was higher in Austria, Cyprus, Finland, and Slovenia and lower in Colombia, Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Russian Federation, and Thailand.

[5] Given the sample design adopted in ICCS, it is not possible to make a distinction between classroom-level and school-level variance.

[6] The adopted criterion applies to the one adopted for the multilevel analyses carried out for the International Report. Hong Kong SAR, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg and the Netherlands were excluded. Data were weighted according to the criteria adopted in the analyses carried out for the International Report. The tables indicate the countries reporting a missing data percentage above 15%.

Student perception of openness in classroom discussion showed a positive and significant association for most ICCS countries, but its effect appears to be quite moderate.
Similar results were shown as for the index of socio-economic background. In Guatemala its effect was higher when compared to the other ICCS countries.

Table 1. Student and school-level results from multilevel analysis of student attitudes towards gender equality before controlling for school average index of socio-economic background

| | Student level | | | | | | School level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Country | Gender (female) | | Student perception of openness in classroom discussions | | Index of socio-economic background | | Principals' perception of issues of social tension in local comunity | | Principals' perceptions of social problems at school | |
| Austria < | **8,18** | (0,43) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **1,71** | (0,29) | 0,00 | (0,04) | -0,05 | (0,06) |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | **7,07** | (0,43) | **0,08** | (0,03) | 0,50 | (0,28) | **-0,07** | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,06) |
| Bulgaria | **5,13** | (0,43) | **0,12** | (0,02) | **0,53** | (0,24) | **-0,17** | (0,05) | **0,11** | (0,04) |
| Chile | **9,84** | (0,46) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **1,76** | (0,27) | 0,01 | (0,02) | -0,05 | (0,04) |
| Chinese Taipei | **5,67** | (0,29) | **0,14** | (0,01) | **1,18** | (0,19) | **-0,05** | (0,02) | 0,03 | (0,03) |
| Colombia | **2,39** | (0,29) | **0,18** | (0,02) | **0,80** | (0,16) | -0,01 | (0,04) | -0,06 | (0,03) |
| Cyprus^ < | **9,84** | (0,46) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **1,76** | (0,27) | 0,01 | (0,02) | -0,05 | (0,04) |
| Czech Republic + | **4,73** | (0,28) | **0,12** | (0,02) | **1,41** | (0,21) | -0,01 | (0,03) | **-0,10** | (0,05) |
| Denmark + < | **6,98** | (0,36) | **0,13** | (0,02) | **1,88** | (0,22) | 0,02 | (0,03) | -0,06 | (0,03) |
| Dominican Republic < | **2,04** | (0,40) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **0,51** | (0,18) | **-0,08** | (0,02) | 0,00 | (0,02) |
| England ++ < | **6,20** | (0,54) | **0,19** | (0,03) | **1,65** | (0,28) | -0,04 | (0,04) | **-0,16** | (0,06) |
| Estonia | **4,55** | (0,34) | **0,04** | (0,02) | **0,87** | (0,24) | **-0,26** | (0,06) | 0,05 | (0,05) |
| Finland | **9,75** | (0,35) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **1,11** | (0,21) | 0,02 | (0,03) | -0,05 | (0,04) |
| Greece | **8,83** | (0,44) | **0,21** | (0,02) | **1,50** | (0,21) | 0,02 | (0,04) | 0,07 | (0,04) |
| Guatemala[1] | **3,41** | (0,40) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **0,53** | (0,21) | **0,11** | (0,04) | 0,08 | (0,05) |
| Indonesia | **2,19** | (0,20) | **0,08** | (0,01) | **0,45** | (0,13) | -0,01 | (0,03) | -0,05 | (0,03) |
| Ireland | **7,14** | (0,50) | **0,13** | (0,02) | **1,56** | (0,21) | **-0,09** | (0,05) | **-0,13** | (0,06) |
| Italy | **6,41** | (0,35) | **0,18** | (0,02) | **1,74** | (0,20) | -0,03 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,03) |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | **5,83** | (0,32) | **0,04** | (0,01) | **0,90** | (0,18) | -0,01 | (0,03) | **-0,08** | (0,04) |
| Latvia | **3,99** | (0,39) | **0,09** | (0,03) | **1,52** | (0,25) | -0,04 | (0,04) | **0,08** | (0,04) |
| Lithuania | **5,06** | (0,36) | **0,08** | (0,02) | **1,71** | (0,23) | -0,06 | (0,04) | 0,01 | (0,04) |
| Malta | **4,14** | (1,94) | 0,07 | (0,04) | 0,42 | (0,21) | -0,09 | (0,06) | -0,18 | (0,11) |
| Mexico | **3,42** | (0,17) | **0,07** | (0,01) | **0,39** | (0,11) | **-0,09** | (0,02) | 0,02 | (0,02) |
| New Zeland + < | **5,81** | (0,58) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **0,96** | (0,33) | **-0,20** | (0,06) | -0,09 | (0,07) |
| Norway + < | **6,43** | (0,47) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **2,03** | (0,29) | -0,02 | (0,04) | 0,00 | (0,04) |
| Paraguay[1] < | **3,60** | (0,40) | **0,19** | (0,02) | **1,07** | (0,20) | -0,04 | (0,04) | 0,05 | (0,03) |
| Poland | **6,54** | (0,40) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **1,01** | (0,24) | 0,02 | (0,05) | 0,01 | (0,04) |
| Russian Federation | **2,95** | (0,27) | **0,10** | (0,01) | **0,86** | (0,15) | -0,01 | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,02) |
| Slovak Republic[2] | **4,07** | (0,37) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **1,28** | (0,27) | **-0,10** | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,05) |
| Slovenia | **8,78** | (0,45) | **0,12** | (0,03) | **1,54** | (0,25) | -0,02 | (0,04) | 0,04 | (0,04) |
| Spain | **4,76** | (0,36) | **0,07** | (0,02) | **1,56** | (0,20) | -0,01 | (0,03) | **-0,08** | (0,03) |
| Sweden | **6,69** | (0,44) | **0,21** | (0,03) | **1,79** | (0,28) | 0,03 | (0,03) | **-0,08** | (0,03) |
| Switzerland + | **6,84** | (0,48) | **0,13** | (0,03) | **0,66** | (0,28) | 0,00 | (0,04) | -0,01 | (0,07) |
| Thailand + | **2,30** | (0,22) | **0,09** | (0,01) | **0,30** | (0,12) | -0,08 | (0,05) | 0,01 | (0,04) |
| ICCS average | **5,63** | (0,10) | **0,13** | (0,00) | **1,16** | (0,04) | **-0,04** | (0,01) | **-0,02** | (0,01) |

Notes:
Statistically significant ($p$ <0.05) coefficient in **bold**.
( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

The school-level variables showed a significant association with attitudes towards gender equality only for a limited number of countries and, anyway, at a very moderate effect (see table 1).
A negative association was found with principal perception of issues of social tension in the community for Belgium (Flemish), Bulgaria, Chinese Taipei, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovak Republic. Conversely, a positive association emerged for Guatemala. Principals' perception of social problems at school resulted as negatively associated for Czech Republic, England, Ireland, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, but positively associated for Latvia. Nevertheless, its effect is extremely moderate, if not negligible.

