

Tatjana Zimenkova

Citizenship Through Faith and Feelings: Defining Citizenship in Citizenship Education. An Exemplary Textbook Analysis

Abstract

This article describes the specifics of the definition of citizenship in citizenship education (CE). The ambiguity of understanding citizenship between status and active position is indicated and differentiated, and perceptions of citizenship activity are revealed. The author proposes to build a typology of citizenship conceptions in CE, suggesting an analytical instrument for typology building (types of attitudes, reflected in and crucial for each conception of citizenship). Citizenship conceptions from two Russian textbooks are analysed in order to show reconstruction of their implicit meanings. A proposed analytical instrument for the typology building is applied to the reconstructed citizenship conceptions. The author proposes a demonstrated manner of analysis and typologisation as instruments for international studies on citizenship education.

Contents

Introduction

1. Citizenship category: specific thought challenges for theoretical thought in CE
2. Textbook Analysis
 - 2.1. Expected outcomes of the Textbook. Self-Definition in the Introduction
 - 2.2. Construction of the citizenship category in the body of the textbook
Citizenship and law
 - 2.3. Citizenship category in the Glossary
 - 2.4. Material for comparison
3. Application of research analysis to the current development of CE in Russia
4. Typologisation of citizenship conceptions and further research perspectives

Keywords

Citizenship Education, Citizenship as Category, Textbook analysis

Introduction

How do young people become active and participating citizens? What role does school education play in this process? Which conceptions of citizenship and participation do young citizens internalise during schooling, and what kind of activities are they likely to see as their right and duties?

The discussion on the theoretical problems of a definition of citizenship⁴² in social sciences and in education contexts mostly ends in a question, namely – whether

⁴² I am very thankful to my colleagues Reinhold Hedtke and Thorsten Hippe for long and fruitful discussions; and to Oxana Karpenko for some essential ideas on citizenship conceptions in Russia and especially in Russian textbooks, see also Karpenko (2008, in this volume).

citizenship should be defined by the citizens' status or active position. This question is important not only in theoretical thought, but even more so in educational praxis. Certainly, these two possibilities – citizenship as status or as an active position – are not exclusive; they are to be seen as two possible opposite poles of the citizenship definition. The decision however, whether citizenship conception leans more on the status (and correspondingly on the fulfilment of rights and duties) or on active position (and correspondingly on the providing of students' active participation in the society, even if they are not formally citizens of the country) is essential for understanding the implications of different forms and conceptions of citizenship education.

Many international and national actors of citizenship education have recognised the potential of citizenship education for the provision of young citizens with concepts of their role in society; patterns of participation for co-designing, opposing or supporting the state and strengthening or weakening some of states' essential structures and instruments. Stating the necessity of active citizens' education and different citizenship education CE actors⁴³ apparently do not mean the same, as when they address "active citizen". So how can we detect the meaning of the conceptions of citizenship in each given context?

Detecting this special meaning of citizenship is especially important for all kinds of (comparative) studies on the CE. In order to make (international) comparisons possible, we have to describe the meaning of the conceptions in each given context and then develop an instrument for the systematisation of these conceptions of citizenship. This article seeks to take the first step in this direction by answering the question: *How can the specific meaning of citizenship conception be detected in any given context?* Furthermore, this essay suggests a frame for systematisation of the conceptions of citizenship, and thus establishes a basis for the future research. Finally, the article gives an exemplary definition of citizen as a first step towards typology.

The article is divided into 4 sections. In section (1) we suggest controversy pairs of attitudes, reflected in and crucial for each conception of citizenship. Each pair of attitudes builds a continuum, within which each type of citizenship is defined within CE. In section (2) we demonstrate how citizenship conceptions can be reconstructed by example of Russian textbooks. This section suggests a method of critical analysis of CE conceptions. In section (3) we briefly apply the results of our analysis on the current Russian political and media citizenship debate, and thus establish links between citizenship conceptions both in the textbooks chosen and those within the broader societal context. It is clear that the citizenship conceptions in textbooks do not emerge from nowhere; it is also obvious that we cannot "distil" the citizenship conceptions which emerge from the textbooks and those perceived from family communication, media and political discourse (cf. Krek at all 2006, 6 ff). It is especially important to prove the relevancy of the detected citizenship conceptions against the background of the broader societal debate. Finally, in section (4) we put together the results of our analysis of citizenship conceptions and revise the pairs of attitudes. We show the validity of these pairs for typology building. In the conclusion we suggest a first type of citizen for a future typology.

⁴³ e.g. international actors like the European Commission (COM 2005, 7); the Council of Europe (CoE 2003, 6-8), the national governmental project like German "Live and Learn Democracy" (<http://www.blk-demokratie.de/>), or NGOs like "Nashi" in Russia (<http://www.nashi.su/ideology>)

1. Citizenship category: specific challenges for theoretical thought and CE

Different conceptions of citizenship, which stem from different scientific discourses and disciplines (however heterogeneous within each discipline as well, e.g. Mackert/Müller 2000, 19 ff.), are hardly compatible with one another. Not to mention the terms created for large scale quantitative research (Holford/Patulny/Sturgis 2006), those relevant for the different educational programmes, or those used in the political discourses on civic education.

The fundamental tension in the definition of citizenship (Barber 1984, 155 vs. Giddens 2001, 684; see also Mackert/Müller 2000, 16 and Turner 2000, 251 ff. etc.) relevant on the level of theory and crucial regarding its usage in education contexts is:

- a) Whether citizenship is to be understood as a legal *status* (formal belonging to the state, including rights and duties)
- b) Or whether there are differences between being a *formal* citizen (in a sense of the formal belonging to a state, but not necessarily *acting*) and being a citizen consciously, being an active citizen, in other words; whether *active participation* is to be understood as a central feature of citizenship, where citizenship is based on conscious *activity*.

None of these two dimensions of citizenship (status vs. conscious activity) can reasonably be excluded; the examination of citizenship – and hence the education of citizens – must embrace both dimensions. Formal criteria of citizenship are essentially relevant for the political rights of the persons. The informal criteria, accentuating the active role of the citizen, are essential in order to grasp the citizenship as active co-designing of the society, and to grasp citizenship beyond the borders of the national state (global citizenship (Falk 1994), to grasp citizenship within supranational political formations (cf. EU, NIS), and to grasp special forms of citizenship e.g. ecological citizenship (Steenbergen 1994). etc.). Furthermore, a direct link between citizenship and participation establishes strong interdependence between citizenship and democracy (Ichilov 1998; Habermas 1994; Barber 1984).

The necessity to define citizenship as something more than a political status, especially in the context of citizenship education (CE), can be illustrated in the example of a classroom setting, where many of the schoolchildren are non-citizens of the country⁴⁴. Migration and globalisation challenge the organised field of the CE in a very special way and bring about the intrinsic motivation to position citizenship not exceptionally as a political and legal status, but as an active position, possibly beyond the national state borders and belongings. This motivation corresponds to the existing international frame of citizenship education (CE) and participatory citizenship education (PaCE), shared and promoted by international political and education agencies within CoE, EU, UNESCO, etc. (e.g. Amadeo et al. 2002, 105-172; Krek et al. 2006 ; Salema 2006 ; Hoskins 2006 ; Eurydice 2005).

Given the tension of “citizenship as status” vs. “citizenship as active position”, empirical studies and educational programs, if they have to grasp citizenship in the educational contexts or to contribute to the CE, define a *sub-term of citizenship, in which this tension is explicated*. As examples of such definitions we can refer to “active

⁴⁴ The description of some special challenges of the CE and for example the commemoration work within the CE with regard to migration in the cases of Germany, see Brumlik 1997 and Bergmeier 2000.

citizenship” (Hoskins 2006) and “responsible citizenship” (Eurydice 2005). Such conceptions aim at (re-) definition of the citizenship term. On the one hand they narrow this term down, while binding it to certain types of activities, but on the other hand they widen the citizenship term, while detaching it from formal belonging. Formal dimensions of citizenship, like nationality/belonging to the union of the states, are however not definitely excluded from these sub-definitions.

Both dimensions of citizenship then seem to be – at least theoretically – compatible, in the practice of citizenship theories and citizenship education there is usually a clear focus on one of the two dimensions. If the status dimension of citizenship seems to be essential in order to produce its exclusivity, the active and participatory dimension of citizenship is essential to underline the democratic character of citizenship, and to integrate citizenship as a conception into such processes as globalisation and migration. The implied conflict of belongings – especially explicit in the context of globalisation and migration – illustrates the basic tension of these two dimensions of citizenship, which seems to be conquerable through conceptions which explicate this tension – like “active citizenship”. We argue however, that in spite of the seemingly logical compatibility of these two dimensions, the conceptions of CE tend to – if we see it as a continuum of possibilities – found the citizenship definition either on a status or on an active position, and furthermore to define the types and borders of the possible citizens’ activities. We believe that this decision, as made in each CE-conception, is central in order to understand how the CE-conception constructs citizenship, and what kind of citizens are aimed at as a goal of this educational concept.

Educational programmes and conceptions (as e.g. Council of Europe on its pages dedicated to the Education for Democratic citizenship⁴⁵) work with the active dimension of citizenship; however, it is not always clear what is beyond the conception of active citizenship, and how active or responsible citizenship can be operationalised in and instrumentalised for the educational programmes. This results in a broad range of interpretations, which are partly irritating (as for e.g. is understood by participating schools in the German project “Live and Learn Democracy”⁴⁶) and partly even in opposition to the idea of citizenship as political office and basis for democratic co-development of the society⁴⁷ (as it will be shown later in this article on the basis of Russian Textbooks).

Definitions used in the European context of the CE seek to determine a common (European) international frame for citizenship education. Introducing the active term of citizenship, they focus on participation, which serves as indicator for citizens’ activity. For example, the CRELL research project on “Active Citizenship for Democracy”⁴⁸ uses the following definition⁴⁹:

Active citizenship: Participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterised by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy (Hoskins 2006, 2)

⁴⁵ http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/What_is_EDC/GlossaryKeyTerms_en.asp#P207_8117 – visited 1.04.08

⁴⁶ See examples of different understandings of active democratic learning by participating schools in Frank (2004) and especially the example from Baden-Württemberg (pp. 12-14) and from Hamburg (pp. 22-25).

⁴⁷ A rather consensual concept, based for example on Barber 1984; Walzer 1992; van Gunsteren 1994; etc.

⁴⁸ <http://crell.jrc.ec.europa.eu/> – visited 12.12.2007

⁴⁹ This preliminary definition was finally taken over by the CRELL (Mascherini/ Saltelli/Vidoni 2007).

