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Since the close of the Second World War, and especially since the fall of the Berlin Wall, European nation-states must negotiate tensions around citizenship and belonging as they become increasingly diverse in race, ethnicity, religion, and culture (Preuss, 1998). The conflict between heritage-based citizenship laws and continued demographic changes has especially challenged Germany to reconcile its diverse society with its traditional exclusionary notions of belonging. Citizenship education traditionally needed only prepare those who were citizens to interact with others like them. However in the late 1990s new citizenship and immigration laws officially redefined Germany as an immigrant nation. The political discourse, which has long championed a monocultural view of Germany, began to emphasize integration of immigrants and the preparation of all future citizens for participation in multicultural German and European polities. Whether education policy and practice have likewise expanded to create and enact more inclusive citizenship education has been left unprobed. This dissertation examines, in the case of Bavaria, citizenship education policy at the state-level and the implementation of this policy by individual teachers. Results reveal that state policy expansion towards multiculturalism is bounded by European concepts to the exclusion of non-European German students. Likewise teachers view diversity as positive only in European terms and continue to define and enact citizenship education in ethnocultural terms.
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CHAPTER ONE: CITIZENSHIP, DIVERSITY AND EDUCATION IN GERMANY, A RESEARCH QUERY

This dissertation began long before I even considered attending graduate school. It began on an unseasonably warm October day when I walked into a classroom in the former East Berlin. I had been hired by a non-profit organization to teach after school English and history to children who had recently immigrated. I had students from Iran, Iraq, Togo and Cameroon, but mostly they came from the former Soviet Union. The latter were considered repatriates (Aussiedler) instead of foreigners (Ausländer), because their parents or grandparents could claim German heritage, and therefore they were eligible for German citizenship. The Aussiedler sat in one part of the classroom, while my other students sat several rows away.

By the end of week one, I was tired of this self-selected seating arrangement, and I asked the students to please find a partner with whom they had never worked. No one moved. I rephrased the question and spoke slower mimicking with my hands the action of crossing over the classroom. No one moved. I directly looked at Katja, one of my best English-speakers, and asked her to work with Nasareen. She looked at me, she looked at Nasareen and still no one moved. I translated the request into German, trying to control my growing frustration. No one moved. I sat down and asked my students why they would not work with each other. Tatijana said simply, gesturing to the other side of the room: “They don’t like us.” Syed countered, “Why should we like you? You are just like them.” I asked: “Who is ‘them’?” “Die Deutschen,” said Syed. “The Russians [referring to the repatriate students, many of whom spoke Russian, but most of whom were of mixed Central Asian, Russian and German heritage] get everything just
because they think they are German. We are just foreigners here. I don’t know why I
even bother.” Tatijana angrily countered: “What do you know? I am not German, do
you think I wanted to come here? They don’t think we are German. Why do you think
they make fun of us in school? Why do you think the teachers ignore us or put us in the
corner with some stupid kid’s book?” It was this last statement which really piqued my
interest. I asked her what she meant and she explained quite bluntly: “The teachers don’t
even know what do to with us.”

Syed and Tatijana’s argument, which led to some fruitful discussions and the
eventual understanding that we could all work together in our after school classes,
highlighted the complex notion of belonging in Germany. Tatijana, by virtue of her
heritage, had a German passport but was not and did not desire to be German. Syed,
whose parents were political refugees, wanted to fit in and felt he had no opportunity to
do so. At this time, discussions of revising the citizenship laws, which privileged blood
over soil or heritage over place of birth, were just beginning to heat up at the national
level. But in my small classroom on the edge of Berlin, we had children classified by the
German bureaucracy as repatriates, refugees, economic migrants and illegals who found
one commonality among them—they were foreigners in their own eyes and in the eyes of
their German teachers.

Fast forward ten years, and the citizenship laws have been expanded, at least to
some degree, to recognize as German citizens children born to foreign parents in
Germany. The Federal government passed, after much compromise and debate, its first
ever immigration bill; and Gerhard Schroeder, then Chancellor of Germany, declared
Germany to be an immigrant nation in which the future depended on people of many
ethnicities and cultures living and working together. At the same time the European Union, then just a fledgling new constellation, had grown both in terms of member states and in terms of its everyday presence in Germany. European citizenship and a shared sense of commonality among European nations has now become a part of the discourse at the supranational, national and regional levels. Officially at least, monoculturalism is out, and diversity has become a part of the German and European discourses on citizenship.

It is not an overstatement to say that, in terms of citizenship and diversity, Germany has in less than twenty years redefined itself. I don’t know if Syed and Tatijana would have the same conversation today as they did those many years ago. But there is no doubt that the notion of citizenship and — of importance for this dissertation — citizenship education and the role of the school in it, have been challenged to make room for students like Tatijana and Syed. This dissertation will attempt to see, to what extent teachers and state education actors have responded to the new definitions and roles for German citizens. I undertake this project in the spirit of my students who, regardless of what immigration category they fell into, felt isolated and alone in their classrooms and saw no future for themselves as German citizens or members of the community.

Citizenship and Diversity in Germany

In recent years, globalization, demographic changes, economic migration, and the expansion of transnational and supranational allegiances have contributed to the erosion of nation-state autonomy from without. At the same time, ethnic and religious debates about group rights are new challenges for the nation state from within. Since the close of the Second World War, and especially since the fall of the Berlin Wall, European nation-states must negotiate these tensions as they become increasingly diverse in race,
ethnicity, religion, and culture (Preuss, 1998). The conflict between heritage-based citizenship laws and continued demographic changes has especially challenged Germany to reconcile its diverse society with its traditional exclusionary notions of belonging. The advent of the European Union with its charge to create a European dimension to citizenship (Commission of the European Communities, 2005) is an additional complexity. Thus, at both the national and supranational levels, Germany seeks to balance diversity\textsuperscript{1} with a unique sense of Germanness and Europeanness.

As the principal means to define belonging and to regulate rights and privileges, citizenship is one of the key areas on which all of these pressures bear (Joppke 2001). Although citizenship has distinct legal and political manifestations, it also encompasses cultural and social belonging. These two sides of citizenship, on the one hand highly pragmatic and functional and on the other more nuanced and nebulous are intimately interwoven (Goudapel, 1997) because the rights and privileges bestowed on citizens when not extended to other residents of the community create what Balibar (2004) terms “unequal species of humanity” (76). Likewise, while the state can regulate who has access to what rights and privileges through its control of citizenship, it delegates the training of citizens to embrace the notions of citizenship and belonging to society itself—most obviously through citizenship education in the schools.

In light then of the changes and challenges to citizenship highlighted above, it follows that citizenship education is equally contested and must be reconceived if future populations are to become participating citizens in a diverse state and be socialized into a

\textsuperscript{1} Most scholars describe diversity as the recognition and respect for difference based on race, religion, sexual orientation, gender etc (Banks, 2006, Nieto, 2004 etc). While aspects of inclusion such as sexual orientation and gender also play into citizenship education, it is the inclusion of immigrants and immigrant experiences which most directly affect the expansion of citizenship education.
more global world (Banks, 2004). As Banks (2006) reminds us, diversity cannot be sacrificed for unity, but unity must also protect diversity. Sutton (2005) likewise explicates the relationship between diversity education and citizenship education. She writes:

> Controversies connected to multicultural education go to the heart of the meaning of citizenship in a nation-state. Mass, state-sponsored schooling has universally promoted some concept of citizenship in a nation. Among the many purposes and objectives ascribed to national school systems, the creation of national subjects shares historical primacy and endurance with the objective of fostering economic growth (Sutton, 2005, 6).

In Germany, diversity as it relates to citizenship has been systematically ignored because citizenship has been defined by blood; access and participation in the social democracy, therefore, has been limited to those meeting this singular criterion. Citizenship education therefore needed only prepare those who were citizens to interact with others like them. However in the late 1990s new citizenship and immigration laws officially redefined Germany as an immigrant nation. The political discourse, which has long championed a monocultural view of Germany, began to emphasize integration of immigrants and the preparation of all future citizens for participation in multicultural German and European polities. Whether education policy and practice have likewise expanded to create and enact more inclusive citizenship education has been left unprobed.

This query is further complicated by the education structure in Germany, which gives each individual German state (*Land*) control over its education system. Thus the tenuous relationship between diversity and unity is made more complicated in the case of Germany where unity must be established at both the nation-state and European levels in a manner which is inclusive of diversity, but also where neither the supranational nor the
national entity has education policy-making power at the state or local levels. It is the individual state which, in response to these supranational and national expansions of the notions of belonging and citizenship in Germany, has to construct a more inclusive citizenship education. Likewise it is the individual schools and teachers which interpret the state policies on citizenship education, each in their own classrooms with their unique milieu and cultures. This dissertation will contribute to understanding how, in the new context of citizenship, diversity and immigration in Germany, citizenship education at the state and teacher levels has expanded to convey new and more inclusive notions of Germanness.

The context of citizenship, which is nationally and supranationally established and education, which is controlled at the state level and implemented at the local level, presents a challenge in terms of research design. As will be explicated below, this dissertation envisions education policy as resulting from complex relationships between system level imperatives and everyday lifeworld interactions. Here I am drawing on Habermas’s (1987) conceptualization of system as the aggregate of action consequences developed through fully rationalized and minimally interpersonal interactions, and of lifeworld as shared common understandings developed through face-to-face interaction. I have chosen one state, Bavaria, as a case study for two reasons: first, because it has a strong history of conservatism and its main political party has been very critical of attempts to redefine German citizenship to recognize diversity. Thus, if evidence could be found about changing conceptions of citizenship in Bavaria, it is likely that other, less conservative and resistant states will have made more progress toward implementing a multicultural curriculum. Second, it has been very affirmative of the European Union and
greater European integration. Bavaria is known for its resistance to change regarding immigration and multiculturalism. As will be explained at length in the methodology section of this dissertation, I have chosen to examine Bavarian constructions of citizenship education by analyzing state-mandated curricula and textbooks from 1988-2006. In order to understand how teachers interpret these *de facto* policies on citizenship education in their classroom, I interviewed Bavarian middle school social studies teachers\(^2\) and asked them, among other things, to reflect on how their teaching of citizenship has changed in the last ten years.

**Research Questions**

In exploring whether, and to what extent, citizenship education has responded to global, supranational and national challenges to citizenship, belonging and immigration in Germany, I have considered the following guiding questions:

1.) How are diversity, German citizenship and European citizenship represented in state-developed education materials? How has this representation changed over time, given the geopolitical changes, which have taken place?

   a. What are the backgrounded political theories at play in the citizenship education policies, as represented by state mandated textbooks?

   b. What, if any, vision of Germanness is invoked in the state-mandated textbooks?

   c. What, if any, vision of Europeanness is invoked in the curricular policies and textbooks?

   d. How are immigrants and non-ethnic Germans included in the concept of citizenship forwarded by the state materials?

2.) In what way do Bavarian teachers consider it their responsibility to promote an understanding of diversity as a part of citizenship education?

   a. How is diversity defined by Bavarian teachers, and does it encompass German, European and global elements?

---

\(^2\) Justification for this choice will be given in Chapters 3 and 5
b. How are integration, immigration and diversity reflected in teachers’ descriptions of their citizenship education teaching, and how do reflections reveal teachers’ understandings of citizenship education?

Although political science has contributed a large body of literature dedicated to the study of citizenship (Brubaker, 1992; Gosewinkel, 1998; Habermas, 1996; Kymlicka, 2001) and, increasingly, of the influence of globalization and Europeanization on citizenship (Balibar, 2004; Delgado-Moreira, 2000; Joppke, 2001), there is essentially no work on the German case that considers how diversity brought about by both globalization and the project of European integration, influences citizenship education (Castles 2004). This dissertation will begin to fill this lacuna in the literature by examining, for one European country, changes in citizenship education policy and practice as a result of changes in national, European and global influences.

**Organization of Dissertation**

This dissertation is arranged in three sections: Context, Methodology and Findings. Within each of these there are several chapters which contribute to the overall goal of the dissertation section. Below I will outline each section and chapter.

*Section I: Context*

In this section the context of the study is explored. It is comprised of three chapters, this introduction, an historical overview of citizenship in Germany and a literature review.

*Chapter Two: History of Citizenship*

With this chapter I lay an historical foundation about the nature of citizenship and belonging in Germany. The historical literature review interrogates the nature of
citizenship as it relates to immigration, exclusion and belonging. The section concludes with an examination of the most current reforms to citizenship and immigration laws, those which move Germany away from heritage based citizenship toward a more inclusive concept of diversity.

Chapter Three: Literature Review

The third chapter in the context section examines the relevant literature for this study. Two key literatures will be examined: schooling practices in Germany and the citizenship education literature. In particular I explain the tripartite system of secondary schooling and introduce the *Hauptschule* and *Realschule* in Bavaria as the main school forms included in this study. I then turn to examining citizenship education structures in general and those structures that apply to Bavaria in particular. Special attention is paid to understanding the role of social studies, as the major subject charged with citizenship education, in the school curriculum. I then probe citizenship education further by using the academic literature. Finally, this chapter concludes with a discussion of how globalization has challenged citizenship education and has clarified the connection between multicultural education and citizenship education.

Section II: Methodology

This section contains two interrelated chapters: theoretical underpinnings and research design. Both work together to explain how citizenship education is being conceived in this study.

Chapter Four: Theoretical Underpinnings

This chapter opens with a theoretical exploration of the nature of education policy and practice. I argue, using Habermas’s conception of system and lifeworld, that there is
a dynamic between state policy imperatives regarding citizenship education and diversity, and teachers’ implementations of these policy imperatives. The unique role of teachers as mediators between system and lifeworld points to the need for studies, such as this one, to examine empirically both levels.