Table 2. Student and school-level results from multilevel analysis of student attitudes towards gender equality after controlling for school average index of socio-economic background

| | Student level | | | | | | School level (characteristics) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Country | Gender (female) | | Student perception of openness in classroom discussions | | Index of socio-economic background | | Principals' perception of issues of social tension in local comunity | | Principals' perceptions of social problems at school | | School average of socio-economic background | |
| Austria < | **8,18** | (0,43) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **1,71** | (0,29) | 0,00 | (0,04) | -0,05 | (0,05) | **3,39** | (0,77) |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | **7,07** | (0,43) | **0,08** | (0,03) | 0,50 | (0,28) | 0,00 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,05) | **4,39** | (0,54) |
| Bulgaria | **5,13** | (0,43) | **0,12** | (0,02) | **0,53** | (0,24) | -0,02 | (0,04) | 0,03 | (0,03) | **3,47** | (0,38) |
| Chile | **5,27** | (0,32) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **0,97** | (0,25) | -0,02 | (0,03) | **-0,06** | (0,02) | **3,39** | (0,38) |
| Chinese Taipei | **5,67** | (0,29) | **0,14** | (0,01) | **1,18** | (0,19) | -0,02 | (0,02) | 0,02 | (0,03) | **2,21** | (0,43) |
| Colombia | **2,39** | (0,29) | **0,18** | (0,02) | **0,80** | (0,16) | 0,02 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,03) | **3,24** | (0,32) |
| Cyprus^ < | **9,84** | (0,46) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **1,76** | (0,27) | 0,00 | (0,02) | -0,03 | (0,03) | **2,78** | (0,95) |
| Czech Republic + | **4,73** | (0,28) | **0,12** | (0,02) | **1,41** | (0,21) | -0,02 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,04) | **3,83** | (0,62) |
| Denmark + < | **6,98** | (0,36) | **0,13** | (0,02) | **1,88** | (0,22) | 0,05 | (0,03) | -0,03 | (0,03) | **2,60** | (0,68) |
| Dominican Republic < | **2,04** | (0,40) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **0,51** | (0,18) | **-0,04** | (0,02) | 0,02 | (0,01) | **2,86** | (0,39) |
| England ++ < | **6,20** | (0,54) | **0,19** | (0,03) | **1,65** | (0,28) | 0,02 | (0,04) | -0,10 | (0,07) | **2,52** | (0,86) |
| Estonia | **0,02** | (0,80) | **0,02** | (1,41) | **0,02** | (0,51) | **0,03** | (0,50) | 0,02 | (0,53) | **0,02** | (0,97) |
| Finland | **9,75** | (0,35) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **1,11** | (0,21) | 0,03 | (0,03) | **-0,07** | (0,97) | **3,41** | (0,71) |
| Greece | **8,83** | (0,44) | **0,21** | (0,02) | **1,50** | (0,21) | 0,02 | (0,04) | 0,06 | (0,04) | 1,18 | (0,65) |
| Guatemala[1] | **3,41** | (0,40) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **0,53** | (0,21) | **0,06** | (0,03) | 0,03 | (0,02) | 3,50 | (0,46) |
| Indonesia | **2,19** | (0,20) | **0,08** | (0,01) | **0,45** | (0,13) | 0,00 | (0,03) | **-0,05** | (0,03) | **1,56** | (0,58) |
| Ireland | **7,14** | (0,50) | **0,13** | (0,02) | **1,56** | (0,21) | -0,01 | (0,05) | -0,10 | (0,05) | **3,47** | (0,86) |
| Italy | **6,41** | (0,35) | **0,18** | (0,02) | **1,74** | (0,20) | 0,00 | (0,02) | 0,01 | (0,03) | **2,78** | (0,40) |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | **5,83** | (0,32) | **0,04** | (0,01) | **0,90** | (0,18) | -0,01 | (0,03) | **-0,08** | (0,04) | 0,08 | (0,69) |
| Latvia | **3,99** | (0,39) | **0,09** | (0,03) | **1,52** | (0,25) | 0,01 | (0,04) | 0,04 | (0,03) | **2,83** | (0,49) |
| Lithuania | **5,06** | (0,36) | **0,08** | (0,02) | **1,71** | (0,23) | 0,01 | (0,04) | -0,02 | (0,03) | **3,16** | (0,47) |
| Malta | **4,14** | (1,94) | 0,07 | (0,04) | **0,42** | (0,21) | -0,05 | (0,06) | -0,13 | (0,10) | **3,75** | (1,03) |
| Mexico | **3,42** | (0,17) | **0,07** | (0,01) | **0,39** | (0,11) | **-0,05** | (0,02) | 0,01 | (0,02) | **1,42** | (0,31) |
| New Zeland + < | **5,81** | (0,58) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **0,96** | (0,33) | **-0,10** | (0,05) | -0,04 | (0,07) | **5,88** | (1,08) |
| Norway + < | **6,43** | (0,47) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **2,02** | (0,29) | 0,02 | (0,04) | 0,01 | (0,04) | **4,06** | (0,79) |
| Paraguay[1] < | **3,60** | (0,40) | **0,19** | (0,02) | **1,07** | (0,20) | -0,02 | (0,03) | 0,00 | (0,02) | **3,22** | (0,34) |
| Poland | **6,54** | (0,40) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **1,01** | (0,24) | 0,00 | (0,05) | 0,03 | (0,04) | **2,40** | (0,66) |
| Russian Federation | **2,95** | (0,27) | **0,10** | (0,01) | **0,86** | (0,15) | 0,02 | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,02) | **2,56** | (0,39) |
| Slovak Republic[2] | **4,07** | (0,37) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **1,28** | (0,27) | -0,02 | (0,03) | 0,05 | (0,03) | **4,35** | (0,45) |
| Slovenia | **8,78** | (0,45) | **0,12** | (0,03) | **1,54** | (0,25) | -0,01 | (0,04) | 0,00 | (0,04) | **2,34** | (0,79) |
| Spain | **4,76** | (0,36) | **0,07** | (0,02) | **1,56** | (0,20) | 0,03 | (0,03) | **-0,04** | (0,02) | **2,87** | (0,42) |
| Sweden | **6,69** | (0,44) | **0,21** | (0,03) | **1,79** | (0,28) | 0,02 | (0,03) | **-0,06** | (0,03) | **2,49** | (0,65) |
| Switzerland + | **6,84** | (0,48) | **0,13** | (0,03) | **0,66** | (0,28) | 0,05 | (0,03) | 0,02 | (0,06) | **3,84** | (0,58) |
| Thailand + | **2,30** | (0,22) | **0,09** | (0,01) | **0,30** | (0,12) | -0,07 | (0,04) | 0,04 | (0,03) | **2,82** | (0,37) |
| ICCS average | **5,37** | (0,10) | **0,13** | (0,05) | **1,11** | (0,05) | 0,00 | (0,02) | -0,02 | (0,04) | **2,90** | (0,12) |

Notes:
Statistically significant ($p$ <0.05) coefficient in **bold**.
( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

When school average index of socio-economic background was added in the model (see table 2), the effect of the other two variables at a school level tended to almost disappear. Whereas this index effect was positively associated and statistically significant with school average of socio-economic background for most ICCS countries, although moderate. A stronger association could be seen for Belgium (Flemish), New Zealand, Norway, and Slovak Republic.