This definition pictures a peaceful civil society in which an active citizen is supposed to undertake her⁵⁰ role, taking part in common life within the given frame of the human rights and democracy. With some brief analysis we can say that the tension “citizenship as status vs. citizenship as active position/participation” appears in this definition as follows: a) the definition does not restrict citizenship to the national state, and sees action (participation) as a necessary component of citizenship. Formal status alone does not suffice. However, this definition does not exclude the possibility of restricting it to the national state context. b) The definition puts an active participation on the focus of citizenship. At the same time the idea of participation is not defined through activity, but merely through the restrictions that this participation underlies. No clear differentiation between an active and passive citizenship is possible, according to this definition, and c) the actions, referred to in this definition, do not encompass possible actions of critical interfering.

Education network on education in Europe⁵¹ works on its study of Citizenship Education at School in Europe (Eurydice 2005) with the following definition:

“As a starting point, a ‘citizen’ may be regarded as a person coexisting in a society. In recent decades, societies have changed and, with them, the theoretical conceptions and practical implementation of citizenship. The concept is steadily broadening and changing, as lifestyles and patterns in our relations with others become more diversified. Far from being limited to the national context, the notion of harmonious coexistence among citizens relates to the concept of a community embracing all contexts – local, regional, national and international – in which individuals live.

The notion of ‘responsible citizenship’ raises issues concerned with awareness and knowledge of rights and duties. It is also closely related to civic values such as democracy and human rights, equality, participation, partnership, social cohesion, solidarity, tolerance of diversity and social justice. The concept of ‘responsible citizenship’ is now increasingly widespread, particularly in that a series of relevant recommendations and resolutions promoting the issue have been adopted by the member states of the Council of Europe. The European Commission has also published White Papers and studies on the issue, as a result of which it has become a priority area for many European countries.” (Eurydice 2005, 10)

The main feature of this definition, relevant for our considerations, is “responsibility”. This term is used here in order to constrain (defining direction of responsible citizen’s action) or to broaden (detaching it from the national context) the citizen role in the maintenance of harmonious coexistence. A continuum between “citizenship as status” vs. “citizenship as responsibility” is handled in this definition in the following way:

- a) A difference between citizenship as (passive/non-responsible/non-reflective) *coexisting* and *responsible* citizenship is made. The first position refers merely to the citizenship as a status, and a citizen as an individual profiting from living in harmonious relations with others. The second form of citizenship is supposed to accent the responsible role in maintaining/achieving this harmonious condition, and

⁵⁰ For the gender equality and in order to balance the Russian textbook texts analysed later (in Russian no gender equality on the language level is established yet), as well as due to a long history of women’s exclusion from citizenship we will use the female form throughout the article. All citizens, both male and female, are meant here.

⁵¹ <http://www.eurydice.org/> – visited 2.01.08

- b) The form and realisation of responsibility however is not operationalised. The information about the own rights and duties puts citizenship in a somehow formalised context, and makes the *fulfilment of duties* a part of the responsibility. An active reflection of the adequacy of existing societal structures and possibilities for co-designing them, as well as critical reasoning, are not addressed. Responsible citizenship appears as a co-existence of well-informed individuals, ready to fulfil their duties and to profit from their rights in the context of the harmonious civil society, undertaking (if any) actions, to secure the harmony in the society at all levels.

The idea of responsible/active citizenship refers to the development of new generations of citizens, responsible for the co-development of their environment in political, social, ecological, etc. spheres (COM 2005, 7; CoE 2003, 6-8; etc.). The common denominator of the majority of such definitions in European and other western international contexts (Hoskins 2006; Eurydice 2005; COE 2008⁵², Abs/Veldhuis 2006; EUYOUPART 2005; Holford/Patulny/Sturgis 2006; Hoskins 2006; Ogris/ Westphal 2006; Weerd/Gemmeke/Rigter/Rij 2005) is a citizen, not only well-informed about the own rights and duties and fulfilling them, but supporting the development of society in a democratic direction.

The intention to educate active citizens manifests a tendency to (partly) re-delegate (or voluntary alienate) state power back to citizens, and finally support citizens in their ability to criticize and control the state. However, analysing the definition of active citizenship in depth, we notice variances and deviations from this model (for e.g. strong focus on harmony and ignoring potential of citizen's opposition to the state). The explanation of active citizenship, and hence the practice of citizenship education might strongly (re-) focus the idea of active citizenship e.g. towards maintaining harmonious community life. Regarding the explicit (communicated) task of citizens' empowerment, a political system might aim at factual restriction of citizens' activity areas. If this is the case, then it manifests itself in education policies and citizenship education.

For this reason it is essential to learn what kind of citizen is actually being raised, and in which relation the conceptions of active/responsible citizenship and state (as provided in the organised field of the CE) stand to each other. By analysing conceptions of citizenships inside of the CE we can gain some answers to the question of the extent of citizen' freedom and possibilities of co-designing the society, with which a state, international, national or local actors intend to provide their citizens. We can, by analysing the citizenship education theories and practices on different levels, finally come to a description of what kind of citizen is hoped for within an educational system.

A precise look at the citizenship conceptions, as used in different international contexts of the CE shows that besides the importance of differentiation citizenship as status vs. citizenship as active position, some other features are very important as well. The question of the nation state as a focus of authority and a possibility of citizenship beyond the nation state borders emerged⁵³. We can also see that although the notion

⁵² http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/What_is_EDC/GlossaryKeyTerms_en.asp#P147_2839 – visited 01.04.08

⁵³ As the Council of Europe states it: "Within the context of EDC, the term citizen can be broadly described as 'a person co-existing in a society'. This however, is not to say that the idea of a citizen in relation to the Nation State is no longer relevant or applicable, but as the Nation State is no longer the sole focus of authority, there has been a need to develop a more holistic view of the concept."

of participation is crucial, it is defined in a way that allows us to see non-political participation as sufficient. And finally, if participation is positioned as a political one, it is not clear how critical it can or should be. These considerations bring about the following *pairs of attitudes reflected in and crucial for each conception of citizenship*. We understand these pairs not as either/or options, but as two poles in a continuum of meanings, which build up citizenship conception.

- Citizenship as status vs. citizenship as based on conscious *activity* (passive membership vs. active participation);
- National/local identity vs. global /cosmopolitan identity;
- (Non-political) moral activity in the service of the community vs. political actions/participation in political life;
- Political participation in a supportive form (or for harmonisation) vs. political participation in a critical function (including protest⁵⁴/interference).

We argue that these poles are crucial in order to define citizenship conceptions, as they are positioned in the field between the poles. By answering the question, which of the attitudes in each pair a certain conception of citizenship is closer to, we put the conceptions on citizenship into an analytical frame. This frame would (after enough different conceptions of citizenship are detected from the CE contexts and put into this frame) allow us to systematise the different citizenship conceptions. At the end of this systematisation effort we will develop a typology of citizenship conceptions, as provided in the frame of the citizenship education. The appropriateness of these pairs of attitudes as an analytical frame for further typologisation of citizenship conceptions within CE field shall be empirically verified. They are solely a first attempt of an analytical design frame. Indicated below is the application of the results of analysis to these pairs of attitudes. This is the first case of their empirical verification.

2. Textbook Analysis

In the next pages we show an exemplary analysis of the Russian CE textbooks in order to demonstrate how the citizenship conceptions can be reconstructed. This kind of analysis must definitely be done parallel to the analysis of the classroom situation, combining the textbook conceptions with the conceptions relevant in the (classroom) practice as well as other citizenship conceptions emerging on the different levels of the CE. As shown here, reconstruction of the citizenship conceptions from the textbooks should serve as the first step in a comprehensive analysis of citizenship conceptions within citizenship education.

We will verify the relevancy of textbook analysis by means of its comparison with the current political and media debate in Russia. This comparison will demonstrate the interdependency of the citizenship conceptions in textbooks and in the broader societal discourse. The interdependency proves that the broader societal discourse on

http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/What_is_EDC/GlossaryKeyTerms_en.asp#P147_2839 – visited 01.04.08

⁵⁴ See also Hoskins (2006a, 4): “Thus active citizenship is understood in the very broadest sense of the word – “participation” – and does not focus solely on the political aspect. It ranges from cultural and political to environmental activities and on local, regional, national, European and international levels. It includes new forms of active citizenship such as once-off issue politics and responsible consumption as well as the more traditional forms of voting and membership in parties and NGOs.”

citizenship is mirrored to a great extent in the citizenship conceptions as used in the textbooks.

The textbooks have not only the potential of bringing (official political or wide spread media) citizenship conceptions into the school, but above all, they provide these conceptions in the form approved by responsible authorities. As yet, no one can say how much impact each given textbook in each given case has, but written materials (textbooks) should not be ignored while reconstructing the citizenship conceptions relevant for the CE. On the one hand they are capable of representing the official (ministry's, governments' etc.) point of view (as well as points of view of certain important lobby groups), and on the other hand they are capable of giving teachers the support or possibility to hide behind the authority of the textbook while addressing tricky topics⁵⁵.

Throughout of the textbook analysis we will apply the pairs of attitudes (as defined above) on citizenship conceptions, reconstructed from the textbook. Thus we will both prove the sufficiency of the pairs and work continuously on citizenship conceptions typology.

Approach

The analysis is based on the reconstruction of latent meaning structures (sequential analysis; Oevermann 1979, 1993; Wernet 2000), and is close to the methods of objective hermeneutics. The procedures of the Grounded Theory (Strauss/Glaser 1998; Strübling 2004) have influenced the procedure of the analysis as well. Due to the lack of space we use illustrative analysis of sequences, crucial for reconstruction of the citizenship conceptions. In the process of analysis, the entire text of the textbook was analysed by means of sequential procedure. Context knowledge (e.g. current political situation, patriotic movements, school structure) is introduced into analysis after the language analysis is accomplished. Later in this article, under section 3, we will present some ideas for applying the result of the analysis on the current Russian citizenship discourse.

The sequences were translated into English⁵⁶ for the presentation in the article and the analysis was done in Russian. The procedure of the textbook analysis with some methodological notes can be seen below (Zimenkova 2008a). The analysis as used here aims to reconstruct the citizenship conceptions from two textbooks.

Extrapolated, this form of analysis could serve as methodological instrument for detecting the meanings of citizenship conceptions in different CE contexts. Such kind of analysis can result either in finding the best and worst practices, or in producing constructive critics on the conceptions.

⁵⁵ For example, as shown by the results of the pilot research with the teachers' trainers in St. Petersburg and Leningrad region (Damberg/Lebedev 2006).

⁵⁶ The literal meaning of the words and phrases used is of essential importance for the method of sequential analysis. we apologise for the clumsy translations of the sequences for the sake of the literal meaning.