**Chapter Five: Methodology**

The second part of the methodology section lays out the methodology used in this inquiry. I begin by explaining critical inquiry as a perspective which serves to unite the system level analysis of state textbooks and curricula with the lifeworld level analysis of teachers’ reflections on their pedagogical practices. Then, I summarize the case selection process, arguing that Bavaria is an appropriate case because of its stable conservative regime. The last part of the methodology sub-section explains content analysis and interview analysis. I introduce the political theory matrix, a methodological tool I developed to connect these two analyses, which seeks to respond empirically to Gutmann’s (1987) assertion that citizenship education enacts political theory. Additionally, I detail sample selection and validity concerns for both. In the subsequent findings chapters I explain in greater depth the actual steps taken in conducting each analysis.

**Section III: Findings and Conclusions**

This section contains three chapters: the findings from the textbook analysis, the findings from the interview analysis and the overall concluding chapter, which I draw together with implications and future research.

**Chapter Six: System level analysis of state mandated textbooks and curricula**
I begin this chapter with a detailed description of framing analysis, the means of analysis used to conduct the initial content analysis. Next, I present the results of the content analysis and then relate these results to the dominant political theories used to describe German citizenship. This latter step employs the political theory matrix as an analytical tool, introduced in the methodology chapter. This instrument is developed via the findings from the textbook analysis. I argue in the conclusion to this chapter that, despite supranational and national discourses in favor of multicultural citizenship and legal changes to citizenship and immigration policies, Bavarian citizenship education policy remains largely ethnocultural in its intentions.

Chapter Seven: Lifeworld level analysis of teachers’ reflections on citizenship education practice

This chapter examines, using the same political theory matrix as above, teachers’ reflections on citizenship education. By connecting the analysis of the reflections directly to the textbook and curricular analysis, I am able to examine whether teachers reproduce, resist or reject state notions of citizenship and diversity in their own implementation of the curriculum. I conclude that teachers, for the most part, do reproduce system level conceptions of who and what is an ideal citizen.

Chapter Eight: Implications and Conclusions

The final chapter of this dissertation examines first the implications of the findings. I will do so, following Habermas’s (1987) suggestion, that studies should seek to have empirical, theoretical and methodological implications. Here I will argue that empirically the results show that Bavaria is not successful in conceiving of citizenship education as a multicultural or cosmopolitan endeavor. Further, I will suggest that State curricula and textbooks need to be revised whole-heartedly with the intention of
reproducing citizens who value diversity. I will also recommend that teacher training be
considered in this revision because teachers do not themselves view diversity as positive.
Theoretically I will point out that there are important implications for conceiving of
teachers as agents between system and lifeworld. I will also outline possible future
studies, recommending they continue to examine the role of the teacher in citizenship
education in a manner which interrogates the teacher’s relationship to the state. Finally, I
will posit the continued use of political theory as an analytical tool for revealing tacit
assumptions has important methodological implications.
CHAPTER TWO: CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION, HISTORY AND CHALLENGES

Germany, as suggested above, faces an especially complex task of redefining German citizenship (Brubaker, 1992; Gosewinkel, 1998) and reconceiving citizenship education (Demaine, 2004). In Germany, pervasive subordination (Balibar, 2004), results from exclusive access to democratic participation in the nation-state. Citizenship laws, policies and practices have institutionalized discrimination against non-Germans on the basis of the conceptually unclear standard of ‘being German’ and ‘belonging to the German Volk.’ According to Brubaker (1992) the resulting ethnocultural standard has, in turn, illegitimately preserved a monocultural—white, European, German-speaking, Christian—means of being German, despite its diversity of language, religion, race and ethnicity.

This enforced monoculturalism has been challenged, both through societal pressures and lawmaking over the past fifteen years. Since 1990, approximately 1.8 million ethnic Germans have relocated to Germany. This group, known as the Aussiedler\(^3\) or Russian-Germans, claim German citizenship as a consequence of post-World War II policies, which recognized ethnic Germans living in the Soviet Union as a persecuted

---

\(^3\) This term, which literally translates to out-settler, is actually a legal term which refers to all people who settled in areas east of the German Empire. Primarily this was in areas of the former Russian empire, but there were also significant settlements in Poland, Romania and the Ukraine. Until 1993 any Aussiedler could claim German citizenship. However, in 1993 the law changed and essentially excluded all of the Aussiedler groups from automatic citizenship and return rights unless they could prove ethnic persecution. An exception to this law, however, remained Aussiedler from the former Soviet Union. After 1993 they were legally considered Spätaussiedler (Late Outsettlers). (Ingenhorst, 1997). For the purposes of this study I am simplifying the language and use the term Aussiedler or Russian-German to refer to the large group of people who settled in Germany between 1990 and the present.
people. This designation preserved their right to return to Germany.\footnote{Article 116 of the German Basic Law determines German citizenship to be heritage-based. \textit{Deutscher im Sinne dieses Grundgesetzes ist vorbehaltlich anderweitiger gesetzlicher Regelung, wer die deutsche Staatsangehörigkeit besitzt oder als Flüchtling oder Vertriebener deutscher Volkszugehörigkeit oder als dessen Ehegatte oder Abkömmling in dem Gebiete des Deutschen Reiches nach dem Stande vom 31. Dezember 1937 Aufnahme gefunden hat.} (A German is, in the sense of this Basic Law unless otherwise legally regulated, a person who possesses German national citizenship or who is a refugee or displaced person of German heritage or his spouse, or descendant, who has been admitted to the area of the German Empire as of December 31, 1937)} The Russian-Germans are now the second largest minority population in Germany—just slightly behind the two million Turkish-Germans. The Turkish-Germans, as well as all other immigrant groups, have traditionally had no right to German citizenship even if their children or children’s children were born in Germany. Because the Russian-Germans are by law considered German but, for example, rarely speak German, their now physical presence in Germany (as opposed to their previous symbolic presence in the diaspora) has sparked debate about what it means to be a citizen of Germany, and, indeed, even what it means to be German.

In addition to the unique case presented by the migration of the Russian-Germans, Europeanization and pressure from the growing percentage of non-German permanent residents created enough political pressure in the 1990s to revise the citizenship law and conceive of immigration in more permanent terms. The Law on Nationality went into effect on January 1, 2000 and allows children born in Germany to foreigners, under certain conditions, to receive German citizenship. It does not allow for dual citizenship. The Immigration Act went into effect January 1, 2005. It is the first immigration law in modern German history and recognizes the need for legal regulation of immigration as a permanent part of Germany’s future. Its passage, as will be elucidated below, was far from uncontested.
The present chapter will examine in detail how citizenship and immigration have been defined historically in the Federal Republic of Germany and will explain the contemporary legal changes, outlined above, to these concepts. I will argue that taken together, these recent political developments can be understood as a deliberate, but still bounded, movement toward a more inclusive and multicultural notion of citizenship.

CITIZENSHIP AND BELONGING IN HISTORICAL TERMS

The Ethnocultural Standard

Since the early years of the Federal Republic, political rhetoric has consistently rejected multiculturalism in favor of a volk-based concept of modern Germany. By representing membership in the German nation-state as ethnocultural, the increasingly large number of non-German permanent residents was disenfranchised. Subsequently, Germany was able to maintain the appearance of a monocultural state. Germany protected the ethnocultural membership standard primarily through citizenship and immigration laws. These laws served as a means of continued cultural categorization of both immigrants and Germans themselves. Citizenship, both in the legal and in the social sense, has roots in the history of Germany. Brubaker (1992) writes:

Since national feeling developed before the nation-state, the German idea of the nation was not originally political, nor was it linked to the abstract idea of citizenship. This prepolitical German nation, this nation in search of a state, was conceived not as the bearer of universal political values, but as an organic cultural, linguistic or racial community—as an irreducibly particular Volksgemeinschaft⁵. On this understanding, nationhood is an ethnocultural, not political fact (Brubaker, 1992, 1).

As Brubaker points out, the German concept of citizenship is a result of Germany’s historical development not as a nation-state, but as a ‘Volk’; Germans were held together

⁵ A community of people
not by geography, but by their common “Germanness.” The purpose of citizenship is to
give Germans identity with their fellow Germans and later with the nation-state of
Germany; exclusion of others appeared to be to build this identity.

The actual citizenship laws came into being in reaction to, not only the geographic
dispersion of Germans throughout Central and Eastern Europe, but also to the
simultaneous dispersion of non-Germans in the German territories. The 1871
constitution, the first to unify Germany, is important for understanding the Germans’
evolving relationship with citizenship. The declaration in Section II Article iii states:

There shall be a common citizenship for all Germany, and the
members (subjects or citizens) of each State of the confederation shall
be treated in every other State as natives, and shall accordingly have
the right of becoming permanent residents; of carrying on business; of
filling public offices; of acquiring real estate; of obtaining citizenship,
and of enjoying all other civil rights under the same conditions as
those born in the State…No German shall be limited in the exercise of
these rights by the authorities of his native state nor by the authorities
of any other State of the Confederation (Constitution of 1871).

Here the focus is clearly on unification of the separate German Länder into one German
state; there is no mention of inclusion of non-Germans or of naturalization per se.

Secondly, the language throughout the document is telling of the framers’ intentions.
Looking at the above passage as an example, line 7, “No German” is a specific term
referring to heritage rather than citizenship.

In conceiving the first citizenship laws in post 1871 Germany, the lawmakers
reached back to the 1842 Prussian naturalization laws and developed a naturalization
process which required economic, linguistic and religious assimilation and left the
decision itself up to the discretionary powers of the civil servant processing the case.
Specifically, proof of ability to support one’s family, permission of the officials in the
geographic area where the applicant resided and ‘respectability’ were the criteria. While this is not necessarily an outright mention of blood based citizenship, Gosewinkel (1998) maintains that these criteria allowed citizenship to become more homogenized.

The 1913 citizenship laws, which form the basis for both the 1919 and the 1945 constitutions, moved away from social and religious indicators in favor of linguistic and cultural criteria (Gosewinkel, 1998). Joppke (2000) explains that this law served as a dual rationale for excluding Slavic people who were deemed undesirable and including those Germans in the far reaches of the former empire. The constitution of the Weimar Republic follows the general pattern of the 1871 constitution both in language and style. In the law, but not in the constitutions, we see direct mention of citizenship by descent. Quite ironically, considering the later emphasis on the Aussiedler population, the 1913 law was very strictly interpreted in the Weimar Republic to discourage many Aussiedler from returning to Germany during the economic depression. This was rationalized by saying that while the populations were clearly German, their return would hurt the survival of other German minority groups in the east (Levy, 1999).

Clearly the 1935 Nuremberg laws go much further in excluding non-Germans and in defining who is German. There is no question that these laws intended to remove citizenship rights from non-Germans, and there can be no true comparison between the 1913 descent laws and the 1935 fascist laws. However, we do see a progression of blood-based “Germanness” with the definition of who is Jewish and who is Aryan. Further, Rathel (1995) points out that the Nazis did not rely solely on the blood definition to determine “Germanness.” Indeed, Paragraph Two of the Reichsbürgergesetz (part of the Nuremberg Laws) from the 15th of September 1935 reads: “Reich citizen is only that
citizen, who is of German or German-related blood, who through his behavior proves that he is willed to faithfully serve the German folk and empire.” Rathel (1995) explains that it was the blend of blood and behavior criteria which made the Nazis so effective in their domination of so many different groups. It should be noted that the 1949 Basic Law (German Constitution) and subsequent citizenship laws, which remained in effect and essentially unchanged until 1999, are clearly based on the 1913 laws, but the framers of the Basic Law did have to struggle with its similarity to the Nuremburg Laws in terms of the ethnic conception of a nation-state. Paragraph 116 of the German Basic Law reads:

*XI Uebergangs- und Schlussbestimmungen (Temporary and End Decisions)*

*Artikel 116 (Article 116):*

A German is, in the sense of this Basic Law unless otherwise legally regulated, a person who possesses German national citizenship or who is a refugee or displaced person of German heritage his spouse or descendant, who has been admitted to the area of the German Empire as of December 31, 1937.

As Rathel (1995) shows, both the Nazi and the 1945 definitions make allowances for German *Volkszugehörigkeit* (belonging to the German *Volk*). Rathel writes:

Both formulations state that a German *Volkszugehöriger* [own emphasis] is somebody who lays claim to German-ness and who has certain ‘German’ characteristics such as language, education or culture. While the West German formulation of course does not include the sentence that those of foreign blood, such as Jews, cannot be German, it adds the word *Abstammung* (descent) [own emphasis] to the formulation of 1939 (Rathel, 1995, 5).

Joppke (2000) explains that indeed it was the *Aussiedler* population, that is those living in the then Soviet Union, which provided the necessary justification for keeping the *ethnocultural* definition of citizenship in 1949, despite the similarities to the Nazi laws. As will be discussed below, this definition had important influence on the constructed image of the Russian-Germans in public discourse. The division of Germany into East
and West and the erection of the Berlin Wall meant that not only were East German
citizens barred from citizenship in democratic Germany, but also those Voltk Germans in
various parts of the East Bloc were denied democratic participation. Joppke writes:

Considering that Article 116(1) was conceived of as only a temporary
device to cope with the consequences of the war, this has never been the
dominant constitutional opinion. More widespread has been the view that
the Basic Law’s general conception of the Federal Republic as a
provisional incomplete nation-state commanded its closure toward
foreigners, because the inclusion of the latter might undermine the social
impulse for unification through changing the texture of the citizenry…
(Joppke, 2000, 217).

Given Joppke’s interpretation, it appears that Germany had to maintain its monocultural
citizenship until such a time as political unification could be achieved.