*Student attitudes towards equal rights for immigrants*

At the student level, gender and student perception of openness in classroom discussions showed a positive association with student attitudes towards immigrants. This association was found statistically significant for most countries, although the effect was fairly moderate. A negative association emerged for Thailand.
The student index of socio-economic background showed a significant positive association only in a few countries and its effect is negligible. This index had negative effects in Switzerland.

The variables at the school level had significant but weak or minor effects only in a small number of countries (see table 3).
As for principals' perceptions of issues of social tension in the community, its effects were found positive in Austria, Estonia, Guatemala, Switzerland. A negative association emerged for Bulgaria, Chile, Republic of Korea, New Zealand.
As regards principals' perceptions of social problems at school variables, its effect was negative in Austria, England, Estonia, New Zealand, whereas positive in Bulgaria.

As shown in table 4, when school average index of socio-economic background variables were added in the model, the effect of the other two variables at a school level tended to almost disappear. An association between school average index of socio-economic background itself and student attitude towards immigrants could be seen only in about half of the participating countries. These effects were, however, extremely moderate.

Table 3. Student and school-level results from multilevel analysis of student attitudes towards equal rights for immigrants before controlling for school average index of socio-economic background

| | Student level | | | | | | School level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Country | Gender (female) | | Student perception of openness in classroom discussions | | Index of socio-economic background | | Primcipals' perception of issues of social tension in local comunity | | Principals' perceptions of social problems at school | |
| Austria < | **3,09** | (0,55) | **0,18** | (0,03) | 0,55 | (0,36) | **0,17** | (0,04) | **-0,10** | (0,05) |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | **2,01** | (0,41) | **0,12** | (0,03) | -0,14 | (0,31) | 0,05 | (0,03) | -0,07 | (0,05) |
| Bulgaria | **0,86** | (0,38) | **0,12** | (0,03) | 0,27 | (0,30) | **-0,11** | (0,03) | **0,06** | (0,03) |
| Chile | **1,18** | (0,28) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **0,45** | (0,23) | **-0,06** | (0,02) | -0,03 | (0,02) |
| Chinese Taipei | **1,15** | **0,30** | **0,16** | (0,02) | **1,38** | (0,20) | -0,02 | (0,02) | -0,01 | (0,03) |
| Colombia | 0,39 | (0,32) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **0,43** | (0,19) | -0,01 | (0,02) | 0,00 | (0,02) |
| Cyprus^ < | **3,93** | (0,52) | **0,19** | (0,02) | 0,58 | (0,31) | 0,00 | (0,02) | -0,02 | (0,04) |
| Czech Republic + | **1,83** | (0,30) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **0,47** | (0,23) | -0,04 | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,04) |
| Denmark + < | **2,61** | (0,35) | **0,13** | (0,02) | **1,13** | (0,23) | 0,01 | (0,03) | -0,07 | (0,04) |
| Dominican Republic < | 0,44 | (0,36) | **0,07** | (0,02) | 0,28 | (0,28) | -0,02 | (0,02) | -0,01 | (0,02) |
| England ++ < | **1,81** | (0,56) | **0,19** | (0,03) | **1,36** | (0,38) | -0,03 | (0,05) | **-0,18** | (0,06) |
| Estonia | **1,72** | (0,32) | **0,09** | (0,02) | 0,12 | (0,26) | **0,16** | (0,06) | **-0,15** | (0,05) |
| Finland | **5,43** | (0,40) | **0,17** | (0,03) | **0,93** | (0,23) | 0,05 | (0,03) | -0,05 | (0,05) |
| Greece | **2,93** | (0,48) | **0,22** | (0,03) | **0,90** | (0,24) | 0,02 | (0,04) | 0,01 | (0,03) |
| Guatemala[1] | -0,57 | (0,37) | **0,13** | (0,02) | -0,02 | (0,21) | **0,08** | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,02) |
| Indonesia | -0,31 | (0,24) | **0,10** | (0,01) | 0,12 | (0,16) | -0,01 | (0,01) | 0,01 | (0,02) |
| Ireland | **1,21** | (0,53) | **0,19** | (0,02) | **1,54** | (0,27) | 0,03 | (0,04) | -0,07 | (0,04) |
| Italy | **1,88** | (0,40) | **0,19** | (0,02) | 0,45 | (0,25) | 0,04 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,04) |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | **1,21** | (0,36) | **0,05** | (0,02) | **1,16** | (0,17) | **-0,04** | (0,02) | 0,02 | (0,02) |
| Latvia | **0,96** | (0,37) | **0,12** | (0,03) | -0,13 | (0,29) | 0,02 | (0,05) | 0,02 | (0,03) |
| Lithuania | **2,04** | (0,36) | **0,10** | (0,03) | **1,02** | (0,21) | -0,01 | (0,04) | -0,02 | (0,03) |
| Malta | 2,18 | (1,68) | **0,10** | (0,04) | 0,35 | (0,44) | -0,04 | (0,04) | -0,07 | (0,07) |
| Mexico | **1,21** | (0,31) | **0,16** | (0,02) | 0,30 | (0,18) | -0,06 | (0,03) | 0,02 | (0,02) |
| New Zeland + < | 0,48 | (0,57) | **0,26** | (0,03) | **0,85** | (0,36) | **-0,09** | (0,03) | **-0,07** | (0,03) |
| Norway + < | **2,63** | (0,48) | **0,21** | (0,03) | **0,77** | (0,36) | 0,07 | (0,05) | 0,02 | (0,06) |
| Paraguay[1] < | -0,25 | (0,36) | **0,18** | (0,02) | 0,33 | (0,23) | -0,05 | (0,03) | 0,03 | (0,03) |
| Poland | **2,06** | (0,35) | **0,08** | (0,02) | **0,48** | (0,21) | -0,03 | (0,05) | 0,01 | (0,04) |
| Russian Federation | **0,71** | (0,32) | **0,13** | (0,02) | 0,43 | (0,25) | 0,00 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,04) |
| Slovak Republic[2] | **0,89** | (0,39) | **0,13** | (0,02) | 0,26 | (0,28) | -0,02 | (0,03) | 0,03 | (0,05) |
| Slovenia | **2,81** | (0,45) | **0,16** | (0,03) | 0,14 | (0,27) | 0,04 | (0,04) | -0,07 | (0,04) |
| Spain | **0,91** | (0,41) | **0,14** | (0,03) | **0,63** | (0,25) | 0,02 | (0,03) | -0,03 | (0,04) |
| Sweden | **3,60** | (0,53) | **0,20** | (0,03) | **1,13** | (0,31) | 0,08 | (0,05) | -0,04 | (0,06) |
| Switzerland + | **3,63** | (0,55) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **-0,68** | (0,30) | **0,12** | (0,04) | -0,08 | (0,06) |
| Thailand + | **-0,81** | (0,29) | **0,14** | (0,02) | 0,15 | (0,14) | 0,01 | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,02) |
| ICCS average | **1,64** | (0,10) | **0,15** | (0,00) | **0,53** | (0,05) | 0,01 | (0,01) | **-0,03** | (0,01) |