Textbook selection

The teaching of civics (“Obschestvoznaniye”) in Russia starts in the 6th grade, and continues until the 9th grade with 1hr/week, in 10th- 11th (last) grades the teaching takes 140 hours. CE includes federal components defining the basic necessary knowledge on the CE topics, local components, connected to the local history, culture and local problems and school components – each teaching institution is free to increase the number of CE hours thorough the elective courses and focus them on e.g. economics, politics, cultural studies etc. Federal component is compulsory for all schools in Russia.

The main task of the CE in Russia⁵⁷ is defined as to teach the humanistic and democratic values on the basis of the constitution. Civics must combine theoretical and practical training. In the 6-9th grades CE focuses on the (ethics, norms, rights and regulations) of family and society life; work, citizenship and public activities; on the aspects of tolerance and multiculturalism and critical assessment of the media. In the 10-11th grade an additional focus on the cognitive skills, based on the methods of social and humanitarian sciences, is added. Civics is a part of the obligatory attestation of all school leavers, necessary e.g. for higher education entrance qualification. CE teaching in 10th and 11th grade is designed for preparation of this attestation.

For the deeper analysis of the citizenship category in Russian textbooks we choose the “Textbook on Civics” Nikitin et al. (“Obschestvoznaniye”, Moscow: Prosveschenije, 2004, 2nd edition), permitted by the Educational Ministry of Russian Federation.

Until the year 2008, Russian school textbooks had to be “permitted” by the Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation (MES) in order to be used in schools. After approval by two independent academies, and a test period a “permitted” textbook, the smaller number moved into a category of “recommended”. Since 2008 only those textbooks, approved by two academies, are allowed to be used in schools. The Ministry “permitted” the textbook of Nikitin (et. al.), for 2004 and “recommended” newer edition for the years 2006/2007; 2007/2008; 2008/2009⁵⁸, which positions this textbook as continuously accepted by Russian education authorities. Only five textbooks on civics for 8th and 9th grade were approved by the ministry for 2008/2009; in 2007 they were five⁵⁹, in 2006 seven⁶⁰. Among this number, the textbook of Nikitin et. al. is constantly present (the relevant sequences from the analyzed edition of the 2004 hardly differ compared to the newest edition of 2008⁶¹, the edition of 2008 was printed after the analysis was completed). The textbook analyzed was printed by “Prosveshenije” in Moscow, one of Russia’s most prominent publishing houses for education materials.

Certainly, this textbook cannot be regarded as *the* representative one. No statistical data is available on the popularity of the civics’ textbooks; however experts argue⁶² that the status of the “recommended” textbook is an important stimulus for a school’s decision in favour of a certain textbook. Furthermore, the reputation of the publishing house and the amount of the print run (repeatedly 10.000 copies), places this textbook in a good position on the textbook market. Due to the reduction of the number of

⁵⁷ According to a standard of the Federal Agency for Education <http://www.ed.gov.ru/d/ob-edu/noc/rub/standart/mp/08.doc> visited 14.11.08

⁵⁸ <http://www.mon.gov.ru/dok/prik/4371/> – visited 14.01.08

⁵⁹ Regulation № 321 of the MES from 14.12.2006 http://www.edu.ru/db/mo/Data/d_06/m321.html visited 14.11.08

⁶⁰ Regulation № 302 of the MES from 07.12.2005 (<http://fsu.edu.ru/p47aa1.html>) visited 14.11.08

⁶¹ “Textbook on Civics” Nikitin, “Obschestvoznaniye”, Moscow: Drofa, 2008, 3rd edition

⁶² Damberg/ Lebedev 2006

textbooks, recommended on the federal level, the possible impact of this textbook on the CE education seems to increase.

Under section (2.4) we indicate a short analysis from another “recommended” textbook, reported as being popular by CE experts⁶³ in order to prove the legitimacy of some generalisations.

Under section (3) we prove the hypothesis that the (chosen) textbook definitely mirrors the broad societal discourse on citizenship.

2.1. Expected outcomes of the Textbook. Self-Definition in the Introduction

The design of the analysed textbook was for use over for two years (the last two classes of the gymnasium: 10th and 11th) and thus provides some continuity in the teaching and learning process. Knowledge, provided in the last two school years, becomes basic knowledge for entrance exams of universities.

The introduction of this textbook is clearly designed for those adults (teachers and parents) providing this textbook to schoolchildren. It describes what competences schoolchildren will gain while using the textbook.

“The goal of this teaching course is not only providing students with necessary knowledge about humanity and society, but training the schoolchildren in such qualities as patriotism and citizenry, social activism and responsibility, conviction in the final triumph of the kindness over evil.” (Nikitin 2004, 3)[Nik1]⁶⁴

Many textbooks and programmes on Citizenship Education (CE) describe their goals as twofold: to provide knowledge and to educate for an active position. Corresponding goals take up an interesting form in the quotation above. The most important competences of future citizens are being named; the first pair seems to be the most important: *patriotism and citizenry*⁶⁵. As in many contexts in Russian educational programmes and in the media, both terms are being used parallel or even as synonyms. This provides us with a first idea of the citizenship conception relevant for this textbook. Surely, the very possibility of mixing the terms of patriotism and citizenry shows certain specifics of the citizenship conception. Linkage to patriotism automatically reduces some levels of citizenship, connected to globalisation, for example. Furthermore, such linkage produces strong moral connotations here, characteristic of the Russian term of “patriotism”. The second pair of competences – social activism and responsibility – might be seen as subordinate. Through the second pair of terms, the active component of the citizenship position is stressed; the textbook aims to educate for active citizenship. However, this active dimension of citizenship is being reduced scientifically by the fifth competence, which the textbook seeks to provide as the “conviction in the final triumph of the kindness over evil”. The word

⁶³ Karpenko 2007a; 2008

⁶⁴ Abbreviation [NIK1, 2] refer to the original sequences which can be requested in Russian at Zimenkova@gmx.net

⁶⁵ “Grazhdanstvennost’”, is translated here as citizenry and differs from the more conventional “grazhdanstvo”, because “grazhdanstvennost’” (citizenry) in Russian, refers to an active self-understanding as a citizen, an active and a responsible position, not primarily a status.

“conviction”⁶⁶ as such does not allow for an opening of other possibilities; “conviction” refers to a final truth, which simply did not come into being yet. The fact that this kind of conviction is put in line with patriotism, social responsibility, and so on, makes the conviction an important part of citizenship. The conviction is seen as a basis for living and being active as a citizen. As such the social responsibility, patriotic activities and social activities are undertaken while believing in the final triumph of kindness over evil. On the one hand the modality of the citizens’ activities is clear: they will bring about the triumph of kindness over evil; on the other hand the very essence of the activities takes up a strong moral dimension with almost religious rhetoric. Neither knowledge of the laws and instrumentalisation of the rights and institutions nor civic courage will be the basis of the actions of the young citizens, but rather a conviction that one day “kindness” will triumph over the “evil”.

Applying the pairs of attitudes as elaborated above, we could say that the definition of active/passive is definitely important in this citizenship category; that the local identity (patriotism) plays a certain role; that the activity is not precisely defined as political one; and that a shift towards moral components of activity is possible or likely.

We would now like to turn to the body of the textbook.

2.2. Construction of the citizenship category in the body of the textbook

Due to a shortage of space in this article, we are only able to present a few sequences here, which show re-construction of the citizenship category that are found throughout the textbook.

a) Citizenship and Law

Let me turn to *Chapter 36, “Electoral Law”* (pp. 200-205). The description of one of the main citizenship rights in the democracy – the right to elect (and to be elected) – is useful for the reconstruction of citizenship conception. While describing the necessity of taking part in the election, the textbook states:

“Participation in the elections is a manifestation of the social responsibility, conscientiousness, political maturity and maturity in the legal questions (and even political and legal culture perhaps) of each adult person, each citizen. Citizen continuously (s)elects – in the political, social sphere. He⁶⁷ does it, because he is not indifferent towards the destiny of the country, his own region, city or village. One can barely call a real citizen that person, who is sitting out at home on the polling day, while giving the solution of the social and political questions over to the elements (chaos).”

(ibid, 200 ff) [Nik2]

Here the author draws a distinction between a “real” citizen and a person, who can “barely be called a real citizen”, thus constructing citizenship as an active position and not as a status. This activity however takes place within the official frame suggested by the law (contemporary European trends in the CE see participation in the election as a

⁶⁶ The usage of the word “conviction” is not typical for Russian in this sentence, it would be much more idiomatic, if it used the word „faith“. Conviction” bares much more finality, being positive about the future state of the art.

⁶⁷ In the Russian original, the male form is used (as yet, gender equality in the language is not established in the Russian language).

passive form of citizenship activity⁶⁸). The importance of each voice is implicated and the weight of the citizen within a representative democracy is addressed.

The participation in the election is used as an indicator of the following citizen virtues: “social responsibility, conscientiousness, political maturity and maturity in the legal questions (and even political and legal culture perhaps)”. These virtues are referred to as virtues of an adult person and of the citizen, thus underlining the aspect of maturity. The definitions are very evaluative, for example, one definition states that not taking part in the election is not mature enough. The reason for election is that the citizens are not indifferent to the destiny of the country, region, their own town or village. However, this “not indifferent to” is not explained as for example perceiving the possibility of co-designing this destiny, rather it is explained as simply being stated as an indicator of maturity. The negative scenario is outlined as “giving the solution of the social and political questions over to the elements⁶⁹ (chaos)”. The political system without the citizens’ participation is constructed as irrational illogical power, but the participation as such – as citizen’s duty – is a moral/emotional category and an indicator of maturity. It is a moral category, because on the one hand, the essence of co-designing opportunities (including possibility of being elected) is not addressed. Instead it uses a moral imperative of “if you are a moral citizen, a mature adult, you go and elect”, and “by this you show your commitment to your locality”. Voting becomes an initiation ritual⁷⁰ with a strong moral/emotional component; and patriotic and local binding. The duties of the citizen are constructed as proof of maturity, attachment to the destiny of her country and responsibility on the local level. Does the election as addressed here refer to the real possibilities of co-designing the society? Is the conclusion that the moral/emotional construction of citizen’s responsibility (with reference to political culture and maturity and the emotional element of “not being indifferent”) acceptable?

The following sequence, taken from the description of the election procedure, might show the validity of the previous analysis:

“The voter marks the list of the party he feels for (sometimes he has the right to mark in the list of the preferred party the candidate he is sympathising with)”

(ibid., 203) [Nik3]

The voter is being constructed as dilettante, at the same time a higher power/authority, steering the election procedure is mentioned (granting the right to mark the candidate). State power/authority is constructed as being highly professional, at the same time the reasons for the citizen’s voting decision are vague and emotionally based – citizen ticks off the political party she feels for (an alternative formulation would be for e.g. a party, to which a citizen would like to delegate her ruling power to), or even marks the candidate she “puts an eye on” on a candidate’s preferred party list (literal translation, put an eye on).