The Ethnocultural Standard and Immigration:

As outlined above, Germany has protected its ethnocultural membership standard
primarily through citizenship and immigration laws. These laws served as a means of
continued cultural categorization of both immigrants and Germans themselves. Given
this, it is particularly useful to examine the shifts in these laws as they relate to two
specific minority groups—the ethnic German returnees known as Aussiedler and the
temporary labor immigrants or Gastarbeiter— as these represent the two major groups of
minorities in contemporary Germany. Further, and perhaps more importantly, these laws
privileged the Aussiedler over the Gastarbeiter—using the existence of the former to
deny the latter full rights.

In relation to any non-ethnically German immigrants, such as the Turkish-
Germans, there can be little question that these laws and practices provided a means of
exclusion and perhaps even disparagement.\textsuperscript{6} The Guest Worker policies, which were the most significant policies governing immigration in West Germany, were not driven by this exclusionary ideology explicitly, as had been use under Hitler of foreign/slave labor (Baker et.al., 1985). Rather, the policies were based on economic necessity, but nonetheless they excluded the foreigners in every aspect of democratic society. This can best be exemplified by the following quote from the General Administration Code for the Enforcement of the Foreigner Law, paragraph 6:

Foreigners enjoy all basic rights, except the basic rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of movement and free choice of occupation, place of work and place of education, and protection from extradition abroad (Castles, 1985, 185).

Given this situation, it is not surprising that hallmarks of disparagement, including lack of success in mainstream society and aspects of minoritization, particularly in terms of geographic isolation and low educational attainment is present in every non-German group (Bade and Oltmer, 1999). Yet, the very existence of the Guest Workers population may have contributed to the continuation of the \textit{ethnocultural} definition which, at least to some degree, relies on ‘othering.’ The presence of a large number of non-Germans (particularly those who cannot pass and who mark themselves as different through language and religion) provided reinforcement that being German was something particular to blood and heritage. Quite in contrast to the Guest Workers, the \textit{Aussiedler} were in effect, privileged by the \textit{ethnocultural} definition. While it is clear that the citizenship law itself allowed \textit{Aussiedler} to return and granted them citizenship (with all the rights and privileges thereto), it is equally important to understand that the very

\textsuperscript{6} De Vos 1990 building off of Ogbu (1974) presents a model of disparaged minorities being minorities who face social and economic barriers put into place by the majority. This disparagement can lead to the development of oppositional identities and lack of success in mainstream society.
definition was maintained through the social memory of the ‘‘Germanness’’ of the
Aussiedler (Levy, 1999).

At the end of World War II a large number of Germans lived in the eastern
territories of the former German empire as well as regions of Eastern Europe. The
expulsion of these Germans (nearly 13 million in total), from these regions referred to as
the Vertriebene, under the Potsdam Accords (1945) forms the backbone for promoting
allegiance to the German Volk in terms of citizenship. The expellees’ integration and
presence in German society served as a constant reminder to Germans of what they had
lost during the War. At the same time other ethnic Germans, living in the Soviet Union,
were interred and forbidden from returning. They were, by all historic accounts, truly
persecuted for being German (Ingenhorst, 1997). Levy (2002) argues that in examining
the influence of Vertriebene on German society and politics during the first years of the
Republic (1949-1960) a nearly unnatural strengthening of the concept of German is
revealed. The government supported the Vertriebene through laws which served to
further maintain the ethnocultural maxim. Beyond the actual citizenship laws outlined
above, Levy (2002) explains that the government focus on the ceded eastern provinces
particularly the Oder-Neise line, reinforced the status of the Vertriebene as victims
because of the focus on their lost lands… or Heimat. Additionally, the Vertriebene

---

7 Expellee: The Vertriebene and later Aussiedler are both groups of ethnic Germans who settled in Eastern
regions of Europe. The Vertriebene were expelled under the 1945 Potsdam Accords, the Aussiedler were
not allowed to leave for Germany and were interred under Stalin.
8 After World War II the eastern border of German was moved westwards to the Oder and Neisse rivers.
The Allies had intended it to be a temporary border until such time as a peace conference could be called
and a definitive border could be drawn. Such conference did not occur and the Soviet occupying power
liberally interpreted which branch of the Neisse River could be used, thus giving Poland fertile agricultural
lands. It was not until 1990 that then Chancellor Kohl conceded this border area as permanent (Sandford,
1999).
9 “Heimat emerged in the late nineteenth century as a politically ambiguous term reflecting tensions
between local loyalties and German national identity. Notoriously difficult to translate, it is perhaps best
formed strong organizations and made themselves and their land loss highly visible in
everyday German life. They lobbied the government, organized editorial writing
campaigns and held public demonstrations about their plight (Levy 1999; Ingenhorst,
1997). Examples include the installation of a national ‘Tag der Heimat’ a day celebrating
the eastern provinces (Levy 1999). The German government also sought to mandate
cultural knowledge of Germans in the East. The 1953 Bundesvertriebenengesetz (Federal
Expellee Law or BVFG) explicitly lays out the importance of protecting this knowledge
base through museums, libraries and community groups. The first section of Paragraph
96 reads:

The federal and state governments must, as a result of the powers
invested in them through the Basic Law, maintain the Kulturgut
[cultural worth] of the areas of expulsion in the consciousness of
the expellees and refugees, the entire German people and those
abroad; to maintain, add to and provide quality-control for
archives, museums and libraries as well as to support and maintain
art exhibitions and education…

While this emphasis on cultural knowledge also showed the need to continually
protect the idea of the German Volk, it also created a specific kind of knowledge centered
around the diasporic German people. Legally, the Federal Expellee and Refugee Law of
1953 also specifically put expellees on the same level with Aussiedler still behind the
Iron Curtain; paragraph 6 outlines that factors of descent, language, culture and
commitment to ‘Germanness’ equaled Volkszugehörigkeit. Levy (2002) argues that a
distinct public discourse about being German emerged in this era—one which is based on
the constructed social memory of being German. This was further reinforced through the

rendered by the word ‘roots’, which sidesteps the difficulty in English of expressing the meanings of
‘home’ and ‘homeland’ while evoking some of the wider psychological connotations of the word”
(Sandford, 1999).
discourse which revealed the *Aussiedler* and expellees as being persecuted and punished for their Germanness.

Brubaker (1992) explains that for most of the post World War II era, this idea of *Volkszugehörigkeit* was very liberally interpreted, and it was generally accepted without question that the Germans behind the Iron Curtain were discriminated against and required refuge. While this policy certainly was effective in maintaining the *ethnocultural* definition—for as long as there was a need to include this population—it was in reality really a policy in name only. The Soviet Union’s restrictive travel policies prevented many *Aussiedler* from returning to Germany. Those few who did return were able to assimilate without much notice by the majority population (Dietz, 1998). In short the *ethnocultural* maxim solidified around two central ideas during the Cold War era: around the protection of what are the characteristics of being German vis-à-vis those other groups who were made-up mainly of Guest workers. Second, it draws on the concept of what is an *Aussiedler* which itself is framed around the ideas, experiences and memories of the expellees. Thus, through this selective social memory the presumed monoculturalism of historical Germany was maintained and carried over into an increasingly multicultural West German state.

**CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES AND POLITICAL CHANGES**

*Repatriation and its Consequences*

Between 1990 and 1998 nearly two million *Aussiedler*, the vast majority from the former Soviet Union, immigrated to Germany. As suddenly as the Berlin Wall had collapsed, Germans were confronted with the very real effects of their citizenship laws. This reality, in the form of 2 million new residents, challenged and changed the social
memory constructed around the *Aussiedler*. In so doing, this influx also undermined the fabricated monoculturalism which rested on the social memory the German ‘volk.’ The relatively few *Aussiedler* who were able to return prior to 1990 (despite the heavy travel restrictions of the Soviet Union) had been able to speak some German and had maintained some affinity and attachment to German traditions before immigration, the second generation, the so-called *Spätaussiedler*, for the most part, did not speak German and, indeed, did not think of themselves as ethnically German (Ingenhorst, 1997; Levy, 1999). The laws regulating Russian-German returnees became increasingly strict throughout the 1990s. This tightening however rested mainly on ‘proving one’s Germanness’ (Senders, 2002). Being German, or in this case being found to be German through the recognition process dictated by *Aussiedler* policies, became equated with speaking German. Currently, Russian-Germans applying for an entry visa have to pass a language exam before immigrating—as do their non-ethnically German family members (Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2005).

*Reform of Citizenship Criteria*

In addition to the tightening of *Aussiedler* regulations after 1993, there have been two significant new federal laws which affect citizenship and immigration to Germany. Likewise, several developments at the European Union level exerted influence. In December 2000, the federal government passed the first fundamental reform to citizenship since the founding of the Federal Republic in 1949. These revisions made
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10 1993 *Kriegsfolgenbereinigungsgesetz* (Law for Settling the Consequence of War) changed the long standing assumption of the German government that ethnic Germans were persecuted for their Germanness and therefore should be granted refuge. The law placed the burden on the applicant to prove that he was discriminated against because he belonged to the German Volk. However, the law excluded all Germans living in the former Soviet Union from this law. The law, however, did distinguish those returning after the law went into effect as late returnees or *SpätAussiedler*. 
naturalization possible after eight years of permanent residence, provided the immigrant could demonstrate adequate German language ability and show proof of livelihood. More importantly, though, it grants German citizenship to children born to foreign parents, if one parent had been a permanent resident in Germany for eight years (Federal Office of Migration, Refugees and Integration, 2005). The child also receives the original citizenship of his or her parents and must choose at eighteen between the two citizenships. This aspect of the law, which is still quite limited in application, is the first movement away from a purely descent-based concept of citizenship.

Despite these revisions, the constitutional definition of “German” remained unaltered and thus the ethnocultural standard is still the primary standard of belonging. Indeed, the 2000 law equivocates the notion of citizenship—moving on the one hand toward a territorial and inclusive concept of citizenship, while on the other hand reaffirming the heritage-based criteria. This is curious not only because of the inherent contradictions it presents, but also because it is in contrast to the standards of the other EU members states, which in general accept dual citizenship (Faist, Gerdes, Rieple, 2004). Initially, the then ruling Social Democrats (SPD) conceived of a much broader reform, one which would have included the right to dual citizenship. The opposition party, the Christian Democrats (CDU/CSU), initiated a huge national petition against dual citizenship, thereby creating a huge public backlash against the law. Bavarian Minister President Edmund Stoiber led the action, using the justification that dual citizenship would create a serious threat to national security and that integration must be the first goal of foreigner policy (Darnstaedt et.al, 1999). A poll taken in 1999, at the height of the public outcry against dual citizenship, revealed that 53 percent of Germans
were against any form of dual citizenship (Emnid Poll, 1999, 25). A 1999 Spiegel article articulates the fear underlying the anti-dual citizenship sentiments:

The idea that bilingual street signs might be put up in German Turkish ghettos, like in Berlin-Kreuzberg, might seem cute to some who like to take ski vacations in the Italian section of Southern Tirol. But what happens when German Turks achieve a majority in local elections and affect what is taught in the schools or pass a requirement to wear headscarves? (Darnstaedt et al., 1999, 22).

Ultimately the SPD was forced to withdraw dual citizenship from the reform measures. This serves as an excellent example of how concepts of multiculturalism are used as a negative when associated with German citizenship. Faist, Gerdes and Rieple (2004) argue that initially the SPD brought forth as positives the multicultural outcomes of dual citizenship, such as maintenance of dual identities and bilingualism. The CDU, however, successfully renamed multiculturalism as a negative by presenting it, as it traditionally has, as a measure of segregation (Stoiber, 1989). For example, Stoiber writes in an early piece on the dangers of multiculturalism:

A multicultural society has a totally different goal than integration: meant is that different cultures, justice systems, forms of living together, religious and cultural tendencies live next to each other within one state’s justice system. The prevalence of this though must be taken seriously as a sign that the ability of our society to integrate 100,000 foreigners is exhausted. In this sense the term multicultural society is not a new, hope-filled solution, rather a clear alarm signal (Stoiber, 1989, 20).

By associating multiculturalism with segregation, it becomes the enemy of integration. Based on such an understanding it is easier to comprehend how the citizenship reform ultimately presented an equivocal picture of citizenship in Germany and was successful in limiting the movement toward a multicultural notion of belonging. Further, this anti-
multicultural rhetoric and the inherent contradictions in citizenship once again underscore how the study of diversity in Germany is directly tied to the study of citizenship. As the findings of this dissertation reveal, citizenship education, much like citizenship itself, remains contradictory and contested in terms of its inclusion of diversity.

Immigration Act

While the passage of the citizenship reforms was significant, even more influential in terms of expanding the notion of belonging in Germany was the adoption of an Immigration Act in 2005. Prior to this law, Germany never had a law regulating immigration because immigration policy officially did not exist. The Guest worker policies, which brought so many of the current non-ethnic-German residents to Germany in the 1960s and 1970s, were viewed as temporary economic policies. Any other policies which have regulated residency, such as the right to family reunion which contributed to an increase in the number of non-German residents by allowing spouses and children to join Guest workers, were considered foreigner policies. There was essentially no legal framework or even language for considering non-ethnic German residents as immigrants. The Immigration Act sets forth a variety of legal reasons for immigrating to Germany—but, most significantly, also requires immigrants to attend a culture and language course, the purpose of which is to support integration. Access to these courses, which are modeled on the initial language and orientation course once offered only to Aussiedler, is legally guaranteed by the Act. The 2005 federal budget line lists €208 million for language courses for foreigners (Federal Ministry of the Interior 2006). The federal
government carries the full cost for the courses\textsuperscript{11}, enough to enroll 138,000 newly arrived immigrants and 56,000 current resident aliens in language courses (Ibid).