Notes:
Statistically significant ($p$ <0.05) coefficient in **bold**.
( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.
Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some total may appear inconsistent.

Table 4. Student and school-level results from multilevel analysis of student attitudes towards equal rights for immigrants after controlling for school average index of socio-economic background

| | Student level | | | | | | School level (characteristics) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Country | Gender (female) | | Student perception of openness in classroom discussions | | Index of socio-economic background | | Principals' perception of issues of social tension in local comunity | | Principals' perceptions of social problems at school | | School average of socio-economic background | |
| Austria < | **3,09** | (0,55) | **0,18** | (0,03) | 0,55 | (0,36) | **0,17** | (0,03) | **-0,10** | (0,05) | 1,21 | (0,69) |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | **2,01** | (0,41) | **0,12** | (0,03) | -0,14 | (0,31) | **0,06** | (0,03) | -0,08 | (0,05) | 0,56 | (0,66) |
| Bulgaria | 0,86 | (0,38) | **0,12** | (0,03) | 0,27 | (0,30) | -0,04 | (0,03) | 0,03 | (0,03) | **1,66** | (0,37) |
| Chile | **1,18** | (0,28) | **0,15** | (0,02) | 0,45 | (0,23) | -0,05 | (0,02) | -0,02 | (0,02) | **1,04** | (0,30) |
| Chinese Taipei | **1,15** | (0,30) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **1,38** | (0,20) | 0,00 | (0,01) | -0,02 | (0,02) | **2,32** | (0,37) |
| Colombia | 0,39 | (0,32) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **0,43** | (0,19) | 0,00 | (0,02) | 0,00 | (0,02) | 0,59 | (0,31) |
| Cyprus^ < | **3,93** | (0,52) | **0,19** | (0,02) | 0,58 | (0,31) | -0,01 | (0,03) | 0,00 | (0,04) | 1,31 | (0,95) |
| Czech Republic + | **1,83** | (0,30) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **0,47** | (0,23) | -0,04 | (0,03) | 0,03 | (0,04) | **1,05** | (0,38) |
| Denmark + < | **2,61** | (0,35) | **0,13** | (0,02) | **1,13** | (0,23) | 0,03 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,04) | **2,24** | (0,83) |
| Dominican Republic < | 0,44 | (0,36) | **0,07** | (0,02) | 0,28 | (0,28) | 0,00 | (0,02) | 0,00 | (0,02) | **1,35** | (0,38) |
| England ++ < | **1,81** | (0,56) | **0,19** | (0,03) | **1,36** | (0,38) | 0,02 | (0,05) | **-0,13** | (0,06) | **2,06** | (1,04) |
| Estonia | **1,81** | (0,56) | **0,19** | (0,03) | **1,36** | (0,38) | 0,02 | (0,05) | -0,13 | (0,06) | **2,06** | (1,04) |
| Finland | **5,43** | (0,40) | **0,17** | (0,03) | **0,93** | (0,23) | 0,06 | (0,03) | -0,07 | (0,04) | **2,42** | (0,74) |
| Greece | **2,93** | (0,48) | **0,22** | (0,03) | **0,90** | (0,24) | 0,02 | (0,04) | 0,01 | (0,04) | 0,19 | (0,65) |
| Guatemala[1] | -0,57 | (0,37) | **0,13** | (0,02) | -0,02 | (0,21) | 0,07 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,02) | 0,67 | (0,34) |
| Indonesia | -0,31 | (0,24) | **0,10** | (0,01) | 0,12 | (0,16) | -0,01 | (0,01) | 0,01 | (0,02) | 0,07 | (0,28) |
| Ireland | **1,21** | (0,53) | **0,19** | (0,02) | **1,54** | (0,27) | 0,07 | (0,04) | -0,05 | (0,04) | **1,92** | (0,69) |
| Italy | 1,88 | (0,40) | **0,19** | (0,02) | **0,45** | (0,25) | 0,04 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,04) | 0,43 | (0,57) |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | **1,21** | (0,36) | **0,05** | (0,02) | **1,16** | (0,17) | -0,03 | (0,02) | 0,02 | (0,02) | 0,82 | (0,44) |
| Latvia | **0,96** | (0,37) | **0,12** | (0,03) | -0,13 | (0,29) | -0,01 | (0,05) | 0,04 | (0,04) | **-1,40** | (0,57) |
| Lithuania | **2,04** | (0,36) | **0,10** | (0,03) | **1,02** | (0,21) | 0,01 | (0,04) | -0,02 | (0,03) | **1,14** | (0,38) |
| Malta | 2,18 | (1,68) | **0,10** | (0,04) | 0,35 | (0,44) | -0,04 | (0,04) | -0,08 | (0,07) | -0,53 | (1,05) |
| Mexico | **1,21** | (0,31) | **0,16** | (0,02) | 0,30 | (0,18) | -0,01 | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,02) | **1,54** | (0,36) |
| New Zeland + < | 0,48 | (0,57) | **0,26** | (0,03) | **0,85** | (0,36) | -0,05 | (0,04) | -0,05 | (0,03) | **2,45** | (0,70) |
| Norway + < | **2,62** | (0,48) | **0,21** | (0,03) | **0,77** | (0,36) | 0,10 | (0,05) | 0,03 | (0,06) | **2,53** | (1,10) |
| Paraguay[1] < | -0,25 | (0,36) | **0,18** | (0,02) | 0,33 | (0,23) | -0,04 | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,03) | **1,33** | (0,37) |
| Poland | **2,06** | (0,35) | **0,08** | (0,02) | **0,48** | (0,21) | -0,05 | (0,05) | 0,02 | (0,04) | **1,59** | (0,50) |
| Russian Federation | **0,71** | (0,32) | **0,13** | (0,02) | 0,43 | (0,25) | -0,01 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,04) | -0,53 | (0,59) |
| Slovak Republic[2] | **0,89** | (0,39) | **0,13** | (0,02) | 0,26 | (0,28) | 0,00 | (0,04) | 0,05 | (0,05) | **1,61** | (0,52) |
| Slovenia | 2,81 | (0,45) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **0,14** | (0,27) | 0,05 | (0,04) | **-0,09** | (0,04) | 1,38 | (0,76) |
| Spain | **0,91** | (0,41) | **0,14** | (0,03) | **0,63** | (0,25) | 0,03 | (0,04) | -0,02 | (0,04) | 0,89 | (0,46) |
| Sweden | **3,60** | (0,53) | **0,20** | (0,03) | **1,13** | (0,31) | 0,08 | (0,05) | -0,03 | (0,05) | 1,45 | (1,02) |
| Switzerland + | **3,63** | (0,55) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **-0,68** | (0,30) | **0,13** | (0,04) | -0,07 | (0,06) | **1,50** | (0,65) |
| Thailand + | **-0,81** | (0,29) | **0,14** | (0,02) | 0,15 | (0,14) | 0,01 | (0,03) | 0,03 | (0,02) | **1,03** | (0,26) |
| ICCS average | **1,64** | (0,10) | **0,15** | (0,00) | **0,57** | (0,05) | **0,02** | (0,01) | **-0,02** | (0,01) | **1,18** | (0,13) |