⁶⁸ http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/What_is_EDC/GlossaryKeyTerms_en.asp#P147_2839 – visited 01.04.08

⁶⁹ The Russian word “stihia” has a double meaning of the nature elements, however in their active form (e.g. hurricane, sea at storm), usually the meaning is of irrational power, not controllable by the humans. In the metaphorical sense it means all processes, which are seemingly illogical, intensive and uncontrollable.

⁷⁰ As it de facto was in the times of the Soviet Union, voting for the first time (within one-party-system) was strongly connected to being adult.

The rational politically reasoned basis for the election decision is neither being implied in this sequence, nor in the chapter dedicated to the election law and procedure. The delegation of the power to a party/MP, which is a basis of democratic governing, is not addressed at all.

A citizen is presented as a person having duties; possessing high moral competences and maturity; concerned with the destiny of her country and her locality; and hence taking an active part in the life of the country and being responsible.

Applying pairs of analytical attributes, suggested under section (1), we can say that the distinction between local/national and international/global conceptions of citizenship is definitely relevant for this textbook; citizenship attachment is put on the locality. Furthermore, activity of the citizen plays an important role, but the form of activity is reduced to the legal rights of the citizens in the representative democracy.

Voting is seen an essential activity, distinguishing a “real” and mature citizen from an indifferent person. The voting or non-voting of the citizens is evaluated morally, the voting process as such is dilettantish and emotionally based.

In general, the whole textbook switches between *two language modalities*. One language modality is very functional or even a bureaucratic language, describing the formalities of different procedures, and the contents of laws and rights. The other language modality (used in most sequences on citizenship) is operating with moral and emotional categories, in the language it is oriented upon dilettanti (a form, more suitable for schoolchildren; however it is peculiar that citizenship as such, is being addressed throughout a textbook as a moral/emotional conception, lacking bureaucratic or legal connotations).

Both language modalities are reproduced in each article, even though different authors write them. The scheme of working with both language modalities – the formal one, used for the description of procedures and laws; and the moral-dilettantish one for description of the student’s own situation – her self-understanding and self-positioning in the society and her relationship with the state seems to be a convincing strategy, shared by all its authors.

b) Citizenship and the State: Relationship and mutual dependencies/ belongings

Switching between two language modalities is very visible in Chapter 37, “*Protection of the citizen’s rights in court. The law protects us*” (here both language modalities are represented in the headline). This chapter has a potential of becoming a classical manifestation of the relationship between citizen and the state by addressing rights, duties and their fulfilment (control).

The chapter starts with the relationship “human/person – state”, constructing the notion of the higher power. The chapter constructs from the very beginning – through the subtitle “the law protects us” – the atmosphere of a safe and secure place, which is indeed very much needed, as seen in the first paragraph:

“Each kind of rule⁷¹, and especially the one, relying on the might of the state, is a big power, which one cannot but has to take into consideration. Each (separate) human does, compared (to such power) sometimes look like a weak plant on the way of a

⁷¹ The Russian language has numerous substantives for (State) power; three of them are used in the first sentence of this sequence.

heavy track. But this is only the case in unfair state, under unfair political regimes. In civilised democratic states the human rights are protected by the law.”

(ibid., 205) [Nik4]

The construction of danger, threatening each human being through the state as such is especially powerful due to the metaphor of the weak plant in the way of the heavy truck. The source of the danger is a state power, and human beings cannot resist it. The power relation is definite. Although there are circumstances under which the position of a human/person⁷² is not that hopeless. Living in a civilized democratic state is a guarantee of safety, because between the state power and human beings there is a law protecting human beings. Due to the subtitle “the law protects us” the Russian Federation is being constructed as a civilized democratic state.

The category of citizenship is addressed here: for only people belonging to a certain type of the state are protected from the state power, hence we speak of the citizens of the state. Here we are facing an extremely weak construction, devaluating in its rhetoric the conception of citizenship, replacing it with the term “human”, hence magnifying the state and excluding the double-sided, equal relationship between the citizen and the state. Here we are dealing with a very special construction of democracy: praising a democratic regime as giving protection and opposing the absolute power of the governing structures. The notion of democracy used here leaves out the rights of the citizen, for citizens’ protection is not addressed as a duty of the state, but as achievement. In the case of citizenships such protection is a duty of the law system, for citizens are the real power of democracy. Using the term human particularly, compared to a weak plant, enables praising of the state order. Thus we see a construction of human (the de facto citizen of the democratic civilized state) as a person, protected by the state, not left alone with the omnipresent danger – this is a passive position. The description of the citizen’s positions then takes a turn towards the own role of the citizen. Speaking of protection through the law, the chapter continues:

“At that, the law protects humans not only from criminals, dodgers, villains and further malefactors, but also from the soulless, much too zealous or (which sometimes also happen) simply cruel officials who think that they are the state; that the state agencies belong them; and that they can use their closeness to the power in their own mercenary interests. In a fair state justice and law are a real buttress of the ruling power, that is why justice and law in such a state are stronger than power. One should know how to use the enormous humanitarian potential of the law for the protection of their (and those of the others) legitimate rights and interests. One has to believe, that such protection is realistic for everyone. This faith strengthens the feeling of one’s own dignity – one of the main, most important feelings of each citizen. Having strengthened this feeling, a citizen will never turn into a slave of anything: power, people, circumstances, etc. He will eternally stay a free human being/person.”

(ibid., 205ff) [Nik5]

By separating the officials (bureaucrats) from the state, the listing of the evil powers is closed and thus the bureaucrats are positioned as possible opponents of the citizen. At

⁷² In Russian, this word (“chelovek”) is used to mark a natural person. However, due to it being impossible, on the language level, to differentiate between the terms human and person (the special legal formulation for natural person is not applicable in the everyday language), this term naturally absorbs moral/ethical connotations than the term human, as well as connotations of “humanity”, for this reason we switch between these two terms here.

first glance, this sequence can be understood as criticisms of the state, showing the imperfection and possible dangerousness of bureaucrats even in the purely democratic state. It encourages the reader (young citizen) to oppose the unfair bureaucrats, making a promise of a more powerful power, than that of the state – the power of law.

If we however analyse the sequence more deeply, we will see that this sequence proposes an active position to the citizen, showing her how to handle those from whom the citizen has to be protected. This active position has very interesting specifics: the responsibility of protecting the rights is transferred to the citizens themselves⁷³ (which is quite surprising on the background of the described power imbalance, constructed through the opposition: weak plant – heavy truck). However, no instructions are given or even implied. The law is addressed as an enormous humanitarian potential, which is usable if one knows how. And the question of “how?” is answered in a very special way, namely through the faith⁷⁴ in the possibility of such protection. The belief in the possibility of such protection is essential. The aspect of the belief appeals on the one side to the active role of the human/citizen, for she *has to believe* in order to reach something. On the other hand, this activity is very individualistic, which is rather characteristic for many religious experiences. This formulation suggests the dependency of law instrumentalisation’s success from the strength and seriousness of the citizens’ belief. Apart from that, faith in contrast to knowledge is something that cannot (and does not have to) be confirmed through the experience. The essentiality of faith presumes the possibility that protection would not function if faith disappears.

This conception is contrary to the idea of citizens being protected by the state because of them having this status, irrespective of their perception of the state. Here we have an active citizenship position, which is not referred to as citizenship as a status, but to the individual faith.

The faith has an important task: it strengthens the feeling of “one’s own dignity”, one of the “main, most important feelings of the citizen”. Citizenship is thus defined through feelings. It becomes an emotional category. Strengthening of this feeling of dignity is an own task of the citizen, and this feeling makes a citizen become a citizen. The role of the citizen is to believe in the correctness of the law system and in strengthening her self-understanding as a citizen – the feeling of dignity. The essentiality of these tasks of a citizen becomes clearer when we read the alternative scenarios drafted in the paragraph. The one who does not have the feeling of dignity exposes herself to the danger of becoming a slave (in different possible understandings of slavery). And only the one who has the feeling of her human dignity will stay a free human being/free person “for eternity”. On the one hand it states the essentiality of the freedom; on the other hand it acknowledges the lack or weakness of institutions, which could provide citizens with freedom, and leaves coping with danger of slavery to the activities of the citizen. The state cannot guarantee that its citizen is not becoming a slave; a citizen herself must take care of her freedom, and can reach it – at least on the level of the self-perception. The protection of the citizen through the state is replaced through the self-achieving of the inner freedom of each person. We are facing religious rhetoric where one receives something corresponding to the strength of the faith⁷⁵. The aspect of knowledge about own rights and the instrumentalisation of this knowledge are being

⁷³ Here we refer to the Russian idiom “the saving of the drowning man is a business of drowning men”.

⁷⁴ The Russian language does not differentiate between faith and belief

⁷⁵ E. g. Mathew 8, 5-13

replaced by the faith, which is supposed to bring about the fair state of affairs and finally the protection of right of those who believe in law and democracy.

Achieving essential freedoms and protections are only possible as a result of the activities of the citizen. These activities are not connected appropriately to the law system of citizenship rights; they are of a mystical-religious or emotional nature. Citizens' co-designing of the society or collective activities towards the protection of the rights is not addressed. Citizenry appears not to be a status, but a condition of *emotional self-perception within the democratic state*. Through the moral and religious connotations, the office of citizen with its rights is being devaluated.

Until now the parallel usage of the terms "citizen" and "person/human", and even replacement of the term citizen through the term human/person, had the function of stating the state power, praising the achievements of democracy, and protecting the weak from the powerful. In the middle of the chapter, these terms are being separated in the following way:

"That is why a citizen in a constitutional (law) state is treating the court with respect and hope. He is not afraid of the court. He treats the court as means, which is capable of easing his life, a means, which might help in difficult, sometimes tragic situation. He knows that he is provided with help of the advocate, that the court will give him many other possibilities to prove his case, to disprove the unjust complaints. One (only) has to remember, that in the case of the overload of courts due to the civil suits, administrative and criminal cases; in the case of the defaults of the defendants, witnesses and others, the consideration of the case might be dragged on for a rather long period of time. This demands from a person, who appealed to court, patience, tenacity and faith in the final triumph of the justice."

(ibid., 207), [Nik6]

Due to lack of space in this article, should we ignore the devaluation of the supportive and protecting role of the courts in this sequence (showing all the appearing difficulties, rhetorically demolishing the advantages of the courts) as well as the addressing of a citizen as a defendant only, and we rather concentrate on the usage of "citizen" and "human/person" in this sequence, we will see the difference between the both. A citizen is the one hoping, and having no fear of appealing to court. A citizen is capable of using the instruments of the state and having knowledge of laws as her starting point. The human, by contrast, is the one who knows the real situation in the courts, knows the state of the art, has patience, tenacity and faith, and these assists her in overcoming the appearing difficulties and finally instrumentalising the court system for her own rights. A citizen must have knowledge and hope, a human must believe, and only the combination of both brings success.