With the expansion of the course availability to all groups, the government showed that it recognized the need to commit financial and human resources to the project of building a multicultural society. In contrast to all other aspects of education policy in the Federal Republic, the Federal Office for Migration, Refugees and Integration (itself a newly renamed and reorganized ministry) oversees most federal measures to support integration, including coordination of state and local efforts. The ordinance regulating integration courses specifies course details, in particular curriculum design and content, and the length and certification procedures for course providers who have to be approved by the newly created Federal Office for Migration and Refugees.

Clearly this new law represents a considerable change in the nature of citizenship and immigration in Germany. For the \textit{Aussiedler} in particular, it further reduces their special status, homogenizes and attempts to equalize immigrant opportunities and services. Sanctions for not completing the language course, primarily a ten percent reduction in welfare benefits, are aimed at all immigrants. With the Immigration Act we see language becoming the central criterion for integration of immigrants. Much like the adoption of the citizenship reform measures, the Immigration Act was a highly controversial and contested reform, which ultimately passed only after significant compromise between the left-leaning SPD and right-leaning CDU. Indeed the initial law was passed under the strangest of circumstances when the representative from the federal

\textsuperscript{11}This compromise was necessary to get the bill passed after the initial bill was overturned on procedural grounds by the Constitutional Court. This brings up interesting ideas related to local will to actually implement the federally mandated policy.
state of Brandenburg gave his oral affirmative vote while other members from his state shouted ‘nein’. His yes vote, which was necessary for passage, was recorded and the bill was passed. Before it could go into effect, the law was challenged and ultimately overturned by the Constitutional Court. It took three more years for a new compromise to be reached between the Christian Democrats (who were in large part against the bill) and the Social Democrats. Here the Bavarian head of State, Edmund Stoiber, again played a leading role. Indeed the Bavarian Christian Social Union (CSU) spoke out against the position of the conservative sister party, CDU, taking an even more conservative stance. The main counterpoint to the Immigration Act was its ideological intention. Both the CDU and CSU required that the Immigration Act set limits to immigration as one of its major intentions. The CSU, in particular, also connected internal security with immigration, demanding that deportation rights be strengthened especially in light of Islamic terrorism. Again within the debate on the Immigration Act, we see multiculturalism being viewed as something undesirable and negative and integration being defined in assimilationist terms, requiring foreigners to be subsumed under the dominant culture.

Supranational influences

Europeanization has also affected the conceptualization of citizenship and belonging in Germany. In 1992, during the same time that Germany was beginning to grapple with the effects of massive Aussiedler immigration, the Treaty of Maastricht codified European Union citizenship in order to encourage free movement of people

\[12\] The Al-Qaeda terrorist attacks in Madrid in March of 2004 came in the middle of the negotiations which strengthened public support for the CSU perspective.

\[13\] This refers to the process put into motion by the Maastricht Treaty (1993) which aims to integrate members of the European Union on economic, political and increasingly social terms.
within the Union, to reduce the EU’s perceived democratic deficit and to support the creation of a European identity (O’Leary, 1998).

The process of Europeanization has challenged Germans to define themselves in more international terms. In particular we see this through EU support of European minority rights, which seek to preserve the linguistic and cultural heritage of small-language groups. In Germany this includes very small ethnic groups such as the Friesians and the Sorbs. Brown (2005), for example, found that European Union programs and policies surrounding regional cultural development have emboldened groups to draw attention beyond the national level to engage with the supranational even though their territorial homes are part of the nation-state. A series of treaties, beginning with the Maastricht Treaty has worked on solidifying the free movement of goods and, more importantly for our discussion, movement of people within the European space. Border crossing has become less of a bureaucratic problem and regional ties that extend beyond the limits of the nation-state have been strengthened (Moravacsik, 1998).

Articles 17-18 of the European Communities Treaty regulate European citizenship and make it dependent on holding national citizenship in one of the member states of the EU. The Maastricht European Citizenship clause clarifies this point in declaring: “Citizenship of the Union shall complement and not replace national citizenship.” However, in reality the existence of EU citizenship does affect national citizenship policymaking because of the interdependence created; if one country, France for example, grants citizenship to an Algerian immigrant, then that immigrant now has the right to work and live in Germany. As Hansen and Weil observe, “throughout Europe
the politics of immigration have become the politics of nationality” (Hansen and Weil, 2001, 1).

Further, and of particular importance to the German case, the regulation of third-country citizens residing within the EU is brought into question. European citizenship in its attempt to bring the people of Europe closer together, necessarily disenfranchised any non-European or so-called third-country resident living in the EU. The situation of foreigners (in particular Turks) living in Germany became the most blatant example of disenfranchisement within the EU. Hansen and Weil (2001) explain that it was the general consensus of most member states that if EU citizenship was to rest on member state citizenship, then national citizenship needed to be equitably accessible to long-term residents. This was not the case in Germany (Joppke, 2001). Rostek and Davies (2006) argue that the adoption of the 2000 citizenship reform measures, at least in part, was in response to this European Union pressure and the need to have laws harmonious with Germany’s neighbors. Indeed, the German government claim that the adoption of the new citizenship standards as meeting European Union standards (Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2006). Yet it should be pointed out that the European Union has introduced a powerful discourse about minority rights in Europe (Joppke, 2001). Germany has ignored or rejected this discourse, as well as attempts by the European Union to regulate third-country immigration (ibid).

CONCLUSION

An ethnoculturally defined notion of Germanness has been challenged by internal efforts and a supranational move toward Europeanization. However, these changes have

---

not led to the abandonment of a heritage-based mandate of citizenship. It has only led to an opening toward accepting a politically justified citizenship status alongside the traditional one. Movement toward a diverse society is a reality, but it is not completed. Luchtenberg (2004) for example argues, that Europeanization has allowed Germany to address diversity in non-threatening ways that do not engage the country’s racial, ethnic and religious complexity. Moreover, when considering the changes in citizenship and immigration laws and how they have invoked a negative sense of multiculturalism internally in the political rhetoric, it appears that diversity is acceptable at the European level but only in regard to European “natives” and not to immigrants. The resistance, in particular by the Bavarian CSU, suggests at least in Bavaria, the subject of this dissertation’s inquiry, a climate where respect for and inclusion of diversity are not embraced as a positive part of citizenship. In examining the development of citizenship, immigration and diversity with respect to the German history over the past 100 years, there has been clear movement in the last 10 years toward expanding the notion of what it means to be German at the political and legal level. The question remains whether and how these political changes have also been reflected in creating citizenship education which equally attempts to include diversity, in particular immigrant experiences. This dissertation will contribute to answering this last query.
CHAPTER THREE: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Beyond the historical and legal documents affecting citizenship, there are a variety of literatures which inform this study. Just as important to understand the historical notion of citizenship, as it is critical for this investigation to probe the nature of schooling in Germany, and for my study particularly in Bavaria. The position of the school in society tells us much about its ability to educate its future citizens. Examining the tradition of citizenship education in Germany and how it is situated in the school structure contextualizes any recent shifts or changes. Finally, the larger academic literatures on citizenship education and multicultural education help place the German experiences in a global context. These literatures are critical for my later analysis in order to examine the results in light of what we know theoretically about citizenship, diversity and education. In order to facilitate this process, I point out questions which remain unanswered in the literature and which my study may help elucidate. While this chapter provides an overview of both German and international education literature relevant to this inquiry, I have also drawn on additional context-specific literature in the findings chapter.

GERMAN SCHOOLING

The German school system has, as a structure, mostly been created by the state in order to serve state interests (Geissler, 2005). Education is the purview of the individual federal state, but each state must recognize the education credentials of the other fifteen states and, as such, there is still considerable similarity from state to state. The Standing Conference of Culture Ministers of the Federal States in Germany (Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, abbreviated forth
with as KMK) functions to make sure there is agreement between the federal states on major changes in structure and intent. The KMK, to this end, makes recommendations which are signed by each state’s representative, but are not legally binding in the state. Erk (2003) argues, however, that the KMK policies, which for example include a 1996 decision to include intercultural education as a common thread in the curricula for all school forms (explained below) function as binding because any recommendation must be unanimously approved by all of the ministers. Nonetheless enactment and implementation of any KMK decision is left solely to the discretion of the individual state. The cultural and educational power of each of the federal states remains very important in German politics and, through Article 30 of the Basic Law, is a constitutionally protected separation of powers. Although enshrined in the 1949 constitution, in part because of the Allies’ belief that individual state control over education would serve as a preventative measure against resurgence of nationalism (Erk, 2003), de-centralization of education mirrors the development of Germany as a collection of tribes and, later, lands, as opposed to a unified national state.

Beyond the state level control of education, the most pervasive feature of the German school structure is the tripartite division into different school forms after primary school—in most states, after fourth grade. This structure which like de-centralization, predates even the unification of Germany in 1871, emerged as a source of pride from the position of the Gymnasium, as the elite university preparatory high school (Geissler, 2005). There are three distinct school forms: Hauptschule, Realschule and Gymnasium. Both the Hauptschule and Realschule are generally accompanied or followed by vocational training. The Gymnasium, however, is preparation for the university. This
system, which has its roots in the 19th century, was codified in the 1955 Düsseldorf agreement. This agreement justified classification into the various school forms based on the ‘psychological types’ of students. The agreement states:

It is intended to preserve the current system of schools as it has proved to be worthwhile. The tripartite system of höhere Schulen, Volksschulen and Mittelschulen corresponds to the three major layers of professions that modern life has developed: an intellectually leading, an executing and a mediating layer of practical professions with increased responsibilities in between. This division into three layers also does justice to the three major types of talents: a theoretical, a practical and a theoretical-practical type.

Ertl and Phillips (2000) explain that this tripartite system aligns with German notions of what it means to be educated. The differentiation based on psychological type remains a central feature of education in Germany and is also a cornerstone for the variety in content and outcomes in the three school forms (Ibid).

Although there have been several attempts at an alternative educational model, including the development of a comprehensive high school, the basic division outlined above remains firmly embedded in Germany, and particularly in Bavaria. Indeed it is interesting to point out that Germany has had the opportunity twice in the last fifty years to restructure its education system, once after World War II and once during the process of unification. Yet, despite fairly consistent criticism on the grounds of elitism and inequality as well as the inability of the Hauptschule to meet the demands of contemporary society (cf. Führ and Tapia, 1997), the tripartite system remains. Further, tracking of students into these schools has been shown to reproduce class structure, and more recently, has been shown to place non-Germans and Russian-Germans into lower school forms at a disproportional level (Aurenheimer, 2006). Although parental choice is
a constitutionally protected right, which should mean in theory that parents can decide which school form their child will attend, in practice this does not always play out. In Bavaria, in particular the child is given a certificate (Übertrittszeugnis) which essentially entitles them to attend the school deemed suitable by the elementary school teachers at the conclusion of grade four. Parental input is minimal. In Bavaria seventy-five percent of non-Germans attend Hauptschule or Realschule (Ibid). The principal of a school in one small town which has in the last 10 years become 25% Russian-German summarizes this best: “We have one [Russian-German] who goes to Gymnasium in Ansbach. She is quite unique. Most of them are just not suited for that.” Gomolla and Radtke (2002), in their case study of how elementary school teachers recommend their students for either the Hauptschule, Realschule or Gymnasium, argue that institutional racism influences the overrepresentation of immigrant children in the lower school forms. Gomolla (2005) likewise finds that teachers’ values regarding culture and language affect their judgment regarding academic ability. She writes: “The disadvantaging and exclusion of children from immigrant families is the result of a complex interplay between various forms of direct and indirect discrimination embedded in the daily routines of schooling.” (Ibid, 49). In short, the tripartite system, by design, serves to segregate students with different backgrounds rather than integrate them. Structurally, then, the German school system works against one of the principle goals of citizenship education (Haendle, 1999).

Overall, throughout Germany, roughly 9.2% of pupils are foreigners. This number does not include repatriates, who, as discussed in chapter one, possess German citizenship, but often do not speak German as a native language (KMK, 2002). However, in Bavaria 12.2 percent of students are non-Germans. This number also does not include
repatriates, who resettled in Bavaria in higher numbers than in other states. Figure A. shows the percentage of non-German versus German pupils by school form in Germany as a whole and in Bavaria in particular in the year 2000.

Figure One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Form</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Bavaria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Non-German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauptschule</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures from KMK (2001)

* * 85% of which come from EU countries or other European countries.

I have chosen to focus this inquiry on the Hauptschule and Realschule because of this concentration of non-Germans in these two school forms. Further, although recent reform in Bavaria now will have students beginning Realschule in the fifth grade, during the time of data collection, all students (other than those attending Gymnasium, which
begins in the fifth grade) attended the *Hauptschule* through sixth grade, after which they began to be switched to the *Realschule* if they were recommended for admission by their teacher. Additionally, in Bavaria the *Hauptschule* still enjoys a better reputation and comparatively a higher number of students attend the *Hauptschule* in Bavaria—36 percent, versus 16.3 percent in Germany as a whole. In total just under 70 percent of German children attend one of these two school forms in Bavaria, while 80 percent of non-Germans (excluding repatriates) are represented. Thus, these two school forms represent the closest idea of comprehensive schooling at the middle school level.