Notes:
Statistically significant ($p$ <0.05) coefficient in **bold**.
( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

*Students' attitudes towards equal rights for all ethnic groups*

Student-level results showed a positive association between student attitudes towards equal rights for all ethnic groups and gender. This effect was statistically significant in a high proportion of the ICCS participating countries, although moderate. A stronger association emerged for Cyprus, Finland, Greece, Sweden.

Table 5. Student and school-level results from multilevel analysis of student attitudes towards equal rights for ethnic groups before controlling for school average index of socio-economic background

| | Student level | | | | | | School level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Country** | Gender (female) | | Student perception of openness in classroom discussions | | Index of socio-economic background | | Principals' percetion of issues of social tension in local comunity | | Principals' perceptions of social problems at school | |
| Austria < | **1,74** | (0,41) | **0,21** | (0,03) | **0,97** | (0,29) | **0,10** | (0,03) | -0,10 | (0,05) |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | **1,91** | (0,48) | **0,15** | (0,03) | 0,45 | (0,29) | -0,01 | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,05) |
| Bulgaria | **2,39** | (0,42) | **0,08** | (0,03) | -0,46 | (0,30) | -0,03 | (0,04) | 0,07 | (0,04) |
| Chile | **3,16** | (0,49) | **0,20** | (0,02) | **1,38** | (0,26) | -0,01 | (0,03) | 0,02 | (0,05) |
| Chinese Taipei | **1,36** | (0,30) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **0,90** | (0,18) | -0,02 | (0,02) | 0,03 | 0,03 |
| Colombia | -0,48 | (0,32) | **0,24** | (0,02) | **0,56** | (0,14) | -0,01 | (0,03) | -0,03 | (0,02) |
| Cyprus^ < | **3,16** | (0,49) | **0,20** | (0,02) | **1,38** | (0,26) | -0,01 | (0,03) | 0,02 | (0,05) |
| Czech Republic + | **1,37** | (0,29) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **0,73** | (0,23) | -0,03 | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,04) |
| Denmark + < | **2,74** | (0,39) | **0,20** | (0,02) | **1,51** | (0,23) | 0,05 | (0,04) | **-0,10** | (0,05) |
| Dominican Republic < | -0,45 | (0,34) | **0,13** | (0,02) | -0,12 | (0,21) | -0,01 | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,02) |
| England ++ < | **2,21** | (0,59) | **0,23** | (0,03) | **1,67** | (0,31) | -0,05 | (0,06) | **-0,23** | (0,07) |
| Estonia | **2,10** | (0,42) | **0,15** | (0,03) | **0,79** | (0,26) | **-0,12** | (0,04) | 0,00 | (0,04) |
| Finland | **5,32** | (0,37) | **0,22** | (0,03) | **1,50** | (0,24) | 0,02 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,04) |
| Greece | **3,03** | (0,45) | **0,21** | (0,03) | **1,12** | (0,23) | 0,00 | (0,05) | 0,04 | (0,04) |
| Guatemala[1] | 0,50 | (0,37) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **0,44** | (0,22) | **0,13** | (0,03) | **-0,03** | (0,01) |
| Indonesia | 0,40 | (0,26) | **0,14** | (0,01) | **0,47** | (0,17) | -0,02 | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,03) |
| Ireland | **1,33** | (0,58) | **0,21** | (0,02) | **1,58** | (0,27) | -0,03 | (0,05) | -0,06 | (0,05) |
| Italy | **1,07** | (0,36) | **0,21** | (0,02) | **1,10** | (0,24) | -0,01 | (0,03) | 0,00 | (0,03) |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | **1,79** | (0,43) | **0,07** | (0,02) | **1,54** | (0,21) | -0,01 | (0,02) | -0,06 | (0,03) |
| Latvia | 0,61 | (0,42) | **0,14** | (0,03) | 0,15 | (0,24) | -0,07 | (0,05) | 0,05 | (0,04) |
| Lithuania | **2,06** | (0,36) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **1,21** | (0,23) | 0,01 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,03) |
| Malta | 1,69 | (1,51) | **0,14** | (0,03) | 0,30 | (0,26) | -0,02 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,06) |
| Mexico | 0,46 | (0,27) | **0,20** | (0,01) | **0,55** | (0,16) | -0,11 | (0,03) | **0,02** | (0,02) |
| New Zeland + < | **2,35** | (0,62) | **0,25** | (0,03) | **1,44** | (0,31) | -0,05 | (0,05) | -0,10 | (0,06) |
| Norway + < | **2,65** | (0,47) | **0,22** | (0,03) | **1,79** | (0,33) | 0,02 | (0,04) | 0,02 | (0,05) |
| Paraguay[1] < | 0,20 | (0,40) | **0,18** | (0,02) | 0,07 | (0,21) | -0,07 | (0,04) | 0,04 | (0,03) |
| Poland | **1,89** | (0,37) | **0,13** | (0,02) | **1,32** | (0,23) | -0,02 | (0,05) | 0,00 | (0,04) |
| Russian Federation | 0,11 | (0,33) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **0,69** | (0,23) | -0,02 | (0,03) | -0,03 | (0,04) |
| Slovak Republic[2] | **1,42** | (0,45) | **0,23** | (0,03) | **0,63** | (0,24) | -0,04 | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,05) |
| Slovenia | **2,33** | (0,43) | **0,14** | (0,03) | **1,06** | (0,26) | 0,03 | (0,03) | -0,03 | (0,04) |
| Spain | **1,31** | (0,37) | **0,17** | (0,02) | **1,22** | (0,23) | -0,01 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,03) |
| Sweden | **3,46** | (0,41) | **0,29** | (0,03) | **1,84** | (0,29) | 0,04 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,05) |
| Switzerland + | **1,96** | (0,46) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **1,14** | (0,40) | -0,04 | (0,05) | -0,08 | (0,06) |
| Thailand + | -0,21 | (0,34) | **0,21** | (0,02) | **0,34** | (0,15) | -0,05 | (0,05) | 0,00 | (0,05) |
| ICCS average | **1,68** | (0,09) | **0,18** | (0,00) | **0,92** | (0,05) | -0,01 | (0,01) | **-0,02** | (0,01) |

Notes:
Statistically significant ($p$ <0.05) coefficient in **bold**.
( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

Student perceptions of openness in classroom discussion showed a statistically significant positive association for nearly all the ICCS participating countries. Nevertheless its effects were fairly moderate or even negligible.
Student index of socio-economic background showed a significant positive association in most countries, but its effects were fairly moderate, if not negligible.