Applying the pairs of attributes, suggested under (1) we see, that citizenship is positioned between the poles of status and activity, and that it emerges from formally belonging to the national state and citizen own (however non-political), moral activity, or the faith.

c) Citizenship and the state: Supportive role of the citizen

In Chapter 47 "*The Russian State: Perspectives of the Development*", the connection of the citizen to her state is being built up.

"What a strong state should be like (bold in original, TZ). Political life of Russia on the millennium's boarder takes place under the slogan of strengthening the state. This

is our main political task, our main slogan. This is being claimed by the states' officials, outstanding politicians and scientists.

Indeed, each human being wishes to live in a strong state; on the prosperity and power of which the life and prosperity of the person depend. That is why each sane citizen is interested in strengthening his state."

(Nikitin 2004, 266), [Nik7]

In the opening of this chapter sequence, plural pronoun „we“ (“our slogan”) refers to the country's development priorities, as defined by officials and country elite. Following that section, the desires of a single human and citizen are described. The interests of the human being are constructed as primarily of a financial matter; a very strong connection and even a life-dependency of the human with the state and its prosperity are constructed. From the claim of the human's interests, the interests of each sane⁷⁶ citizen are drawn. Here, the difference between a human and a citizen is determined through the responsibility, attached to the office of the citizen. Both are very strongly connected to the destiny of the country, both have primary interests in prosperity of the state. The human is simply dependent on the state and the citizen strengthens with her citizen power with the state.

The first time within the textbook the citizenship position is addressed as an active role; this activity is however of the supportive matter. A sane citizen (hence, the one not supporting the official course towards a strong state, must be non-compass mentis) cannot but (not a conjunctive modality is chosen here) support the state in the course towards strengthening the state.

The only possibility, that the citizens are not blindly supporting the state power, but trying to control it, is given in the notion of civil society:

“[...] If the state takes under its control economics and political life, than it is not far to the control over spiritual life, than the state defines, which party should preferably be joined, which TV channel should preferably be watched, what should be read, etc.; and this is already a totalitarian regime.

What can be opposed to such anxieties? Only one thing – the citizens should not only be occupied with strengthening their state, but also with developing the possibilities of public control over the work of state officials. And this requires the development of civil society institutes.”

(ibid., 269) [Nik 8]

Skipping the notion that not a state as such, but rather the states' officials are seen as an object of control, and that the possibility of a totalitarian regime is seen as implicit, the specific of this sequence (the first sequence in this textbook refers to civil society) is its indefiniteness. No instructions of opposing the state and of the developing the institutions of a civil society are given. Even exemplary naming of the civil society institutions is lacking. The only reference to the feature, essential for civil society, referred to in this chapter is private property. The indication of the possibility of a citizen's control over the state is very important, for it is the only sequence in the textbook that provides active conception of a critical citizenship. The citizens are left alone with the task to establish a civil society, and these are the rather dilettante

⁷⁶ In Russian the term “zdravomislascij” refers not to a juristic term, but also to a normative evaluation, meaning a healthy ability to judge

citizens who should, as we learn from this textbook, be active on the basis of their faith and moral obligations.

- **Citizenship in the textbook: first summary**

Summing up the conception of citizenship as given in the textbook's glossary definition, we arrive at the following statement: citizenship as a status is treated as a necessary, but not sufficient component of getting through one's own rights. Switching between the terms of "human/person" and "citizen" is partly used for a distinction between profiting from the state (human) and working for the state (citizen). In other sequences however, a "human" integrates the knowledge of rights and laws. With the capability of adaptation of these rights, laws and procedures to the current situation in the home country, a citizen has the specifics of the authorities, of the bureaucracy, and so on. A human component of citizenship thus integrates patience, tenacity and faith in the democratic future of the country, and the belief that despite all the specifics and problems of the home country, the rights will be protected. Furthermore, the faith, essential for the final triumph of the democracy and citizenship rights is combined with emotional bounding to the home country and locality. Citizenship is linked to responsibility (a moral category and indicator of maturity of the person) on the one side and optimistic faith in the victory of democracy on the other side. Switching between "human" and "citizen" does not effectively provide a division between "status" and "active position".

The citizen to be raised with the help of this textbook is primarily a "human" (if we refer to the moral/emotional aspects of humanity), one not blindly trying to get through their own rights guaranteed by the constitution, but one capable of seeing the country specifics that prevent the immediate fulfilment of the rights. Her morality allows her to take over the responsibility needed to care for the destiny of the home country and her locality. This *faithful, mature and responsible human* is able to reflect on the imperfection of the state and still be emotionally bound to it, and to believe in the final coming of the desirable condition of the state despite all problems. She is active, but not in the co-designing or the reforming of society. She is active in the sense of actively believing and living in the faith of the triumph of good over evil and the triumph of the democracy over the totalitarian regime. She believes in the final possibility of her rights to be fulfilled and of her country to become democratic. She is mature, because she understands and perceives the responsibility, which is however not directly connected to any kind of citizens' activity.

The political conception of the citizen is only addressed in the context of the citizen supporting the state and sharing the state's plans of its development. A citizen is seen as a conscious part of the state: capable of thinking and reflecting and hence necessarily coming to the idea of supporting the state. The possibility of developing a civil society as control over the state is given to a citizen, whatever the real notion of civil society, its institutions and instrument are not at issue.

Coming back to the attempt of citizenship conceptions typology announced in section (1), we apply the pairs of the attitudes to the results of the analysis. We can claim that the pairs of attitudes which define the possible poles of meanings, and which citizenship definitions are likely to lean on, are applicable for the analysis of citizenship within this textbook (citizenship as status vs. citizenship as based on conscious *activity*; national/local identity vs. global /cosmopolitan identity; non-political moral activity in the service of the community vs. political actions/participation in political life; political

participation in a supportive form vs. political participation in a critical function). This means that the conceptions of citizenship (which emerge from this textbook) can be positioned within the analytical frame of the attitudes, elaborated in section (1). In each pair of attitudes there is one detected from the textbook that is definitely relevant for the citizenship conceptions. We might, however benefit from introducing *one further attribute* that focuses on the relation between a citizen and a state: *mutual dependency (reciprocity) vs. the belonging of the citizen to the state or the full authority of the state over the citizen.*

We would now like to test the citizenship conceptions, which refer to citizen, citizenship and civil society, as detected from the body of the textbook on the background of the glossary items from the same textbook.

2.3. Citizenship category in the Glossary

In the Glossary (p. 327 ff) we find the following definitions:

“Citizen – in juristic (narrow sense) – is a person, possessing over the totality of the rights and duties, provided by the constitution, having a status of the citizen of the certain state. In the broad sense (citizen is) a moral person, possessing over political and legal culture, politically active, who internalised⁷⁷ the interests and needs of the (own) country.”

(ibid., 333) [Nik9]

Also, in the body of the textbook, citizenship is divided into two conceptions. The authors deal with the question whether to define citizenship as status vs. as activity or with the necessity to combine the both. All the same, here the division is a very special one. Citizenship as a status is a neutral definition. Citizenship as an active position contains three components: morality⁷⁸ of the citizen (the kind of moral meant here is not defined as to whether it is a special citizen moral commitment to the home country, nor as some kind of general moral or ethics), then next is the political and legal culture (possibly containing the knowledge and capability of instrumentalization of the law), and thirdly are the interests and needs of the home country. These interests and needs are to be of essential priority to the citizen. Citizenship is an active position, marked by strong moral connotations and the emotional bounding on the interests of the home country (although it is not clear whether the essential interests and the needs of the home country can be in opposition to the interests of the government). A citizen as a moral person emotionally bound to the needs of her home country corresponds to the conception of a “faithful, mature and responsible human”,– found in the body of the textbook.

Due to limited space in this article, we will not analyse the definition of civic values from the glossary. Here, only one short hint: in this textbook civic values are not linked to values of human rights or similar, but “to the traditional values” of the county, constructing a strong relation to the history and tradition (what happens if the tradition is not a democratic one?) and has a slight patriotic bias.

The definition of civil society is as follows:

⁷⁷ In original: someone, for whom the interests and needs of the country are of essential meaning

⁷⁸ Term “moral” in Russian is used frequently in the everyday language, and has strong ethical connotations.

“Civil society: is a totality of people, characterised by freedom (in the frame of legal norms) of private life of the citizens, who are provided with conditions for the maximal appropriate (self-) occupation in political, economic and social sphere. Local self government plays a big role in civil society. Civil society organisations are public institutions like church, school (secondary, professional, higher), media.”

(ibid., 333) [Nik10]

Civil society is defined as a union of persons (sic! not citizens!) possessing certain kinds of freedom. However, right after naming it, this freedom has restrictions ; civil society is placed under the restriction of the judicial system. The freedom of the private life is only possible in the legal frame (this is surely correct; however, mentioned in this position, it rhetorically restricts and defames the freedom of the citizen, while simultaneously rhetorically strengthening the state). The citizens are *provided* with conditions (by the higher authority; they do not simply *have* the right to live under these conditions, these conditions are provided, hence they can also be withdrawn) of the maximally *appropriate* self-occupation (the adjective “appropriate” implies some scale for measuring activities of the citizens; it constructs the evaluation through the higher standing authorities or the state). Besides such measuring, the activities of citizens in political, economical and social spheres are (rhetorically) devaluated as such, due to the description of the citizen’s activities with the help of the word “samodejatelnost” (self-occupation), which is defined as having a non-professional occupation with something. This term is established in modern Russian language in a two-fold functionality: for description of the non-professional unions (usually with regard to non-professional creative activities, like choir, dancing hobby collectives, etc.) or in order to abuse some activities such as dilettante ones. So, here we have a construction of the state, opening some appropriate possibilities for free activities of those citizens who occupy themselves with politics, economy and social questions in the dilettante manner.

After this construction, the important role of self-governance is claimed (for the first time in this textbook). For the first time the example of the institutions of civic society are named. However, the participation of the citizens in civil society is constructed as dilettante and no control functions through civil society are mentioned.

The last definition, referring to the complexity of the citizen-civil society is the definition of citizenship:

“Citizenship is a stable legal and political connection of a person to the state, political and legal belonging of the person to the state. The state provides realisation of citizens’ rights, provides their protection in the country and abroad. From the citizen obeying the laws and other orders and instructions of the state is required, as well as fulfilment of the constitutional duties.”

(ibid., 333) [Nik11]

Citizenship is constructed here as a non-reciprocal relation where a person belongs to a state politically and legally. The state protects its citizen, and demands that the citizen follow the laws and instructions and fulfil the duties written in the constitution. Neither any kind of reciprocity (if we do not see the state protecting its property as an act of reciprocity) nor any activities of citizens are implied as an essential part of citizenship. A citizen belongs to the state and owes the state obedience. Possibilities of actively co-designing the state or the possibilities of self-designing or selection of the citizenship status is not mentioned.