*Citizenship Education in Germany*

Education is a primary instrument of the state for the purpose of, on the one hand, to initiate or support social change, and on the other, to guarantee social stability and reproduce social traditions and social order. The Prussian educational philosopher Johan Gottlieb Fichte (1971) articulated this latter point, as well as commenting on the social engineering function of schooling in his early 19th century writings. He stated that it is only through formal education that students can be socialized into the common values of the state, including loyalty, patriotism and commitment to the social. Thus, even in its pre-democratic history, Germany incorporated ideas of *politische Bildung*, (political education) as a core part of its educational philosophy. It is important to note that at times during German history, particularly during the Nazi regime and in East Germany during its communist era, citizenship education, much like Fichte points out, was used as a means of socializing students into fascism and socialism, respectively. Indeed, in its modern form, citizenship education was introduced by the Allies during the reorganization of the schools directly following Germany’s defeat in World War II. It
was a key aspect to the Allies’ policy of denazification (Giesecke, 1993). While it was a successful piece of the Allies’ educational policy overall, it was an imposed policy. As Wilde (2004) points out, this creates an interesting contradiction. “Citizenship and political education in Germany suffers from the paradox of having been, initially at least, imposed on the respective systems, without due democratic deliberation and discussion” (8). This is important to consider in light of the findings I will present in the analysis chapters, which indicate that teachers do not question state imperatives nor do they view themselves as part of a democratic process aimed at creating citizenship education policies and practices.

For the most part, citizenship education in Germany is not a separate subject, but rather it is an overarching topic in social studies. Social studies itself has a slightly different connotation in each federal state. In Bavaria the term Sozialkunde (social studies) is used; in other states Gemeinschaftskunde (community studies) or the older Politische Bildung (political education) remains. Still, in each of these incarnations citizenship education remains a fundamental goal of the broader subject area. Likewise, Bavaria recognizes the development of legally mature or actualized (mündige) citizens as a main and overarching goal of the entire Hauptschule and Realschule curricula, and as such, is a common thread in every subject area. Haendle, in her 1999 survey of German experts in the field of citizenship education, reports that the integration of non-Germans is considered a critical goal. Likewise, discussion of the European Union and Europeanness as an aspect of citizenship are viewed as key. Yet particularly these two areas—integration and Europeanness—which are fundamentally values-oriented, were evaluated by the experts as less successful than other parts of the curriculum. The IEA
study on Civics education (Torney-Purta et al., 2001), which is the most often cited comparative citizenship education study, concludes that German students view being a good citizen as someone who votes and participates in community service. With regard to diversity, 71 percent of the German students surveyed believe foreigners in Germany should have equal rights to others who live in Germany (Torney-Purta et al., 2001). This is well below the international average of the other 28 countries, including the United States, France, Great Britain and Denmark, which participated in the IEA survey. This begs the question: why, when integration of non-Germans is viewed as a fundamental goal of citizenship education, such attitudes persist. Returning to Haendle’s survey provides a potential answer. The experts also pointed out that the hidden curriculum was often more powerful than the formal curriculum (Haendle, 1999). In fact, the experts assert in particular that reproduction of patriarchal and authoritarian values are strong features of the hidden curriculum (Ibid). My study recognizes this and is therefore aimed at examining implicit and tacit citizenship education imperatives at the state and teacher levels. In my view this piece of understanding is missing from the literature on citizenship education in Germany.

I concentrate on the social studies curricula, and the textbooks connected to them, because it is the most focused curriculum in which issues of citizenship and diversity are discussed. These curricula are appropriate for this design because I am seeking to explicate, among other things, how the Bavarian state has responded to supranational and national redefinitions of citizenship. However, it is important to acknowledge that cross-curricular and extra-curricular activities, as well as parents contribute to citizenship development. Wilde (2004), for example, found that extra-curricular projects, such as
museum visits, were particularly effective when they involved a feedback loop through which participating students conveyed their experiences to other students, usually in a social studies classroom setting. If I were exploring student learning or knowledge, it would be critical to include extra-curricular aspects and, potentially, also parental contribution. However, there is only a half-day school structure in most of Germany, and particularly in Bavaria there is a limit to the development of non-classroom activities (Haendle, 1999). By no means is the extracurricular sector of the school as well-developed as it is in the United States. As such, the emphasis on curricula and teachers’ actions does indeed represent an examination of the most central means by which students are presented with citizenship education.

**Teacher Preparation and Place of Social Studies in the Curriculum**

At the *Hauptschule* level, teachers are trained much as U.S. elementary school teachers are; that is, they are trained primarily pedagogically rather than in content areas. *Hauptschule* teachers take concentration areas or majors in two subjects and generally a minor in a third, but are expected to teach all of the required subjects in the *Hauptschule* curriculum. Certain subjects, including English and Physical Education, require the teacher to pass a state exam if they do not choose these subjects in their initial teacher training. At the *Realschule*, teachers are trained more similarly to U.S. subject-area teachers. They are required to complete the equivalent of a Master’s degree in two subjects, plus pedagogical training. The subject combinations, however, do *not* include social studies because this is only taught as a separate subject in the 10th grade. As a result, *Realschule* teachers may take social studies as a third area and often do if they choose the subject combination of History and Religion or German and History. All of
the Realschule teachers interviewed for this project had their major academic training in an area outside of social studies. In other federal states, such as North-Rhine Westphalia, social studies, including sociology, psychology and political science, is a possible major subject choice for Realschule teachers. All teachers, at both the Hauptschule and Realschule levels, have the equivalent of a Master’s degree before beginning their in-service teaching.

The number of lessons per week differs between these two school forms and among states. In the Bavarian Hauptschule there are six hours weekly of social studies instruction via the combined subject area of “GSE” (Geschichte, Sozialkunde, Erdkunde), History, Social Studies and Geography. This combination is extremely similar to the US conception of social studies. At the Realschule level there was, until the most recent 2005 reform, only one hour of social studies instruction per week in the 10th grade. Now there are two hours per week. Yet, substantively very similar topics are covered in the two school forms despite the vastly fewer hours devoted to the subject at the Realschule level. This is because history and geography are separate subjects in the Realschule. Trommer (1999) in his assessment of citizenship education in all sixteen German states concluded that in every state the amount of time devoted to the subject is far less than would be required to teach the goals set out by the curricula or recommended by educational experts in the field. In Bavaria, and the in other 15 states, there is, despite the difference in the subject’s name and placement in the school schedule, an overlap in the intent of the curricula. The major themes in Bavaria are: democracy, the European Union, international agencies and the preservation of peace, globalization and economic issues, the media and social and community relations. These are all also found in the
other states’ curricula as well (Trommer, 1999). The IEA study, although primarily focused on student knowledge, also contains a smaller-scale teacher study. For Germany the data reveal that German teachers believe citizenship education plays a very important role in the preparation of students as future citizens, but they also believe that this education could be improved (Torney-Purta et. al., 2000).

**ACADEMIC LITERATURE**

*Citizenship Education*

John Dewey, in exploring concepts of democracy, linked schooling and educative experiences writ large to the success of democratic society insofar as these experiences forge a common identity among democratically competent citizens (Dewey, 1916). Habermas (1992), Taylor (1994) and Kymlicka (2001) have all explored ideas similar to Dewey’s from a political theory perspective. This link between identity and education does not pertain only to school-aged children. Human beings understand themselves in relation to other human beings and develop their identity, among others, through the national traditions and values to which they are exposed. Communities, Dewey argues, sustain themselves through educative processes, thereby socializing members into forms of public knowledge, including values and norms as well as participatory processes (Dewey, 1916). Since the Second World War, the advanced industrial democracies of Europe have, for the most part, developed educational policies aimed at supporting the development of a democratic common national identity. Citizenship education is one piece in a complex set of both, to use Habermas’s terms, lifeworld and system relations that work together to develop citizens able to reproduce national imperatives. Citizenship education institutionalizes a particular form of citizen as best, most appropriate and
desirable. In this sense, citizenship education curricula and policies represent the state’s most formal and direct means of creating citizens.

There has been a wide variety of work, coming mainly out the United States and the United Kingdom, which has, in response to the philosophical work cited above, explored notions and purposes of citizenship education. Hahn (1998) identifies two major models for research—political socialization and cognitive development—whereas Barr (1977) posits transmission, social science or reflection as the three distinct ways in which citizenship education policies can be developed. Zaman (2006) points out that there is a significant overlap in all of these theoretically-oriented studies of citizenship education. They all draw on what Zaman terms the “sociological paradigm” (10), that is, they all fundamentally examine the position of schools in society. I would argue further that, while the authors of these frameworks begin by explicating the role of the school and the relationship between school and society, they do so by exploring student learning processes and relations. This mirrors the majority of the empirical work in citizenship education, which will be addressed in more detail below, but is less helpful in understanding the notion of citizenship education as a form of state education policy or of teachers’ role in implementing this policy.

Since I am concerned with how the Bavarian state has responded educationally to recent federal revisions of the definition of citizenship and how teachers then implement these state imperatives, it is perhaps then more important to consider literature which examines citizenship education policy as a state action. Parry (2003) argues that these policies have the potential to be either reproductive or remedial. Citizenship education policy can reproduce the current political values or the policy can attempt to remediate
within the political system by “reconstructing citizens to improve social and political structures.” (Parry, 2003, 4) In the German case then, citizenship education would have reproduced ethnocultural citizens in order to support the state’s assertion that it is an ethnocultural state. Yet now with reforms to the citizenship laws and recognition of diversity as a critical aspect of Germany’s future, there is the potential that citizenship education has moved towards remedying ethnoculturalism. We would then expect curricula to put forth an image of a multicultural or cosmopolitan citizen as ideal. This idea will be empirically explored in the analysis chapters.

*Education Literature on Citizenship Education*

In political science, primarily contributing on the theoretical level, studies on citizenship education focus on democracy and democratic education (Demaine, 2004; Gutmann, 1987) or, more broadly, on the purposes and intentions of nations (Cerulo, 1995; Soysal, 1994). In education there tends to be a focus on student outcomes and teaching pedagogy (Schwille & Amadeo, 1999; Steiner-Khamisi, Torney-Purta, & Schwille, 2002). Carole Hahn’s (1998) work employed a mixed-method design to examine political socialization in five European countries, including Germany. Her work identified typical teaching methods, (in the German case, a reliance on teacher-centered classes), but primarily examined students’ knowledge rather than engaging with policy processes or contexts. The IEA CIVED project, a comparative survey of 14-year olds in a variety of countries, including Germany and the United States, has been very influential in understanding what students learn and the process of political socialization. This project has also drawn greater attention to the subject of citizenship education. Very recently, and in response to the challenges brought by globalization to citizenship
education (as will be discussed below), several qualitative researchers have begun research in citizenship education. Stevick and Levinson’s (2007) edited volume, for example, probes a variety of contexts, in both emerging and established democracies, from a socio-cultural perspective. This new aspect to citizenship education research will broaden what has been a very narrow perspective, both methodologically and substantively. Although not purely ethnographic, this dissertation contributes to this research tradition by examining the political context underlying both state and teacher conceptions of citizenship education.

Although teachers are included in a smaller-scale survey within the IEA project, for the most part teachers’ views and reflections are limited in the citizenship education literature. The IEA project found that teachers, for example, tend to interpret their own pedagogical decisions and what they have stressed in class differently from their students (Torney-Purta, 2002). Here, though, the emphasis is really on how teacher action affects student learning. Stevick’s (2006) recent examination of teachers’ appropriations (Sutton and Levinson, 2001) of international citizenship education policy and Deborah Michaels’ (2007) examination of Czech teachers’ reactions to EU mandates, are some of the only examples in which teachers and states play a central role in the study. In short, the literature is thin in regards to explicating teachers’ beliefs about citizenship education or their interactions with state mandates. This dearth in the literature represents an incomplete picture of the citizenship education policy process. My dissertation contributes to filling this gap.

In reference to the study of political socialization, Torney-Purta (2000) notes that the traditional means of educating future citizens has been through “direct-transmission”
of knowledge. She argues that this is no longer meeting the needs of a complex society. Falk (1994) also notes that the increasingly intricate ideas of identity brought by globalization and the need for citizenship to move beyond national-borders, means that education must be reconceived, and that new values must underscore the conception of citizenship education. Haydon (2003), writing about the newly adapted citizenship education policy in England, proposes that social inclusion must be seen as the fundamental goal for contemporary policies. Torney-Purta (2000) argues that these shifts challenge education researchers to design studies that not only focus on learning outcomes, but should also consider context and global influences. My study responds to this challenge by examining state and teacher imperatives on citizenship education policy. Both perspectives are often overlooked or reduced to mere lists of topics or pedagogical methods, rather than being critically engaged and challenged. Sutton and Levinson (2001) likewise argue that qualitative research is particularly important in researching citizenship education because it allows for policy and practice to be situated and contextualized. This framework puts forward teachers as actors who have the ability to exercise agency in their interpretation of state education mandates. This too supports the research design I am employing which is premised on the dynamic between the state, as system, and teacher as mediator between the system and classroom lifeworld. This dynamic will be explicated at length in Chapter four.

Recent challenges to citizenship education

The process of globalization has challenged citizenship education. Although often defined in a variety of ways or invoked to mean anything from strictly economic to more broadly social and cultural changes brought by increased migration, Arnove’s (1999)
description of globalization as a dialectic between the local and the global is most useful for education. Law (2004) interprets this dialectic, noting the influence of transnational and international discourses on national education policies. Law suggests that students have to be prepared to think beyond their local or even national borders, and this necessity challenges the exclusivity inherent in citizenship education which has been mainly aimed at preparing students to be national citizens, e.g. to be German.

While this pressure to change has not resulted, as Law notes, in any country’s abandoning local and national citizenship education in favor of a purely cosmopolitan or global model, globalization has influenced educational reform and discourse. One of the most critical areas of influence has been in the coupling of citizenship and multicultural education as areas of educational inquiry.