Table 6. Student and school-level results from multilevel analysis of student attitudes towards equal rights for ethnic groups after controlling for school average index of socio-economic background

| | Student level | | | | | | School level (characteristics) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Country | Gender (female) | | Student perception of openness in classroom discussions | | Index of socio-economic background | | Principals' perception of issues of social tension in local comunity | | Principals' perceptions of social problems at school | | School average of socio-economic background | |
| Austria < | **1,74** | (0,41) | **0,21** | (0,03) | **0,97** | (0,29) | **0,09** | (0,03) | **-0,10** | (0,04) | **2,91** | (0,41) |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | **1,91** | (0,48) | **0,15** | (0,03) | 0,45 | (0,29) | 0,01 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,05) | 1,32 | (0,77) |
| Bulgaria | **2,39** | (0,42) | **0,08** | (0,03) | -0,46 | (0,30) | -0,04 | (0,04) | 0,07 | (0,04) | -0,33 | (0,43) |
| Chile | **1,57** | (0,38) | **0,17** | (0,02) | **0,78** | (0,25) | -0,05 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,02) | 1,37 | (0,27) |
| Chinese Taipei | **1,36** | (0,30) | **0,14** | (0,02) | **0,90** | (0,18) | 0,00 | (0,02) | 0,02 | (0,03) | **1,75** | **0,36** |
| Colombia | -0,48 | (0,32) | **0,24** | (0,02) | **0,56** | (0,14) | 0,00 | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,02) | **1,62** | (0,35) |
| Cyprus^ < | **3,16** | (0,49) | **0,20** | (0,02) | **1,38** | (0,26) | -0,02 | (0,04) | 0,03 | (0,05) | 1,75 | (1,11) |
| Czech Republic + | **1,37** | (0,29) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **0,73** | (0,23) | -0,04 | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,04) | **1,47** | (0,52) |
| Denmark + < | **2,74** | (0,39) | **0,20** | (0,02) | **1,51** | (0,23) | 0,07 | (0,04) | -0,08 | (0,04) | **2,65** | (0,92) |
| Dominican Republic < | -0,45 | (0,34) | **0,13** | (0,02) | -0,12 | (0,21) | 0,00 | (0,03) | -0,01 | (0,02) | 0,67 | (0,43) |
| England ++ < | **2,21** | (0,59) | **0,23** | (0,03) | **1,67** | (0,31) | 0,02 | (0,05) | -0,16 | (0,08) | **2,89** | (1,18) |
| Estonia | **0,02** | (0,56) | **0,02** | (0,73) | **0,02** | -(0,12) | 0,03 | (0,45) | 0,03 | -(0,46) | **0,02** | (0,78) |
| Finland | **5,32** | (0,37) | **0,22** | (0,03) | **1,50** | (0,24) | 0,03 | (0,03) | -0,07 | (0,04) | **3,24** | (0,80) |
| Greece | **3,03** | (0,45) | **0,21** | (0,03) | **1,12** | (0,23) | 0,00 | (0,05) | 0,04 | (0,04) | 0,64 | (0,71) |
| Guatemala[1] | 0,50 | (0,37) | **0,15** | (0,02) | **0,44** | (0,22) | **0,11** | (0,03) | **-0,05** | (0,02) | **1,70** | (0,29) |
| Indonesia | 0,40 | (0,26) | **0,14** | (0,01) | **0,47** | (0,17) | -0,01 | (0,02) | -0,02 | (0,03) | **1,71** | (0,48) |
| Ireland | **1,33** | (0,58) | **0,21** | (0,02) | **1,58** | (0,27) | 0,04 | (0,05) | -0,04 | (0,05) | **3,38** | (0,66) |
| Italy | **1,07** | (0,36) | **0,21** | (0,02) | **1,10** | (0,24) | 0,01 | (0,03) | 0,01 | (0,03) | **1,04** | (0,50) |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | **1,79** | (0,43) | **0,07** | (0,02) | **1,54** | (0,21) | 0,00 | (0,02) | -0,06 | (0,03) | 0,48 | (0,54) |
| Latvia | 0,61 | (0,42) | **0,14** | (0,03) | 0,15 | (0,24) | -0,07 | (0,05) | 0,06 | (0,03) | -0,22 | (0,69) |
| Lithuania | **2,06** | (0,36) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **1,21** | (0,23) | 0,05 | (0,03) | -0,03 | (0,03) | **1,66** | (0,40) |
| Malta | 1,69 | (1,51) | **0,14** | (0,03) | 0,30 | (0,26) | -0,01 | (0,03) | -0,03 | (0,06) | 1,14 | (0,80) |
| Mexico | 0,46 | (0,27) | **0,20** | (0,01) | **0,55** | (0,16) | -0,03 | (0,03) | 0,00 | (0,02) | **2,44** | (0,27) |
| New Zeland + < | **2,36** | (0,62) | **0,25** | (0,03) | **1,44** | (0,31) | 0,01 | (0,05) | -0,07 | (0,05) | **3,68** | (0,72) |
| Norway + < | **2,65** | (0,47) | **0,22** | (0,03) | **1,79** | (0,33) | 0,05 | (0,04) | 0,03 | (0,05) | **3,55** | (0,92) |
| Paraguay[1] < | 0,20 | (0,40) | **0,18** | (0,02) | 0,07 | (0,21) | -0,06 | (0,03) | 0,02 | (0,03) | **1,49** | (0,34) |
| Poland | **1,89** | (0,37) | **0,13** | (0,02) | **1,32** | (0,23) | -0,04 | (0,05) | 0,01 | (0,04) | **1,80** | (0,61) |
| Russian Federation | 0,11 | (0,33) | **0,16** | (0,02) | **0,69** | (0,23) | -0,01 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,04) | 0,74 | (0,54) |
| Slovak Republic[2] | **1,42** | (0,45) | **0,23** | (0,03) | **0,63** | (0,24) | -0,01 | (0,03) | 0,04 | (0,05) | **2,20** | (0,49) |
| Slovenia | **2,33** | (0,43) | **0,14** | (0,03) | **1,06** | (0,26) | 0,04 | (0,03) | -0,04 | (0,05) | 0,65 | (0,77) |
| Spain | **1,31** | (0,37) | **0,17** | (0,02) | **1,22** | (0,23) | 0,01 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,03) | **1,47** | (0,40) |
| Sweden | **3,46** | (0,41) | **0,29** | (0,03) | **1,84** | (0,29) | 0,04 | (0,03) | -0,02 | (0,04) | **3,11** | (0,85) |
| Switzerland + | **1,96** | (0,46) | **0,16** | (0,03) | **1,14** | (0,40) | 0,00 | (0,04) | -0,05 | (0,05) | **3,24** | (0,56) |
| Thailand + | -0,21 | (0,34) | **0,21** | (0,02) | 0,34 | (0,15) | -0,03 | (0,04) | 0,03 | (0,03) | **2,99** | (0,39) |
| ICCS average | **1,57** | (0,09) | **0,17** | (0,02) | **0,88** | (0,05) | 0,01 | (0,02) | -0,02 | (0,02) | **1,77** | (0,12) |