Summary: The most important features of the citizen and citizenship

The difference between the citizen and human is that the “citizen” is well informed, and per definition, supports the state (in this form a citizen’s consciousness and responsibility is addressed). A “human” is a special form of a citizen, not only possessing the citizen’s knowledge about her rights, duties and judicial and political system, but able to reflect on the democratic institutions applied to the home country, and is thus capable of understanding why certain democratic institutions cannot yet work (in Russian Federation) in a wishful way. This human (moral citizen) is capable of being active while knowing about the special (Russian) obstacles and problems; is capable of living in a non-democratic country believing it will become democratic someday; is morally responsible for the country; and is capable of seeing their citizen’s position as a position combining optimism, faith and morality. Citizenship as an independent co-designing of society, which puts individual will and activity into focus (e.g. deliberative democracy, but also all kinds of genuine democratic participation, cf. Martinsen 2006), not to mention a citizen’s possible opposition to the state, are not an issue. Institutions of civil society are named as possibilities for self-organisation and even control over the state; however these institutions are barely described, and the activities of the citizens are positioned as the dilettante activities taking place under judicial restrictions.

The desirability of the active citizen’s position is claimed. However, active citizenship is not linked to participation, options of participation are not discussed, and the idea of the delegation of the rights is not addressed.

The Russian language does allow using the word “human” in the definition of the word “person” or “natural person”, but the word “human” in Russian (“chelovek”) comprises moral connotations since it is the same word used when describing humanistic qualities of the person. Due to the numerous moral connotations used throughout the textbook and the remarkable frequency of using “human” instead of “citizen”, which should rather occur natural in this context, we suggest using “human” and not the neutral term “person” (which is not possible in this neutrality in the Russian language) while defining the type of the citizen addressed in the textbook

While trying to name a type of citizen described in this textbook, we would refer to her as a *“faithful supportive moral human”*, characterised through the emotional self-perception as a part of the democratic state, with a strong attachment to country and locality.

2.4. Material for comparison

After presentation of a detailed analysis of the citizenship category from Nikitin et. al. (2004), we want to provide a short analysis here of the Glossary item of another textbook named “School Dictionary on Civics for 10th-11th Grade”, Bogolubov L.N./Averjanov J.I, Moskau, “Prosveschenije”, 2005. Bogoljubov’s textbooks belong to the ones continuously recommended by the ministry, which is also the case for 2008/2009⁷⁹. Experts report this textbook to be as a popular one⁸⁰.

⁷⁹ <http://www.mon.gov.ru/dok/prik/4371/> – visited 14.01.08.

⁸⁰ I’m thankful to my colleague Oxana Karpenko for showing me this sequence.

We use this analysis to indicate the similarities between both citizenship conception constructions and thereby the possibilities of some generalisations are indicated.

“Citizen – 1) in juristic (legal) sense is a person, who possesses over citizens’ rights. In other words, it means belonging of a person to a state. Citizenship means stable legal connection of a person with the state, and manifests itself in the totality of their – citizen and state – mutual rights and duties. To be a citizen means to possess over a certain legal capacity [...]

2) From the ancient times the term „citizen“ bears also a special moral meaning: to be a citizen means to take up a definite moral position, connected to the sense of duty and responsibility towards fatherland, own people, national values, holy shrines and culture. Citizenship feelings are manifested in sincere cordial feeling with and for the destiny of the fatherland, in the impassioned desire to see the fatherland free and prosper, in the readiness to work (act) fairly for the sake of the country, in the capacity to restrain the own egoism, to render help to those in need. At the same time the citizens’ position is always connected with a critical attitude towards social injustice. And surely, citizen is always prepared to show the personal courage in protecting the home country from any intrusions.”

(Bogolubov/Averjanov 2005, 12 ff) [Bogol]

The conception of a citizen is divided into two sub-conceptions, following the question of defining citizenship as a status vs. citizenship as an active position. In order to separate both sub-conceptions clearly, the authors define the first usage of “citizenship” as a juridical conception. The relationship between a citizen and a state in the juridical terminology is firstly constructed as an ownership relation; however the definition then tries to build up reciprocity: it provides a conception of citizenship, which puts both – the state and the citizen – into a frame of mutual duties and rights. Thereafter, active citizenship is defined.

It begins with building a historical tradition of the term “citizen”, thus constructing traditional legitimacy of the following moral definition. Being a citizen is referred to as a special self-understanding while in a moral position, based on the feeling of duty and responsibility towards the fatherland, people of the home country, its national values, holy shrines and culture.

Here we have two aspects of citizenship: morality and bounding to the fatherland where this bounding is based on traditional values (and not for example on the attachment to the democratic values and political regime of the home country). The morality itself has two modalities: duty and responsibility, thus uniting aspects of owing something to the country (passive) and of taking responsibility (active). Duty is defined as the feeling a citizen experiences. Responsibility implies self-understanding the system of national values, holy shrines and culture of the fatherland. Due to this listing we see a very special aspect of citizenship (activity) based on the preservation and continuation of the traditions. This task strongly positions citizenship, not only into the national context, but also focusing citizenship activity more on preserving the traditions (and being patriot) than on the participation in political decision-making. Surely, the responsibility for one’s fatherland can also be understood as an appeal to active participation and co-designing of the society. However, put into this kind of listing, this responsibility is more likely to be understood as claiming citizen’s responsibility in preserving the existing status quo and state order.

Citizenship feelings are further described. Citizenship is defined neither as a status, nor as an active position. Citizenship becomes increasingly more displaced into the area of feelings and moral. Citizenship activity is described as both a sincere wish to see one's homeland in freedom and prosperity, and this is put as a sort of mental activity marking the being of the citizen. At the same time the citizenship activity is addressed as a readiness to work (toil)⁸¹ fairly for the sake of the country (here implying a selfless working process, neither primarily oriented towards financial profit, nor towards self fulfilment – unless self fulfilment takes place through selfless work for the sake of the home country). Furthermore, besides moral commitment to selfless working, citizenship feelings – or citizenship activity – consist of the skill of bridling one's egoism (here strengthening the idea of selflessness), and helping those in need. Selflessness, sincere and fair working for the sake of the country, forgetting about own profit, and helping those in need are the main feelings defining a good citizen. However, to a great extent these categories could be used to describe a "moral/ethical person" in many of the world religions, for e.g. a "good Christian". Surely, it would not be wrong to say, that a good citizen should be moral person. It is more probable that the question is whether it is sufficient to create a category of the good citizen. What then is special about a citizen?

An answer to the specifics of a citizen leads to the following statement: at the same time, the citizen's position is always linked to the critical attitude towards social injustice". The critical function of citizenship is addressed. However, this criticism possibility is addressed very generally, and the object of the criticism is not defined. The source of the social injustice might be the state, but it also can be historical circumstances, traditions, general financial situation of the country, etc. While taking into consideration the previous attachment of the citizenship feelings, referring to traditional morality, in this critical function we can barely see, the reference to the citizen's control over the state and the citizen's participation in the sense of the co-designing the society. We are more likely to refer this category as the "help for those in need" (those suffering from social injustice, but not through the revision of the given structures).

The definition concludes with the claim that a citizen – not in the context of the citizen's feelings, but in the context of duties – is "surely always prepared (ready)" to show the "personal courage in protecting the home country from any intrusions". The ownership relation between a country and a citizen is defined here. A citizen is always ready to protect a country. At first glance a dependency of a country on its citizens is stated. But if we see it in the context of the duties – the citizen is "surely always" ready – and in the context of other skills and features of the citizen – for example, selfless working for the sake of the country – we see that the citizen is actually obliged to protect the home country selflessly, this is the natural state of the citizen's mind.

In this glossary entry, citizenship is seen as combination of feelings, of the state of the mind and of activities – both wishful and real – for the sake of the state, even to one's own disadvantage. Citizenship as a critical position dissolves in the duties and liabilities of citizens towards the state. Citizenship is addressed as a moral selfless and supportive position, critical against unfairness, but not implying a possible opposition to the state and barely any kind of equality with the state powers. The definition is strongly

⁸¹ The Russian verb „trudit'sja" means working intensively and continuously, the most frequently used idiom with this verb is to "work for someone's sake".

connected to patriotism, lacking any international/global levels (or even constructing globalisation and internalisation as potentially dangerous to local attachment). Defining citizen as is constructed in this glossary entry we should refer to her as an *“ethical selfless citizen”*, with strong patriotic connotations.

Russian citizenship education faces, as any other CE, a question as to whether citizenship should be defined as a status or as an active position. In the description of an active citizen position, political activity, critical function and active political co-designing of the society are substituted with ethical, selfless work for the state, community service, and strong emotional bonding to the state. This bonding takes the form of self-perception as a part of society, which is on its way to becoming a democracy. A citizen is expected to believe in the final democratisation of the society, while facing some structures not yet democratic, and act according to this faith: use the democratic instruments while simultaneously having no expectations of them functioning perfectly in the present. Due to the dilettante character of the citizens' occupation with politics, no critical reasoning or reflection on the current course of a country's development is at issue. Active participation in a society is wishful but is in the form of selfless work, while supporting the current development of the state and maintaining its traditions.

When applying the analytical instrument suggested in section (1), we can claim that pairs of the attitudes are applicable for the analysis of citizenship within both textbooks. We can also see that certain features are especially important for Russian CE, for example the moral/ethical component of a citizens' activity. As already claimed under section (2.3.), one further attitude might be introduced in order to improve the typologisation instrument, an attitude grasping the relation between a citizen and a state: mutual dependency (reciprocity) vs. full authority of the state over the citizen.

3. Application of research analysis to the current development of CE in Russia

Why reconstruction of citizenship categories from teaching materials (and from the classroom practice)? Does such kind of analysis make sense? Do the relationships between a citizen and the state, as put in both textbooks, mirror the current political situation and media debates? Does our reconstruction of the citizen type (“faithful supportive moral human/ethical selfless citizen”) indicate the type of citizenship relevant for the current political and media debate in Russia? Here we only give a brief analysis (which definitely cannot substitute a detailed analysis of Russian citizenship debates) in order to demonstrate the relevancy of the findings from textbook analysis.