*Multiculturalism and Citizenship Education*

Torres (2001), in writing about Latin American experiences with democracy education, notes that “the relationships between democracy, citizenship and education cannot be treated in isolation from the question of multiculturalism.” Yet it is only recently that this area of inquiry, that is, the exploration of the connection between multiculturalism and citizenship education has become a more consistent part of the education literature. The majority of the literature on multiculturalism, multicultural education or diversity education comes out of the United States, and is consequently focused largely on issues of European-American privilege and the resulting disenfranchisement of non-Whites. Indeed, because of the literature’s origins in the American Civil Rights movement, some authors have argued that the literature has been dominated by issues of race, in particular Black and White relations (cf. Suarez-Orozco
and Qin-Hilliard, 2004). The writing, in particular of James Banks (1997, 2004) has been very influential in education because it has focused on curricular, textbook and teacher training reforms, which seek to ensure that the histories, values and experiences of non-White groups are interwoven into learning. Further, Banks as well as other scholars such as Nieto (2004) and Soto (1996), have argued that multicultural education must seek to recognize oppression and use education as a tool of empowerment.

The ideas of education as empowerment and as a means of opposing oppression are clearly—broadly speaking—applicable beyond the US context, but until recently multicultural education has not included a comparative or educational perspective. However, with globalization and the influence, in particular of immigration, this has begun to change. Literature coming out of the US has begun to include non-US contexts in discussions of multicultural education. The intertwining between citizenship education and diversity are being made more directly in this literature. Indeed Sutton (2005) argues that the field of multicultural education is beginning to ‘mature’ as it now has started to include comparative perspectives. Levinson’s (2001) study of a Mexican middle school probes, among other questions, the relationship between educational equity and ethnic background. Ryan (2006), also focusing on Mexico, examines the question of interculturality and citizenship education. Several scholars (cf. Leung and Lee, 2006; Law, 2004; Martin and Feng, 2006) have contributed studies on Asia’s experiences with citizenship education and diversity. Also beginning to appear are studies focusing on the countries of Europe, which have often self-identified and been identified by others, as homogeneous despite long-standing diversity. These studies, connecting citizenship and
diversity through education, are also beginning to appear. (Michaels, 2007; Guilherme et. al., 2006; Stevick, 2006; Walat, 2006; Schissler and Soysal, 2005; Geyer, 2005).

Indeed, in surveying recent publications about citizenship education, such as those cited above, it becomes clear that influences of globalization have refocused scholars’ attention on citizenship education, multiculturalism and interconnected areas of inquiry. Sutton (2005) argues that throughout the world, and in a wide-variety of educational systems, multicultural education has become a larger part of the educational reform discourse.

Loosened from its mooring in the United States civil rights movement, multicultural education has become a rubric – or foil -- for a certain arena of educational reform discourse around the world. … [T]he “epochal” dimensions of globalization such as wide-scale human migration and intensification of global communication have complicated social identities within many nations and so stimulated public debate on how pluralism is recognized in the curriculum and pedagogy of national school systems. (Sutton, 2005, 2).

In Germany, as the last chapter indicated, this discussion comes after years of denying the existence of diversity. But the influence of global forces, particularly Europeanization and migration, have indeed brought issues of multicultural education, as a critical part of citizenship education, to the forefront. My dissertation will contribute to this burgeoning area of literature by explicating this relationship in state imperatives and teacher actions.

**SUMMARY OF LESSONS FROM THE LITERATURE**

Citizenship education has been a well-studied phenomenon both from the political science and education perspectives. However, political science literature tends to ignore the practical aspects of educational processes, focusing on theoretical notions of citizenship, such as those reviewed in the previous chapter. The education literature,
except for a few recent contributions, has favored outcomes-based studies of student learning. Studies which do examine teachers’ attitudes and values still do so, for the most part, in an effort to understand potential disconnects between student learning and teachers’ pedagogical decisions. In short, political science examines national and state intentions, and education research examines student outcomes. There are very few studies which take seriously national and state formulations of citizenship, citizenship education and, of importance given the critical connection between social inclusion and citizenship education, immigration policies. Even fewer studies connect these system-level policy intentions to teachers’ reflections on their pedagogical practices. From Sutton and Levinson’s (2001) argument regarding appropriation of education policy by teachers as a key aspect of the policy process, educationalists know that teachers have the potential to reinterpret and even reject education policy behind their classroom doors. It is clear that there is the need to examine citizenship education, in this case as it relates to the national effort to move toward a more multicultural national conception of Germany, both from the perspective of the state and the teacher. Theoretically, however, this requires a social theory which conceives of the dynamic between these two levels. The next chapter will explicate Habermas’s notions of system and lifeworld as a means of understanding the relationship between state and teacher.
CHAPTER FOUR: SYSTEM AND LIFEWORLD, A DIAGNOSTIC FRAMEWORK

As outlined thus far, I seek to examine what complexities emerge as relevant to the development of citizens, through the educational sector, in the changing European sociopolitical landscape as seen in one conservative German state. This project is premised on significant changes in the notion of citizenship in Germany and on the position of education as the state’s most systematic means of shaping the way citizenship is taken-up by future generations (Levinson, 1999). The present chapter contributes to this endeavor by explicating the structures, interactions and concepts within a theoretical framework adopted from Habermas’s seminal work, the Theory of Communicative Action (1984, 1987).

Specifically I will examine the functions of education as an institution that elucidates both public and private spheres. Habermas’s conceptualization of the system and the lifeworld will be the main theoretical tool for this discussion. Habermas’s (1984, 1987) theory, in contrast to liberal theories with their focus on the individual, is borne out of observations of post-World War II Germany. His emphasis on a social democratic theory of the polis backgrounds this study which is likewise grounded in the historical realities of post-WW II Germany, as they relate to citizenship, diversity and education. Habermas’s theory of system and lifeworld is particularly appropriate for this study, because it examines system level interactions with the lifeworld.

In particular, the dynamic between system and lifeworld and the role the teachers fulfill in this dynamic are at the heart of this inquiry. Furthermore, I will refine the framework using Fraser (1989) as a means of examining how Habermas’s ideas inform our understanding of education in particular as a mediating institution between system
and lifeworld. Fraser’s (1989) critique is useful in examining the ideas of symbolic reproduction and normatively achieved actions as manifested in educative processes. Fraser (1989) takes a feminist perspective in her critique of Habermas pointing out the potential of system and lifeworld interaction to reproduce bias. Since neither Habermas nor Fraser address teachers, my theoretical framework will include concepts of authority, using Gutmann (1987, 1997) and Weber (1921/1963). This is a necessary component to my analysis, since teachers are both representatives of the state and communicators in and with the lifeworld.

In summary this chapter will argue, from a theoretical perspective, that citizenship education functions as an institution in the public sphere connecting the system and the lifeworld. Teachers, as civil servants and by virtue of their professional authority, mediate between these two levels. This mediation has the potential to reproduce, resist or reject system imperatives. The implications of this theoretical standpoint are the need for studies which empirically examine this dynamic relationship between system and lifeworld; state and teacher. My study responds to this implication through its research design.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS ANALYSIS

Before further explaining the role of Habermas’s social theoretical framework as it relates to the study of citizenship education in Germany, it is important to understand that I am not seeking to explicate Habermas’s Theory of Communicative Action. I take up Habermas’s social theoretical framework as applied only to the interaction between the public lifeworld and the public system because, as I argue below, this interaction pertains to citizenship education. I view his framework as a diagnostic that I impose on
the interactions between teachers and state-level bureaucracy. I am aware that Habermas’s framework is much more complex in that it examines, in addition to the two spheres I have mentioned, interactions between the private lifeworld and the private economy (see Figure A). By using Habermas only as a diagnostic tool, I am not following his analysis from classical capitalism towards welfare capitalism. I am taking it as a given that contemporary Germany fits into the category of late welfare state capitalism. By not following this line of historical analysis, I am likewise not incorporating a discussion of the colonization processes he outlines in Volume II of Theory of Communicative Action (1987). My application of Habermas’s social theoretical framework remains focused on discussing how education and citizenship education can be better understood as an interaction between system and lifeworld.

A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION POLICY

The unique case of German citizenship practice, as outlined in the initial chapter of this dissertation, is important in that it explicates citizenship education, as a means of institutionalizing a particular image of citizen as best or ideal. Drawing on the German case, Habermas (1996) argues that citizenship has been used as a means of both creating and enforcing an ethnocultural community. These communities, as Anderson (1991) points out, exist not through political or economic borders or treatises but through myths and symbols reproduced through institutions and discourses. Thus, in Germany the preservation of the ethnocultural citizenship standards would result in state mechanisms, in particular, education, actively creating and reinforcing myths and symbols of the nation-state (Anderson 1991; Hobsbawm 1992). As civil servants, Bavarian teachers are
an extension of the state in this endeavor. However, it would be inaccurate to assume that teachers act, in their interpretation of state policy, without agency (Sutton and Levinson, 2001). Likewise, it would be inappropriate to examine educative processes and their dependence on both state mechanisms and policy as separate from the personal interaction and meaning making of teachers. Schooling includes and mediates communication and interaction of the state with schools and classrooms.

In Habermasian terms, education is a complex system that links and indeed mediates between the system (in this case the Bavarian and by extension German and European state) and the lifeworld of families and communities. Teachers, among others, are the central cogs in the process. They are the ones who interpret policies, mandates and goals manifest in curricular frameworks and directives. They are also the ones who are held accountable for these actions. With regard to citizenship education, it is even more obvious that this mediation between system and lifeworld is necessary and crucial for the survival and future of a democratic state. Habermas’s notion of system and lifeworld explicitly includes a private and public dimension. In my adoption of the Habermasian model, this means that my analysis is limited to the public arena of the lifeworld and the public domain of the system because this is where citizenship education is located.

System and Lifeworld: Defined

Habermas defines the lifeworld as shared common understandings which manifest, within the private sphere in the family and within the public sphere in the arena for political action system-level. The system, which develops out of the lifeworld, is a fully rationalized (state) administrative system. To participate in a lifeworld, which is
constituted purely by mutual participation, is to share a common sense of who “we” are. For Habermas, the lifeworld creates this sense of who we are and whom we value being: norms, values, language, rituals, traditions, and ways-of-being. Because the lifeworld consists of communicative action—people reaching common understandings on everything from the color of the new town sign, to the founding of a new community center to immigration policy—only communicative action can re-create value commitments. But the system as the “aggregate of action consequences” still expresses, via steering media, value-commitments because the system is first rooted and initiated in the lifeworld. Thus the interaction between system and lifeworld is inherent in Habermas’s conception of them- the lifeworld develops first and the system grows from it, depending on and reflecting the lifeworld.

Habermas’s interpretive framework, particularly his discussion of system and lifeworld in Volume II of Theory of Communicative Action, provides insight into the intersystemic exchange between the public aspects of the lifeworld and the public system; it is this interaction which is central to my analysis. Habermas views the two levels of society as mutually dependent on interaction with each other. The system influences the lifeworld through its administrative structures’ use of money and power media, but the system is likewise influenced by the normatively driven and understanding-based lifeworld (Baxter, 2002). Neither, the system nor the lifeworld can function without the interchange with its counterpart. Conceiving of society as purely one or the other is to decomplexify it (Habermas, 1987).

Given this understanding, we can view education within the lifeworld through, for example, the interpersonal interactions of teacher and pupil, as contributing to the
socialization of a new citizen. Likewise the system can utilize education as a publicly administered bureaucracy to create citizens for participation in public decision making.

Thus, the notion of “citizen” itself could be both rooted in the lifeworld and in the system – both a reflection of micro-level norms, values, and traditions while simultaneously linked to system-level constructs like the economic system in a country (e.g. a citizen has economic privileges that a non-citizen does not). See schematic below for a graphic representation of this idea.

**Figure Two: Habermas’ Model of Late Welfare Capitalism Considered in Terms of Citizenship Education**

Habermas interprets the citizen within the public lifeworld-system relations. This study draws from this notion to posit more specifically the interaction between system and lifeworld that must take place in order to produce a citizen. I posit that teachers who, as implementers of state policies on citizenship education, are—to a great extent—the producers of citizens. They teach values, traditions and norms, which are lifeworld
notions. These notions, however, attach to the system through system-level processes such as textbook development and system-level economic values. Expanding on the latter point, the lifeworld norm of punctuality, which is often held up as being particularly ‘German’, emerges in the economy when punctuality is demanded of workers. Those people who do not represent the norm of punctuality in the standard ‘German’ way do not receive or retain jobs. In short, those who are citizens, both in the legal and normative sense, receive economic benefits; citizenship education is the mechanism by which the normative ways-of-being are conveyed to future citizens.

Education represents a case in which there is a dynamic between system and lifeworld. Understanding educative processes requires us to consider both system and lifeworld intentions and practices. Figure B reinterprets Habermas’s concept of system and lifeworld relations in terms of this study.
The public sphere is comprised of school life and social studies lessons\(^\text{15}\), the latter of which are given by teachers based on state-level curricula and textbooks. The system is constituted primarily by Bavarian education policies, because it is these policies which provide direct action imperatives to teachers. However, as chapter one explained, the

\(^{15}\) Of course the idea of the public sphere in education is much more multi-layered than this, but because this study only examine state level policies and teachers’ interpretations of them, I have limited my portrayal of the lifeworld to the aspects which are being addressed. It is also because of this limitation that I am not considering the private sphere (which is presented in Figure A) even though certainly the parents play an important role in the production of future citizens. However, as I have stated above, citizenship education via public schools and implemented by teachers, who are themselves civil servants, remains to most direct way for states to produce citizens.
federal-level changes in citizenship laws and the advent of the European Union have both legal and symbolic influences. In terms of data, I examine Bavarian state policies on citizenship education as manifested in curricula and textbooks. These are examined for their capacity to reveal meaning. Specifically, I examine the values expressed directly and indirectly related to citizenship and diversity, which are lifeworld concepts, and the actions imperatives outlined for teachers, which are system concepts. The federal and EU-levels are considered in terms of how the Bavarian state and its teachers incorporate these levels’ discourses on citizenship and diversity. The discourses themselves become a type of system-level data because they are the aggregate of action imperatives conveyed to the teachers regarding the education of future citizens.