Notes:
Statistically significant ($p$ <0.05) coefficient in **bold**.
( ) Standard errors appear in parentheses.
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.

As shown in table 5, no associations could be found between the two variables at the school level and student attitudes towards equal rights for all ethnic groups. Their effects were negligible, even when found in minorities of countries.

A weak association emerged between school average of socio-economic background and student attitudes towards equal rights only in a minority of countries (see table 6).

**Discussion**

The results of the analysis presented in this paper show that, at the student level, the effects of gender are statistically significant, although moderate, in majorities of the ICCS participating countries in relation to the three attitudes identified in the models as dependent variables.
Similar results emerged as for the effects on student knowledge.

The effect of student perception of openness in classroom discussions was found to be weaker (and with major differences between the ICCS countries). Although associations with the three measured attitudes are statistically significant in most countries, its effect is fairly moderate.
As for the student socio-economic background, its association with the selected attitudes appears weaker, if not absent, for a number of the other ICCS participating countries.
This result seems to confirm that attitudes towards different ethnic/racial groups are not directly related to individual social and cultural background, but they are rather related to the characteristics of contexts in which students live (Card, Dustman, Preston, 2005).

Results concerning community and school variables seem to indicate that they are largely intertwined with the school average index of socio-economic background: it is likely that schools with a lower level of the index of socio-economic background coincide with those schools that are located in less well-resourced and more problem-prone contexts (e.g. issues of social problems surveyed in ICCS). [7]
It should also be considered that the incidence of ethnic or racial issues in the local community is most likely connected to the presence of students from different ethnic groups or immigrant students at school. In this cases students will be likely to be highly supportive of equal rights for ethnic or racial groups and immigrants

Results clearly indicate the need for further investigation relating primarily to the extension of the model, for example, by adding among the predictors, student civic knowledge variables.
Analyses at an aggregate school-level will better highlight differences between schools within each individual country and will allow us to take account of the differences exiting within countries.
Such analyses may also include (at least for the countries meeting ICCS sample requirements for teachers) the variables investigated through the teacher questionnaire but not considered in the analyses presented here.

[7] Statistically significant correlations between the considered variables were found in most ICCS countries.

Table A1. Total and explained variance in the student attitudes towards gender

| Country | Variance Without Controls | | | | % of Variance Explained by Model | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total variance | % of variance between schools | Within schools | Between schools | Within schools | Between schools |
| Austria < | 108 | 7 | 101 | 7 | 20 | 25 |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | 95 | 8 | 88 | 8 | 12 | 41 |
| Bulgaria | 80 | 13 | 69 | 10 | 11 | 55 |
| Chile | 91 | 13 | 80 | 12 | 11 | 51 |
| Chinese Taipei | 90 | 3 | 87 | 3 | 14 | 20 |
| Colombia | 77 | 12 | 68 | 9 | 6 | 48 |
| Cyprus^ < | 111 | 1 | 110 | 1 | 28 | 0 |
| Czech Republic + | 79 | 6 | 74 | 4 | 11 | 49 |
| Denmark + < | 95 | 4 | 91 | 4 | 18 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic < | 57 | 8 | 52 | 4 | 6 | 56 |
| England ++ < | 100 | 7 | 93 | 7 | 15 | 21 |
| Estonia | 74 | 9 | 67 | 7 | 9 | 33 |
| Finland | 101 | 3 | 98 | 3 | 27 | 0 |
| Greece | 118 | 4 | 113 | 5 | 24 | 0 |
| Guatemala[1] | 75 | 16 | 63 | 12 | 8 | 61 |
| Indonesia | 38 | 12 | 34 | 4 | 6 | 13 |
| Ireland | 100 | 14 | 86 | 14 | 13 | 26 |
| Italy | 92 | 5 | 88 | 4 | 19 | 23 |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | 77 | 5 | 73 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| Latvia | 70 | 6 | 66 | 4 | 9 | 30 |
| Lithuania | 80 | 6 | 75 | 5 | 12 | 34 |
| Malta | 101 | 29 | 72 | 29 | 1 | 20 |
| Mexico | 43 | 6 | 41 | 3 | 9 | 37 |
| New Zeland + < | 106 | 19 | 86 | 20 | 10 | 45 |
| Norway + < | 104 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 17 | 23 |
| Paraguay[1] < | 77 | 10 | 70 | 8 | 9 | 67 |
| Poland | 86 | 6 | 81 | 5 | 17 | 10 |
| Russian Federation | 48 | 6 | 45 | 3 | 9 | 35 |
| Slovak Republic[2] | 74 | 7 | 69 | 5 | 10 | 71 |
| Slovenia | 112 | 4 | 107 | 5 | 22 | 0 |
| Spain | 95 | 7 | 88 | 7 | 9 | 49 |
| Sweden | 103 | 3 | 101 | 3 | 19 | 5 |
| Switzerland + | 102 | 7 | 95 | 7 | 14 | 43 |
| Thailand + | 42 | 16 | 35 | 7 | 5 | 45 |
| ICCS average | 85 | 8 | 78 | 7 | 13 | 30 |

Notes:
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.
Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some total may appear inconsistent.