The most important result of the reconstruction of the citizenship category is that there are certain features of citizenship conceptions in both textbooks, which are contradicting the idea of an active citizen as a politically empowered citizen⁸²:

- A strong ethical/moral component (and barely present political one);
- An emotional bonding on the state/locality (no indication of citizenship beyond the nation⁸³);
- Patriotism, bonding to traditions;

⁸² . As described for example by Barber 1984; Walzer 1992; van Gunsteren 1994; Martinsen 2006

⁸³ For analysis of teaching “national” differences in Russian school textbooks see Karpenko 2007a; Karpenko 2008 (in this volume)

- Selflessness;
- Faith/trust as a substitute for knowledge and the instrumentalisation of law and state institutions;
- Support of the state (no critical function)
- A strong dependency from the state (barely an equal relation of citizen and the state).

Are these features prominent in citizenship discourses (media, politics, civil society, non-school CE, etc.) in Russia beyond the level of the school citizenship education and school teaching materials? Do they mirror some present societal developments? Do we learn some general tendencies of the CE by analyzing a textbook?

- **Non-School citizenship education**

In modern Russia, citizenship education looms large. The biggest and strongest NGO, occupied with citizenship education, is probably a government-close “Nashi”⁸⁴, which positions itself as an antifascist youth organisation. “Nashi” citizenship rhetoric corresponds to the citizenship conceptions, detected above. Propagating active citizenship, “Nashi” establishes in its “Manifest”⁸⁵, a strong emotional bonding with their own country, using the idea of globalisation for dividing the world into the leaders and “those driven” and calling young people to strengthen Russia. Explicitly supporting the Putin government (or Putin “course” during and after the new elections), “Nashi” refer to the Russian traditions (thus establishing a link to the glorious past) and their strong emotional bonding to the state is based on patriotic ideas⁸⁶. “Nashi” put patriotism and faith in the glorious future of Russia (based on the history, called “historical optimism”, *ibid.*) as the first two important features for a leader’s personalities, those capable of modernising Russia. Other features are high professionalism, strategic thinking, social responsibility, etc. An ideal leader, as seen by “Nashi”, is a *faithful*, optimistic, responsible, patriotic and an active person.

The seemingly difference between citizenship, as constructed in the analysed textbooks and as seen by “Nashi”, can be found in “Nashi’s” strong focus on building institutions of civil society characterised by activities like demonstrations, public protest, public talks, etc. However, critical activities as described by “Nashi” are directed towards what might be called “social injustice” or human rights violations in everyday life (domestic violence, violence in the army, xenophobia). Societal criticisms are thus possible without any eroding of the governments’ authority. And even the criticisms of the state authorities do not refer explicitly to the state or governmental structures, but to certain generations of officials – “those who lost *faith* in the future of Russia” (*ibid.* my italics, TZ). Finally, the criticisms (though not surprisingly in the pro-government organisation) are only directed at the “unfaithful non-supportive citizens” (officials). This kind of shifting of the problems to the persons, the holding offices, and not to the system as such, is also characteristic of the analysed textbooks. Generally, the majority of the other features of citizenship repeat those detected during the analysis of the textbooks.

- **Political discourse on Sovereign Democracy**

⁸⁴ “The Ours, Our People”, <http://www.nashi.su/> (in Russian) – visited 2.01.2008

⁸⁵ <http://www.nashi.su/ideology> (in Russian), visited 2.01.2008

⁸⁶ More about patriotic ideas and patriotic education in Russia in Karpenko 2008 (in this volume)

Although the first editions of both textbooks were written before the official ideology of “Sovereign democracy”⁸⁷ was used in 2006 by its author Vladislav Surkov, the construction of the citizenship category in the textbooks contains or even anticipates some important features of Sovereign democracy. This is especially the case when concerning the bonding of traditions, national state⁸⁸ and conviction of the citizens’ support of Sovereign democracy’s conception (the way of Russian development, suggested by de facto ruling party) as the only rational possibility of Russia’s development.

In the conception of Sovereign democracy (as well as in “Nashi” ideology), *patriotism* is a central element. Patriotism has explicit historical connotations, and is supported by strong faith in the future of the country and accompanied by emotional bonding on traditional culture (whatever that culture might be in such a multicultural society as the Russian Federation). Every rationally thinking citizen is to support commitment to traditional values, is to see globalisation as a potential danger that is to be overcome by strengthening the state and is to thereby favour Russia’s development into a strong independent state and a Number One global player. Citizenship activity would thus be an emotional patriotic activity, based on the faith and support of the current developments’ course.

Reference to the glory days of its history plays an important role in both the ideology of Sovereign democracy and in that of “Nashi”. This reference determines modern Russian society in many contexts, bringing about debates like the current one⁸⁹ on the history textbook by A.V. Philippov⁹⁰ (“permitted”⁹¹), which refuses any critical commemoration of the GULAG as well as the perception of the USSR as a totalitarian state. This textbook concentrates on the glory days of the WW II victory and refuses to acknowledge any critical attitudes toward Stalin and his dictatorship.

Glorification of the past helps, on the one hand, to state the uniqueness of the Russian situation (constructing it as a huge, strong and independent country, which due to its dimensions and traditions requires some special kind of governing, special kind of democracy and even special kind of human rights conception⁹²). On the other hand, glorification helps to provide a solid ground for growing patriotism. What is special about this kind of patriotism is its self-evidence, which simply *must* be shared by every logically thinking citizen. As a result of the rational choice of the citizen, support of the country becoming prosperous and support of its development towards democracy is not put in any of the conceptions. Any citizens’ activities (activities of a “good citizen”

⁸⁷ <http://www.edinros.ru/news.html?id=114108>, in Russian – visited 2.01.2008

⁸⁸ For the detailed analysis of nation and ethnicity in this conception, and possible implications for xenophobia see Karpenko 2007.

⁸⁹ For a critical debate see for example http://www.gazeta.ru/education/2007/12/26_a_2477155.shtml, in Russian – visited 2.01.2008, and <http://www.5-tv.ru/news/story/details.php?newsId=6575>, in Russian – visited 2.01.2008

⁹⁰ Draft version to be found under <http://www.prosv.ru/umk/istoriya/index.html>, in Russian – visited 2.01.2008

⁹¹ <http://www.mon.gov.ru/dok/prik/4371/>, in Russian – visited 2.01.2008

⁹² See for example . a “Christian” conception of Human Rights, as formulated by the 10th World Russian People’s Council in April 2006 (this took place under the clear patronage of state authorities) on the request of the Russian Orthodox Church (<http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/103235.html> – visited 2.01.2008). This conception stresses alleged differences between the common concept of human rights and those suitable for Russian Orthodox culture. The congress statements appeal to elaborate a new human rights conception for Russia, principally based on Orthodox Christian morality, which opposes some basic human rights (for example, not being discriminated according to sexual orientation, relevant formulation states: „We see as dangerous the elaboration of `rights`, legitimating behaviour patterns which are condemned by traditional moral and all traditional religions”).

are directed towards strengthening the country, consolidating its powers, protecting it from its enemies and restoring social justice) are a result of faith, love and of compassion with the fatherland, without any critical reasoning of the country's development course.

– **Results of the analysis and political debate: Summary**

This small sketch of the both ideologies – Nashi as a CE ideology, supported by the ruling party, and Sovereign Democracy, as an semi-official political ideology – shows, that the reconstructed conceptions of citizenship, as detected from the textbooks' analysis, mirror to a great extent some important conceptions of citizenship in contemporary Russian political and media debate. This takes place irrespective of the bias picked up in these two textbooks only. Hence, the citizenship conceptions, detected from the textbooks, are built into a broader citizenship discourse and represent more than the isolated single-case. Detecting citizenship conceptions from the textbook can thus assist us in the reconstruction of relevant citizenship conceptions within the whole CE system or even within the national frame (this becomes even more relevant due to the strengthening of Russian's Education Ministry control over the textbooks).

It is not our task to compare the idea of active citizenship as stated by international conceptions, cited under section (1), however, by continuing with the same procedure we might learn more about the intentions of international organisations concerning the desired types of citizens.

Surely in the textbooks, this strong dependency of citizenship conceptions on the political developments is a speculation, which has to be tested by deeper research. Politics is not the only agent influencing the development of textbooks, nor the conceptions of citizenship relevant for the textbooks. Surely, the history for example, and the understanding of citizenship in the past, plays a great role in the construction of the citizenship category, especially in the post-authoritative countries where the ideas of citizenry and active participation were very strongly used in the CE during the authoritative era. Hence, modern CE has to cope in some form with CE heritage⁹³.

There are definitely other textbooks in Russia (local components of the CE) that are e.g. more critical towards the state and that aim at educating critically thinking citizens. When analysing textbooks, we do not work with the assumption that the intentions of state towards educating the citizens can be validly reconstructed from each textbook. Furthermore, international agencies, and other actors probably influence the citizenship and other conceptions, occurring in the CE (textbooks). The dependencies, expectations and their outcomes are to be proved empirically on different levels of the organised CE fields. The main task of the presented analysis was the reconstruction of citizenship conceptions, relevant for certain textbooks. Thus, the implications co-designing the classroom situation and influencing to some extent the type of citizenship wished for and internalised by young citizens, can be made visible. If we wish to reconstruct which kind of citizenship and participation is relevant within a certain organised field of citizenship education, we have to reconstruct citizenship conceptions

⁹³ Due to the problem of lack of space in this article, we cannot apply our analysis on the citizenship and participation ideas of the CE in Soviet Union here. My very brief note would be, that both textbooks do not execute a definite brake with soviet tradition. Instead, while ignoring the CE experience on the level of explicit, the authors avail themselves with for example, the soviet glorified rhetoric's of patriotism.

relevant on different levels of the educational system and finally analyse the classroom praxis. Reconstructing textbooks' citizenship conceptions is only one of the steps required.⁹⁴

However, the typology of citizenship conceptions, which has to be developed, is the first step in reconstruction of the development of the citizenship education field.

4. Typologisation of citizenship conceptions and further research perspectives

In our attempt to develop a first draft of an instrument for a typology of citizenship conceptions, we have suggested use of pairs of attributes in order to define, what type of citizen is implied in each conception. Concluding the analysis of the textbook citizenship category construction, we would like to validate pairs of attributes (poles of the continuum of meanings) on the basis of the analysis done under section (2):

- Citizenship as status vs. citizenship as based on conscious *activity* (passive membership vs. active participation);
- National/local identity vs. global /cosmopolitan identity;
- (Non-political) moral activity in service of the community vs. political actions/participation in political life;
- Political participation in a supportive form (or for harmonisation) vs. political participation in a critical function (including protest/interference).