At the lifeworld level, my study also examines teacher reflections on citizenship education, elucidating the values, norms, customs and traditions related to the notion of ‘citizenship’ which refer directly to lifeworld-level issues. These reflections are likewise examined in order to understand explicit and implicit values regarding citizenship and diversity. Thus my study, based on Habermas’s notions of system and lifeworld, examines the production of citizens through the interaction of teachers and the state. In the following section, I will more closely examine this idea of interaction in Habermas’s work.

System and Lifeworld: Interactions

The value of Habermas’s framework, for this study, is that he emphasizes the reproductive dynamic between the public lifeworld and public system. In order to understand this dynamic, two key points in Habermas’s theory, symbolic reproduction
and the difference between communicatively and normatively achieved actions must be examined, as they are in the section below.

Understanding education as a publicly administered system in which state imperatives are translated into education policy on citizenship education, reveals how the system influences values such as what it means to be German even though those values are themselves negotiated in the lifeworld. This idea of the interface between system and lifeworld harkens to Habermas’s (1987) idea of symbolic reproduction. Whereas material reproduction prepares people to be workers and consumers, symbolic reproduction recognizes education’s role in preparing students for political participation and opinion formation. Indeed, I argue that education is a manifestation of Habermas’s symbolic reproduction. Fraser’s (1989) work highlights the distinction between symbolic and material reproduction more distinctly than Habermas’s original contributions. For the purpose of this discussion, symbolic reproduction is critical because it guarantees the survival of society and epitomizes the role of the teachers and the place of citizenship education. Here, the distinction between material and symbolic reproduction is important because it highlights the range of educational functions. Fraser writes: “Symbolic reproduction…comprises the socialization of the young, the cementing of group solidarity, and the transmission and extension of cultural traditions.” (Fraser, 1989, 115). When we consider symbolic reproduction, it is clear that education and the teachers’ role are an essential aspect, even though Habermas himself does not explicate education as a central symbolic function.

Given this concept of symbolic reproduction, it becomes easier to see how through system-lifeworld interaction, the system expresses influence on value-
commitments. As Habermas explains, the administrative system, in this case the Ministry of Education, uses—in addition to money in the form of taxes—also the power medium to influence the public sphere, in this case teachers and students. Thus, through system-level political decisions, like adoption of a limited set of approved textbooks, the passage of new curricula, and the state-controlled training and hiring of teachers, the state can, and as this dissertation argues, does influence the lifeworld-level value commitments of teachers relating to citizenship education. Through this extension of power, the state puts forth the image of ideal citizen, through the symbolic reproduction of textbooks, curricula, hiring and training of teacher. In so doing, the state has the potential to exclude or include possible images of the ideal citizen. This point in particular will be taken up below. Through these political decisions, the system then commands back from the public sphere mass loyalty. Mass loyalty then reattaches lifeworld notions to the system. While Habermas is not specifically addressing education or citizenship education, it is easy to compare his conceptualizations of system and lifeworld to Fichte’s explication of education, as the most direct means of the state to influence its future citizens.

Finally, this understanding of the location of education within the system-lifeworld, necessitates considerations what is meant by positing teachers as mediators. Indeed it is important to explicate this mediator role of teachers as agentic\textsuperscript{16}. By this I mean that teachers as mediators act with agency because of their dual role as civil servants and members of the lifeworld. As discussed above, the system, via its political power medium—including teacher training and employment, funding of schools, selection and creation of textbooks—expresses value commitments which are directed at

\textsuperscript{16} Here I am using this word to emphasize the process of enacting agency. Payne (2005) uses agentic in her description of lesbian girls making active choices against stereotypical girl roles. This complements Bourdieu’s (1984) ideas of activating cultural capital in which he emphasizes choice.
the lifeworld. Through this, the process of symbolic reproduction takes place. Teachers, though, have the opportunity to take-up, interpret and reform these system level value commitments within their own lifeworld. Agency is a lifeworld notion which allows teachers to fulfill their role as mediators between system and lifeworld. To explicate this idea in more detail, it is beneficial to consider Fraser’s (1989) critique of Habermas.

The critique by Fraser (1989) is premised on the idea that Habermas’s framework is useful but has, what she calls “blind-spots” (1989, 119). She argues that Habermas does not consider gender and thereby his critical theory is incomplete, although incompleteness does not nullify the work. “It simply necessitates that one read the work in question from the standpoint of an absence, that one extrapolate from things Habermas does say to things he does not, that one reconstruct how various matters of concern to feminists would appear from his perspective had those matters been thematized.” (Fraser, 1989, 114). In Fraser’s work the reading, as she suggests, ‘from the standpoint of absence,’ concerns gender. However, as with gender, Habermas’s work likewise has blindspots in terms of ethnicity and, as Fraser points out, race. Unequal power relations and the disenfranchisement of non-Germans means that the state policy on citizenship education has the potential to reinforce an ethnocultural ideology. The power mediums explained above, could systematically ignore non-ethnic-German residents or, intentionally or unintentionally, reproduce an ethnoculturally and gender biased image of citizen.

Teachers who, on the one hand, are state servants and, on the other hand, are engaged in the personal everyday interactions between pupil and teacher which characterize the lifeworld, serve as mediators of these normative claims. In their
interpretations of state policy, the teachers can serve as mediators of values for achieving a “communicatively achieved interaction” (Fraser, 1989, 135). That is, the teachers, within the lifeworld, could expand or reject system forwarded images of the ethnocultural citizen. A multicultural citizen, a cosmopolitan citizen, or a combination of a variety of citizens could emerge as a result of the interpretations the teachers make of state curricula, which ultimately would then result in a different citizenship education from that ‘intended’ by the state.

In Fraser’s interpretation of Habermas, actions which are coordinated by “explicit, reflective, dialogically achieved consensus” (139) are communicatively achieved. However, as the data analysis will reveal, the teachers could also reproduce system imperatives rather than interpreting or renegotiating them. In Fraser’s language then, this reproduction is then normatively achieved and communicative action is not acted out. Such normatively achieved action is ”’tacit, prereflective and pregiven consensus,” (Fraser, 1989, 135). The former requires teachers to generate new meanings and a new image of ideal citizen, either as an extension of the state’s image or, in theory, in contrast to it. So the teachers reflect on system-level notions of citizen within their lifeworld and then have the agency to either accept, reject or reinterpret them. This idea is of teachers as agents is also explored in Sutton and Levinson’s (2001) argument for socio-cultural policy analysis in education. They argue that teachers have the ability to appropriate policy, reinterpreting it during the process of implementation. They write:

Appropriation is an active process of cultural production through borrowing, recontextualizing, remolding, and thereby resignifying cultural forms...emphasizes the agency of the local actors in interpreting and adapting to the situated logic in their contexts of everyday practice. (Levinson and Sutton, 2001, 17).
This also supports the idea that teachers mediate between system and lifeworld.

Empirically speaking, we would expect either patterns demonstrating reproduction or resistance to emerge in the teacher’s explanations of their interpretations of state citizenship education imperatives. Habermas’s theory, despite Fraser’s critique, does create the abstract space for emancipatory or communicatively achieved actions. Whether and in what manner this space is taken up by the teachers in concrete actions, will be answered through data analyses.

In summary, systems-lifeworld interactions, as conducted by the teacher through the action imperatives set out in the state-mandated curricula and textbooks, have two possible paths. Both paths are premised on the idea of symbolic reproduction, but one path involves the reproduction of the values given in the state-mandated textbooks and curricula. The second path is a type of resistance and has the potential to take on many forms; but is, at its core, a revision of the values of the state in favor of different and potentially more emancipatory values. Regardless, both paths require an interaction between system and lifeworld.

**TEACHERS AS MEDIATORS: THE QUESTION OF AUTHORITY**

The teachers’ role as mediators between state and local system and lifeworld rests on their authority. The following section explores what is meant by authority and how it potentially affects teachers’ interpretations of state mandates.

Although Habermas is not specifically carving out a role for the teacher, it is clear that in theory teachers would be mediators and implementers between system and lifeworld. Since, however, he does not specifically examine the role teachers, I am going to complement Habermas by adopting Gutmann’s (1987) theory of citizenship education,
which she refers to democratic education, as a function of interactions between the state and teaching professionals. Gutmann (1987) also includes the role of families in her theory, but since that is not the focus of the present study, I will limit myself to the discussion of authority vis-à-vis the state and teachers. This discussion of authority is built on an understanding of teachers as having a dual role. By this I mean they have functions both in the system and the lifeworld. In Germany as a whole, and in Bavaria in particular, teachers are civil servants. They are trained in state institutions, are licensed through a state exam and, after taking a loyalty oath to the Free State of Bavaria, are sworn in as civil servants. But, as discussed in the section above on normatively and communicatively achieved actions, they are also actors in the lifeworld. Through everyday interactions with other teachers, students and community members they act as autonomous professionals in their interpretation of state objectives.

Underlying this dual function, however, is a question of authority. Gutmann argues that the instilling of morals and character is a necessary role for education in social reproduction (1997, 428) But she asks: “Who should decide what kind of character to cultivate?” (Ibid). She answers that states, parents and educators all contribute to this decision-making process and to the educational actions necessary to bring it about. She writes: “The broad distribution of educational authority among citizens, parents and professional educators supports the core value of democracy: conscious social reproduction in its most inclusive form.” (Gutmann, 1997, 429). If we consider this idea in relation to Habermas’s notion of system and lifeworld, the dual function of teachers becomes even clearer. Using Gutmann’s assertion that educational authority is shared among the state, teachers and parents, we can view the state as wholly constituting the
system and parents as wholly constituting the lifeworld. Teachers are authorized by the state, via teacher education, to implement state imperatives on citizenship education. In Gutmann’s terms, the teachers are authorized to convey the state’s concept of a moral citizen in a process of “conscious social reproduction” (Ibid). But because this is a form of democratic education, the parents likewise authorize the teachers to participate in this process, not in place of family but as a supportive supplement to it. In fact, parents delegate this responsibility to teachers. Teachers act “in loco parentis” in virtue of their professional role. Teachers enact a tacit agreement between the state (system) and parents (lifeworld) and through their authority the most direct process of social reproduction of democratic citizens takes place.

By using Weber’s (1921/1968) ideas of authority, a clearer picture of this tacit agreement emerges. From both the system and the lifeworld, certain constraints are placed on teachers’ authority. For the discussion here, it is particularly the constraints from the system which are important. Understanding what limits to teachers’ ability to act autonomously is critical to comprehending the teacher reflections on citizenship education practice presented later in this dissertation. Weber’s notion of bureaucratic authority elucidates the limitations placed on teachers from the system. Weber writes:

> From a purely technical point of view, a bureaucracy is capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency, and is in this sense formally the most rational known means of exercising authority over human beings. It is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability. It thus makes possible a particularly high degree of calculability of results for the heads of the organization and for those acting in relation to it. (1921/1968, 223).

Teachers as employees of the state hierarchy are the extend aim of a bureaucracy and occupy a lowly state in the educational hierarchy. Dougherty and Hammack (1990)
interpret this idea of bureaucratic authority in school structures: “Organizations with bureaucratic authority systems are governed by legal-rational principles that rest on law and on assessments of the ‘best’ way to delegate responsibility and authority to achieve the required task.” (Dougherty and Hammack, 1990, 169). Thus, bureaucracies are also supposed to counter unfair practices and are supposed to be neutral.

In the Bavarian case, this educational hierarchy begins at the state-level as the Ministry of Education officials interpret federal and EU policies in the creation of curricula and the adoption of mandated textbooks. However, teachers also command professional authority. As Weber (1921/1968) argues, bureaucratic and professional authority are not opposed. Rather, because they both place expertise as central, they are fundamentally complementary. Professional authority, which is granted through extensive state training, is a prerequisite for parents agreeing to entrust their child’s moral education to teachers. The principle of academic freedom, which is central to the conception of the teaching profession in Germany (Westbury et.al., 2000), supports professional authority of teachers. The existence of both bureaucratic and professional authority underscores the position of teachers as mediators between system and lifeworld. As such these ideas also reinforce the notion that teachers have the opportunity to symbolically reproduce system imperatives or resist them, thereby renegotiating new conceptualizations of citizenship and diversity. Authority in its various manifestations must be in place for teachers to take up the roles as mediators between system and lifeworld.

Gutmann puts forth four conceptions of authority over education: ‘the family state, the state of families, the state of individuals and the democratic state.’ (1987, 19-
47). Germany aligns most closely with the fourth conception, the democratic state. In discussing this conception, Gutmann writes:

Educational authority must be shared among parents, citizens and professional educators even though such sharing does not guarantee that power will be wedded to knowledge (as in the family state), that parents can successfully pass their prejudices on to their children (as in the state of families), or that education will be neutral among competing conceptions of the good life (as in the state of individuals). (1987, 42).