Table A2. Total and explained variance in the student attitudes towards immigrant

| Country | Variance Without Controls | | | | % of Variance Explained by Model | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total variance | % of variance between schools | Within schools | Between schools | Within schools | Between schools |
| Austria < | 121 | 7 | 112 | 8 | 5 | 24 |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | 79 | 7 | 73 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| Bulgaria | 93 | 4 | 90 | 4 | 2 | 39 |
| Chile | 90 | 4 | 87 | 3 | 3 | 23 |
| Chinese Taipei | 96 | 1 | 94 | 1 | 5 | 62 |
| Colombia | 84 | 2 | 82 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Cyprus^ < | 117 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Czech Republic + | 75 | 3 | 72 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Denmark + < | 83 | 7 | 77 | 6 | 5 | 7 |
| Dominican Republic | 92 | 1 | 91 | 1 | 1 | 15 |
| England ++ < | 116 | 10 | 104 | 12 | 5 | 12 |
| Estonia | 72 | 8 | 66 | 6 | -13 | 72 |
| Finland | 97 | 5 | 93 | 5 | 11 | 4 |
| Greece | 106 | 3 | 102 | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| Guatemala[1] | 87 | 2 | 86 | 2 | 2 | 23 |
| Indonesia | 43 | 1 | 42 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Ireland | 104 | 4 | 99 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| Italy | 89 | 9 | 81 | 8 | 5 | 0 |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | 77 | 1 | 76 | 1 | 2 | 20 |
| Latvia | 67 | 6 | 63 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Lithuania | 74 | 3 | 72 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Malta | 108 | 8 | 100 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Mexico | 100 | 4 | 95 | 4 | 3 | 19 |
| New Zeland + < | 107 | 5 | 101 | 5 | 7 | 32 |
| Norway + < | 119 | 6 | 112 | 7 | 6 | 3 |
| Paraguay[1] < | 76 | 4 | 73 | 3 | 3 | 21 |
| Poland | 76 | 5 | 72 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| Russian Federation | 79 | 5 | 75 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Slovak Republic[2] | 69 | 5 | 66 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| Slovenia | 102 | 4 | 97 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| Spain | 111 | 6 | 104 | 7 | 2 | 0 |
| Sweden | 141 | 12 | 124 | 17 | 7 | 0 |
| Switzerland + | 108 | 5 | 102 | 5 | 6 | 16 |
| Thailand + | 55 | 2 | 54 | 1 | 2 | 15 |
| ICCS average | 92 | 5 | 87 | 5 | 3 | 13 |

Notes:
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.
Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some total may appear inconsistent.

Table A3. Total and explained variance in the student attitudes towards immigrant

| Country | Variance Without Controls | | | | % of Variance Explained by Model | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total variance | % of variance between schools | Within schools | Between schools | Within schools | Between schools |
| Austria < | 101 | 4 | 97 | 4 | 6 | 58 |
| Belgium (Flemish) + | 86 | 4 | 82 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Bulgaria | 111 | 3 | 107 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Chile | 89 | 6 | 84 | 6 | 0 | 46 |
| Chinese Taipei | 83 | 2 | 81 | 2 | 4 | 28 |
| Colombia | 80 | 5 | 76 | 4 | 6 | 26 |
| Cyprus^ < | 111 | 2 | 109 | 3 | 9 | 0 |
| Czech Republic + | 79 | 3 | 76 | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| Denmark + < | 101 | 9 | 92 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| Dominican Republic < | 78 | 2 | 76 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| England ++ < | 125 | 12 | 110 | 15 | 8 | 20 |
| Estonia | 80 | 3 | 78 | 2 | 4 | 34 |
| Finland | 100 | 3 | 97 | 4 | 13 | 18 |
| Greece | 102 | 4 | 97 | 5 | 8 | 0 |
| Guatemala[1] | 73 | 5 | 69 | 4 | 3 | 46 |
| Indonesia | 56 | 7 | 53 | 4 | 3 | 18 |
| Ireland | 114 | 6 | 106 | 7 | 7 | 24 |
| Italy | 85 | 6 | 79 | 5 | 6 | 0 |
| Korea, Republic of[1] | 105 | 2 | 103 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Latvia | 64 | 5 | 61 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Lithuania | 82 | 2 | 80 | 2 | 5 | 16 |
| Malta | 92 | 5 | 87 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Mexico | 88 | 6 | 82 | 5 | 5 | 49 |
| New Zeland + < | 111 | 7 | 103 | 8 | 8 | 28 |
| Norway + < | 108 | 4 | 104 | 4 | 9 | 13 |
| Paraguay[1] < | 69 | 5 | 65 | 3 | 3 | 29 |
| Poland | 88 | 6 | 82 | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Russian Federation | 82 | 6 | 77 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Slovak Republic[2] | 86 | 4 | 83 | 3 | 5 | 22 |
| Slovenia | 91 | 2 | 89 | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| Spain | 100 | 5 | 95 | 5 | 4 | 11 |
| Sweden | 123 | 6 | 116 | 7 | 12 | 10 |
| Switzerland + | 97 | 6 | 91 | 6 | 4 | 56 |
| Thailand + | 72 | 8 | 66 | 6 | 4 | 55 |
| ICCS average | 92 | 5 | 87 | 5 | 5 | 19 |

Notes:
+ Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
++ Nearly satisfied guidelines for sample participation only after replacement schools were included.
< The percentage of cases included in the analysis was below 85 percent.
^ School census data with two classrooms per school.
[1] Country surveyed the same cohort of students but at the beginning of the next school year.
[2] National Desired Population does not cover all of International Desired Population.
Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some total may appear inconsistent.

**References**


Amadeo, J., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., & Nikolova, R. (2002). *Civic knowledge and engagement: An IEA study of upper secondary students in sixteen countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Birzea, C., Kerr, D., Mikkelsen, R., Pol, M., Froumin, I., Losito, B., & Sardoc, M. (2004). *All-European Study on Education for Democratic Citizenship Policies*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Card, D., Dustmann, C., Preston, I. (2005). Understanding attitudes to immigration: The migration and minority module of the first European Social Survey. Discussion Paper Series 03/05. London: Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration (CReAM).

Cox, C., Jaramillo, R. & Reimers, F. (2005). *Education for Citizenship and Democracy in the Americas: An Agenda for Action.* Washington D. C.: Inter-American Development Bank.

EURYDICE (2005). *Citizenship Education at School in Europe.* Brussels: EURYDICE.

Hanushek, E.A. (1994). Money might matter somewhere: A response to Hedges, Laine, & Greenwald. Educational Researcher, 23, 5-8.

Husfeldt, V. (2006). Extreme Negative Attitudes Towards Immigrants: An Analysis of actors in Five Countires. Prospects, Vol. 36, 3, 355-374.

Reezigt, Gerry J. & Creemers, Bert P. M. (2005). A comprehensive framework for effective school improvement. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16:4, 407- 424.

Scheerens, J. (1990). School effectiveness and the development of process indicators of school functioning. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 1, 61-80.

Schereens, J., Glas, C., S. Thomas M. (2003).*Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Monitoring. A systemic Approach.* London and New York: Taylor and Francis.

Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B., Kerr, D. (2008). *International Civic and Citizenship Education Study: Assessment Framework.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Kerr, D., Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38 countries*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Torney, J. V., Oppenheim, A. N., & Farnen, R. F. (1975). *Civic education in ten countries: An empirical study*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Torney-Purta, J., Barber, C., & Wilkenfeld, B. (2007). Latino Adolescents' Civic Development in the United States: Research Results from the IEA Civic Education Study. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36(2), 111-125.

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

Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J. A. (1999). *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four case studies from the IEA Civic Education Project.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).