While proving the sufficiency of the attributes' pairs when applied to the citizenship conception used in the textbook of Nikitin ("faithful supportive moral human/person", characterised through the emotional self-perception as a part of the democratic state, with strong linkage on country and locality), we see that these pairs would allow us to describe the most relevant features of the given citizenship conception. Citizenship as described in the textbook of Nikitin *et al* (2004) is based on conscious *activity* (not citizenship as a status) clearly bordering on national/local identity and lacking any cosmopolitan linkages. Activities of the citizens' are placed into the area of moral responsibility, of sharing the destiny of their locality; within the proposed pairs of attitudes it would thus be a non-political moral activity in service of the community. Although addressed as an active position, this activity is not linked to any kind of political action (any action, using political instruments); even voting is constructed merely as a moral/emotional activity. Concerning the last pair of attitudes, citizenship conception belongs to the first alternative – "Political participation in a supportive form" (though participation does not mean *activity* here). These pairs might be applied with the same result on the analysis of Bogoljubov (2005).

After having finished the analysis, we suggest one more pair of attitudes, suitable for the relation between a citizen and a state:

- Mutual dependency (reciprocity) vs. belonging of the citizen to the state or full authority of the state over the citizen

When applied to the first completed analysis, the pairs seem to be appropriate for building the analytical frame for the systematisation (typology) of the citizenship

⁹⁴ See the reconstruction of the further steps Hedtke/Zimenkova/Hippe 2008.

conceptions'. They cover the most important features of citizenship (however, adding further pairs should be possible if required for building typology). As a result of the combination of different attitudes, naming certain types emerging within the analytical frame shall be addressed later, and this after other types of citizens – as constructed in textbooks – are detected.

The combination of both the conceptions of citizenship, as presented in analysed Russian textbooks, and application of the pairs of attitudes, allows us to construct the first type in typology. This should integrate moral/emotional activities with supportive and patriotic components. We would refer to her as a “*moral supportive patriotic (dependent) citizen*”, while summarizing under the term “moral” components of faith and emotions, as well as of emotional responsibility.

In this article we have shown an exemplary analysis of CE textbooks, and have thus provided insights into the process of reconstructing CE citizenships' conceptions. Such analysis is important for the evaluation of CE teaching concepts and to figure out the best and worst practice methods of the CE. Furthermore, the completed analysis provided the validation and slight revision of the pairs of attitudes usable for the construction of citizenship conceptions typology.

We suggest using the constructed pairs of attitudes in order to build up a typology of citizenship conceptions as they appear in the organised field of CE. We believe such a typology to be essential for the comparative studies of the CE development within the international and national contexts. By reconstructing citizenship conceptions on the different levels of CE, we might be able to detect some directions of the CE development⁹⁵, and some specifics of CE (and its transformation in transforming counties).

The application of these pairs of attitudes might help to see citizenships not only on the continuum between status and conscious activity, but also to describe possibilities and limitations of the citizens' activities. In the future, this kind of typology might become an instrument for reasonable comparison of CE in transition.

Bibliography

- Abs, Hermann; Veldhuis, Ruud. 2006. Indicators on Active Citizenship for Democracy – the Social, Cultural and Economic Domain. Paper by order of the Council of Europe for the CRELL-Network on Active Citizenship for Democracy.
- Barber, Benjamin. 1984. Strong democracy : participatory politics for a new age. Berkeley [u.a.] : Univ. of California Press.
- Bergmeier, Uwe. 2000. Pädagogische Arbeit zur NS-Geschichte mit Jugendlichen aus Migrantenfamilien. (<http://www.ghwk.de/deut/tagung/bergmeier.htm>).
- Brumlik, Micha. 1997. Generationen und Geschichtsvermittlung der NS-Erfahrung. In: Kiesel, Doron, ed. 1997. Pädagogik der Erinnerung. Frankfurt am Main : Haag + Herchen, pp.19-37.
- CoE. 2003. Council Resolution 2003/C 295/04 of Nov. 25, 2003, OJ C 295 of 5.12.2003, pp. 6-8.
- COM. 2005. 206 final, 30.05.2005, EU White Paper “On European policies concerning youth”. Brussels.

⁹⁵ In order to understand the dynamics of CE development we suggest working with indicators as proposed by T. Hippe in this volume.

- CRELL. 2007. Mascherini, Massimiliano; Saltelli, Andrea; Vidoni, Daniele. Participation in Europe: One-Size-Fits-None. Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen 2007. Draft report (<http://crell.jrc.ec.europa.eu/participation/participation.pdf>).
- Damberg, Sergej; Lebedev, Dmitry. 2006. Report on the Seminars with Teachers and Experts of Society Studies Devoted to Problems of Civic Education in Secondary School. CGES research report, Manuscript. St. Petersburg.
- Eurydice. 2005. Citizenship Education at School in Europe. Survey. (http://www.eurydice.org/ressources/eurydice/pdf/0_integral/055EN.pdf) visited 2007-6-15.
- EUYOUPART 2005 = Political Participation of Young People in Europe – Development of Indicators for Comparative Research in the European Union (EUYOUPART). 2005. Final Comparative Report. Vienna. (http://www.sora.at/images/doku/euyoupart_finalcomparativereport.pdf) visited 2007-6-29.
- Falk, Richard. 1994). The making of Global Citizenship. In: van Steenbergen, Bart, ed. 1994. The condition of citizenship. London [u.a.]: Sage, pp. 127-140.
- Frank, Susanne. 2004. Wir wollen's wissen. Broschüre Das BLK- Programm „Demokratie lernen & leben“. Berlin.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2001. Sociology. 4th edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Glaser, Barney G.; Strauss, Anselm L. 1998. Grounded theory: Strategien qualitativer Forschung. Bern: Huber.
- Gunsteren, Herman van. 1994. Four conceptions of Citizenship In: van Steenbergen, Bart, ed. 1994. The condition of citizenship. London [u.a.]: Sage, pp. 36-48.
- Habermas, Juergen. 1994. Citizenship and National Identity. In: van Steenbergen, Bart, ed. 1994. The condition of citizenship. London [u.a.]: Sage.
- Hedtke, Reinhold; Zimenkova, Tatjana; Hippe, Thorsten. 2008. A Trinity of Transformation, Europeanisation, and Democratisation? Current Research on Citizenship Education in Europe. In: Journal of Social Science Education, Vol.6, No. 2, pp. 5-20. (http://www.jsse.org/2007-2/pdf/hedtke_trinity.pdf).
- Hippe, Thorsten. 2008. Indicators for democratic and participatory citizenship education. In: Journal of Social Science Education, Vol. 7.
- Holford, John; Patulny, Roger; Sturgis, Patrick. 2006. Indicators of Non-formal & Informal Educational Contributions to Active Citizenship. Paper from the Conference on “Working towards Indicators on Active Citizenship”. Vienna. (http://farmweb.jrc.cec.eu.int/CRELL/ActiveCitizenship/Conference/05_Surrey_final.pdf) visited 20.01.07.
- Hoskins, Bryony. 2006. Working towards Indicators for Active Citizenship (pre-conference summary paper. 20-21 September 2006. Ispra. (http://farmweb.jrc.cec.eu.int/CRELL/ActiveCitizenship/Conference/00_Summary_paper.pdf).
- Ichilov, Orit. 1998. Patterns of Citizenship in a Changing World. In: Ichilov, Orit. 1998. Citizenship and Citizenship Education in a Changing World. Taylor & Francis(Routledge), pp. 11-27.
- Karpenko, Oxana. 2007. Souveren _Democracy for internal and external use. In: Neprikosnovennij Zapas, No. 1, 51, pp. 134-152, in Russian.
- Karpenko, Oxana. 2007a. Teaching national” differences: narod” in Russian school textbooks. In: Rivkin-Fish, Michele; Elena Trubina, eds. Paradoxes of Diversity in the Contemporary World: Discussions of ‘Culture’ and ‘Tolerance’ after the Soviet Union, in print.
- Karpenko, Oxana. 2008. Problematization of the usage of the category narod” in Russian political, administrative and educational discourse”. In: Journal of Social Science Education, Vol.7, in this volume.
- Krek, Janez; Losito, Bruno; Vogrinc, Janez. 2006. Active Citizenship for Democracy. A paper commissioned by the European Commission Directorate General. Joint Research Centre Ispra, Italy.
- Mackert, Jürgen; Müller, Hans-Peter. 2000. Der soziologische Gehalt moderner Staatsbürgerschaft. Probleme und Perspektiven eines umkämpften Konzeptes. In: Mackert, Jürgen; Müller, Hans-Peter, eds. 2000. Citizenship - Soziologie der Staatsbürgerschaft. Wiesbaden: Westdt. Verl., pp. 9-42.
- Martinsen, Renate. 2006. Demokratie und Diskurs. Organisierte Kommunikationsprozesse in der Wissensgesellschaft. Nomos, pp. 31-45; 47-67.
- Oevermann, Ulrich. 1993. Die objektive Hermeneutik als unverzichtbare methodologische Grundlage für die Analyse von Subjektivität. Zugleich eine Kritik der Tiefenhermeneutik. In: Jung, Thomas; Müller-Doochm, Stephan, eds. 1993. Wirklichkeit im Deutungsprozess:

-
- Verstehen und Methoden in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 106-189.
- Oevermann, Ulrich; Allert, Tillmann; Konau, Elisabeth; Krambeck, Jürgen. 1979. Die Methodologie einer ‚objektiven Hermeneutik‘ und ihre allgemeine forschungslogische Bedeutung in den Sozialwissenschaften. In: Soeffner, Hans-Georg, ed. 1979. Interpretative Verfahren in den Sozial- und Textwissenschaften. Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 352-434.
- Ogris, Günther; Westphal, Sabine. 2006. Indicators on Active Citizenship. The Political Domain. In: Paper from the conference Working towards Indicators on Active Citizenship. Vienna. (http://farmweb.jrc.cec.eu.int/CRELL/ActiveCitizenship/Conference/02_SORA.pdf) visited 20.01.07.
- Steenbergen, Bart van. 1994. Towards global ecological citizen. In: van Steenbergen, Bart, ed. 1994. The condition of citizenship. London [u.a.]: Sage, pp. 140-152.
- Strübling, Jörg. 2004. Grounded Theory. Wiesbaden: Vs Verlag.
- Turner, Bryan. 2000. Grundzüge einer Theorie der Staatsbürgerschaft. In: Mackert, Jürgen; Müller, Hans-Peter, eds. 2000. Citizenship - Soziologie der Staatsbürgerschaft. Wiesbaden: Westdt. Verl, pp229-263.
- Walzer. 1992. The civil Society Argument. In: Maouffe, ed. 1992. Dimensions of Radical democracy. Pluralism, Citizenship, Community. London/ New York: Verso, pp. 89-107.
- Weerd, Marga de; Gemmeke, Mireille; Rigter, Josine; Rij, Coen van. 2005. Indicators for Monitoring Active Citizenship and Citizenship Education. Final Report. Amsterdam.
- Wernet, Andreas. 2000. Einführung in die Interpretationstechnik der objektiven Hermeneutik. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Zimenkova, Tatjana. 2008a. Textbook Research by Means of Sequential Analysis: Exemplary Application Case, CGES Worki