Parents, citizens and educators are called upon to make educational decisions and not delegate this function exclusively to the state. The education system in Germany, particularly Germany’s status as a social democracy which grounds itself in equality, would fail on two of Gutmann’s key points. As Gutmann explains, the democratic state does not necessarily ensure equitable education. She posits that the state, in which all three stakeholders (parents, teachers and citizens) democratically choose to exert authority over education by proxy, must be nonrepressive and nondiscriminatory. Nonrepression means the state may not use the education system to reduce or remove choice and agency from individuals or groups. Nondiscrimination requires the state to ensure an equal and adequate education—for all students,—an education which will allow students to participate in the democracy. From the literature it is clear that the German education system has shortcomings on both of these points. Aurenheimer (2006), for example, reveals that the vast majority of non-German children are tracked into lower level schools regardless of both parental choice and student ability. Bavaria, in particular, has a history of separate schooling for non-German children. Until the early 1980s non-Germans attended ‘consulate’ schools in Bavaria and were not allowed to attend mainstream public schools (Führ & Tapia, 1997).
CONCLUSION

This chapter began by explicating theoretical concepts central to the inquiry. Specifically, this chapter has probed Habermas’s notion of system and lifeworld, positing education as an institution which is situated between the system and lifeworld. The dynamic interaction between the two public spheres in Habermas’s schematic is critical to understanding the production of citizens because it is achieved through this interaction. Teachers, via their bureaucratic and professional authority, serve as mediators and make autonomous choices which either symbolically reproduce state, system-level imperatives or revise these commitments within the individual lifeworlds of the teachers. As the two data analyses undertaken in this dissertation will show, ultimately, the nature of citizenship education or the image of ideal citizen offered to students, is constrained by both state and teacher interpretations. It follows then that the inclusiveness or exclusiveness of this ideal citizen image can best be revealed through a two-tiered analysis which uncovers both the lifeworld and system interests. Such studies need to likewise be reflective of power and oppression as the reproductive nature of system and lifeworld interactions leave open the possibility of reproducing oppression. Given these final implication, a critical inquiry perspective becomes particularly important and will be addressed in the next chapter as a means of uniting the system and lifeworld analyses methodologically.
CHAPTER FIVE: METHODOLOGY, AN OVERVIEW

As argued in the previous chapter, the important differences between system and lifeworld and the role education plays as mediating institution necessitate a research design which explores both system and lifeworld data critically. This chapter will explain the research design constructed, given this context. Because there are two levels to this study, the system-level, represented by an analysis of state-mandated textbooks and curricula, and the lifeworld-level, represented by interviews with social studies teachers, I will outline, in particular, the ways in which the research design seeks to validly relate these analyses. There are two key approaches: the use of a unifying meta-theoretical approach, in this case critical inquiry, and the use of a political theory matrix as a means of revealing the underlying political theory of citizenship. This matrix helps reveal the images of citizen that is being put forth as ideal. It allows me to consider whether there have been changes in the images overtime, e.g. whether this image remains ethnocultural or has expanded towards multicultural or cosmopolitan notions. Finally in this chapter, I will explain the methodological decisions for each analysis, detailing sample selection, data collection and validity techniques.

CRITICAL INQUIRY

Citizenship as a means of oppression

As discussed in the historical overview, the concept of citizenship is power-laden. Nations exercise the power to determine who can or cannot belong through citizenship policy. Education systems reproduce this concept of belonging through citizenship education policy and practice. Power as a result becomes an inevitable part of this
analysis, and as such, the analysis requires a critical methodological approach. Critical research methods are necessary when the object of inquiry, in this case citizenship education policy, is one in which power is unequally distributed among involved parties. At the national level, citizenship policy in Germany has determined who is allowed to be German and what the notion of Germanness means. In turn, this idea of Germanness has been codified by the Bavarian (or another German Federal) State through required textbooks and curricula. With the advent of the European Union, we see the Surpranational imposing a new notion of belonging and Europeanness upon the citizenship policies of its member states and, likewise, the state-level education policy creating a system for cultural reproduction for this Europeanness and Germanness. These notions are a result from labeling those that are non-European and non-German as “other”, even if that “other” is a member of the European or German territory. To this end these labels negate and exclude and can be regarded as serving discriminatory practices. As Carspecken (1996) explains, critical inquiry aims to reveal oppression and seeks to bring about equality. Theoretically speaking, this research design is founded in critical theory and each methodology, critical framing analysis and critical qualitative analysis, draws on it. Critical theory was advanced by the Frankfurt School in a time when two World Wars had left Europe destroyed and, in light of the Holocaust and the rise of the Nazis, revealed an innate evil in humanity. Theorists of the Frankfurt School, including Horkheimer, Habermas, Adorno and Marcuse among others, began to consider inequality, oppression and destruction as omnipresent social conditions. It is particularly appropriate in this study, which examines notions of Germanness and Europeanness in the time following the destruction of Nazism, to draw on a theoretical tradition which
emerged out of this same historical circumstance. Critical theorists view it as a necessity to explain humanity’s need to dominate and oppress, but also to combat such tendencies they call for political action and work toward freedom, rationality and equality.

**Values and Ideology in Critical Inquiry**

Critical inquiry serves as a guiding theoretical perspective informing research design and methodological practice. This influences, in particular, the concepts of facts and values within the critical inquiry project. Unlike positivist or post-positivist research, in critical inquiry facts, values and ideology are an interwoven part of the research design; it is neither possible nor desirable to separate them. (Kincheloe and McClaren, 2003). This does not mean, however, that the values of the researcher will necessarily be the values revealed through the analysis. Indeed, good critical research employs validity techniques and seeks to be anti-biased. Critical research, however, realistically expects that the researcher’s values affect interpretation and epistemology, so it is important to explore the relationship between factual and value claims rather than pretend that an entirely objective stance can be achieved (Korth, 2005). This is in line with Carspecken’s (1996) assertion that critical researchers “find contemporary society to be unfair, unequal, and both subtly and overtly oppressive for many people. We do not like it, and we want to change it” (7).

However, Carspecken and other critical researchers (cf. Kincheloe and McClaren, 2003; Korth, 2002; Lather 2000) also recognize that the values are complex and that good research requires that researchers be reflective about their own value orientations and make efforts to include all participant perspectives in a manner which does not privilege the researcher. ). It is a key part of this analysis to note that I chose
critical inquiry because I believe that current practices of education in Germany are inequitable and they disadvantage non-Germans as well as non-elite students. It is my hope that this study can elucidate the complex relationship between changes in the notion of citizenship and diversity as means of improving discriminatory education policies. In terms of my own value orientations, I have made sure to reflect both with participants and peers on my interpretations of the data. This was particularly important for the interview portion of this study; I strove to include teachers from a wide-variety of backgrounds, include gender balance, number of years of teaching, type of school and location of school. These points will be elaborated in the discussion below. Finally it is my hope that by adopting this critical theoretical perspective as a starting point for both the content and interview analyses, a more unified research design is achieved (Crotty, 1998).

**POLITICAL THEORY MATRIX**

While critical inquiry unites the two analyses in this dissertation in terms of methodological theory, I have also designed an analytic tool, a political theory matrix, which will be used in both analyses. By having a common analytic tool, I am better able to interrogate conflicts between system imperatives and lifeworld realities. I developed this tool based on Gutmann’s (1987) notion that citizenship education enacts a particular political theory of citizenship. She argues that all education policies implicitly draw on a political theory about the role of the state in the formal education of future citizens. Methodologically, I interpret this as meaning that any informed analysis of policies on citizenship education therefore requires making explicit what political theories are at play. In this case, multiple theories of citizenship can serve to set the standards against which evidentiary results, both from the textbook and interview analyses, can be critically
evaluated. Simply by examining the citizenship education literature, outlined in chapter one, we can see the full-range of views of citizenship. On the one end is the very functionalist approach that citizens are loyal to and serve the state, with education crucially preparing citizens for this task. This approach, termed ethnoculturalism by political theorist Rogers Brubaker (1992), tends to ignore diversity and posits the education of future citizens as Procrustean bed to guarantee a loyal citizen in a homogenous state. On the other end, this functionalist approach is challenged by contemporary notions of citizenship, such as Kymlicka’s (1995) idea of multiculturalism or Nussbaum’s (1996) incarnation of cosmopolitanism, no longer tied to ethnic and nation state identification, but expanded to global citizenship.

In the analysis chapters I explore the political theories which emerge in the textbooks and interviews, developing them both via the data and through the political theory literature. While it would certainly be possible to use the literature to operationalize certain political theories and then test for their presence in the textbook and interview data, this would have lacked nuance and risked imposing too rigid a structure on the data. Instead, I coded the textbooks for emergent themes and then organized the emergent themes into political theories which I supported using the literature. The emergent political theories—ethnoculturalism, assimilation, Europeanism, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism—are explained at length in the analysis chapters.

**Research Questions and Overview of Design**

In brief, this design seeks to explore the complexities that emerge in the schooling of citizens in one conservative German state as it confronts the changing European sociopolitical landscape. In the following section I outline the overall research design,
including sample selection and validity techniques employed in this dissertation. I will explain both the system and lifeworld levels of data collection and analysis, which in this case translates to state-level and local-level respectively. Each analysis considers the influence of EU and federal policies in the final discussion chapter, but these levels are not analyzed separately because neither the federal nor EU governments have enforcement power in the educational realm within the individual German state. In the analysis chapters themselves I give more detail about the actual analysis techniques used in order to demonstrate them within the context of the data.

State-level research design

Germany, as discussed in the literature review, has a strict and constitutionally enshrined division of powers between the federal and Länder governments. Because of this practice, I have designed this study to examine how one state has defined and enacted citizenship education policy since 1990 when the fall of the Soviet Union brought considerable demographic change to Germany and Europe. I am seeking with this section of the dissertation to understand:

1. How are diversity, German citizenship and European citizenship represented in state-developed education materials from 1988-2006?

2. What type of political theory is the state, through these representations, invoking in its citizenship education policy, and in what way are new political theories brought in to reflect new geopolitical realities?

3. What image of citizen, given the political theory at play, is forwarded as ideal or best?
Bavaria as a case study

As established in the introduction, Bavaria with its consistently conservative government and anti-multiculturalism rhetoric, combined with its particularly diverse population, provides an interesting case-study. Bavaria also has a highly centralized compulsory schooling system whereby all curricular decisions are made by the state education ministry and all materials, particularly textbooks, must come from a ministry approved list. The ministry of education officials for social studies, whom I interviewed for this project, explained that the procedure for approval of textbooks is very strictly followed and extremely fastidious because it is viewed as a means of ensuring that the teachers are not straying from state-mandated curricular guidelines.

The textbooks provide the content that is outlined in the curricula. It is the best way we have to make sure that the content is spot-on with the curricula. This way we can make sure that the teachers are teaching what they are supposed to do. We invest time and money in approving the textbooks and making sure the teachers know them and use them. We do professional development with teachers and observe them using the textbooks. They are just as important as the curriculum because they are an extension of it (Interview with state education official; August, 2006).

Thus, we see textbooks and curricula working in tandem to create the Bavarian state practice regarding citizenship education policy. They offer, therefore, a means, as posed by my research questions, to explore the representation of diversity, German citizenship and European citizenship and expose the political theories at play. Social studies offers the most direct connection to citizenship education, since citizenship education is not a subject by itself. By examining social studies textbooks and curricula from 1988-2006, we are able to learn what image of best citizen is put forth by the Bavarian state.
Sample Selection

I used textbooks, archived through the Georg-Eckert-Institute for International Textbook Research (GEI), and included any available general textbook for the *Hauptschule* and *Realschule* from 1988-2006 which was approved for use in Bavaria. A list of the textbook series examined appears in the Appendix. I compared the textbooks collected to lists of approved textbooks for the time periods sought, compiled both by the GEI archivists and the Bavarian education ministry. Clearly this sample is limited to the state of Bavaria and to the *Hauptschule* and *Realschule* (Grades 5-10), but for the reasons outlined in earlier chapters, this state and these school forms are the most legitimate for this study. Likewise, it could be argued that history or religion textbooks—both concerned with norms and values—should have also been included in the sample because these subject matters also substantively address citizenship. I chose to limit this to social studies texts because a number of authors have already examined history textbooks in Germany for citizenship content (Dierkes, 2003; Soysal et. al. 2005). Religious education textbooks would have been very interesting to consider, but since religious education is done separately, depending on faith and substantial content control is given to the religious institution, involved i.e. the Catholic or Lutheran churches, this added a dimension outside the scope of this dissertation. In order to select which portions of the textbooks to subsequently code, I used the state-mandated curricular guidelines to locate sections in each of the grade levels (5-10) which addressed issues of citizenship. The following curricular themes guided the textbook section selection: community involvement, intercultural learning, active citizenship (*mündige Bürger*), Europeanization, Globalization, migration, rights and privileges of citizenship, Bavaria
and Germany. Ultimately I was not seeking to limit what was coded in the textbooks, rather to be sure that, across the 5 grade levels and 19 years included in the sample, I consistently identified the same concepts. Since these themes are identified in the *Hauptschule* and *Realschule* curricula as running themes and overall learning outcomes, they were appropriate for guiding the initial selection of material for the content analysis. This selection process follows both Krippendorf (2004) and Neuendorf’s (2001) suggestions for consistency in developing a unit of analysis.

**Reliability**

Reliability in content analysis refers to the use of consistent coding and replicable coding. In this design there are three levels of coding to consider, initial content selection (guided through curricula analysis), the framing analysis, and the political theory matrix analysis. This three-step process was used consistently with every textbook in the sample. In the analysis section I provide examples of the different coding levels. In terms of coding reliability, I had a native German recode at both the framing analysis level and the political theory level in order to ascertain whether the same results would be achieved. Likewise I had another American, fluent in German, repeat the coding. In each case virtually identical coding emerged. A priori coding allows for interrater reliability to be computed. Since this is an emergent schematic, interrater reliability cannot be effectively computed. However, the low level of disagreement among the three coders, would be akin to a very high level of interrater reliability. In cases where there was disagreement between the three coders the sections were examined and discussed and all three coders then agreed upon the appropriate code for the area in question. Such disagreements happened only in three instances.
Theory and Rationale

Neuendorf (2001) rightly explains that content analysis becomes reductionist and ineffective when a clear rationale for the choice of content is not provided. Likewise she, as well as Krippendorf (2004), underscore the importance of connecting the analysis to the other data in a study via theory. Further, the conceptualizations which underscore the content analysis must be explained not only using the data (e.g. evidence must be provided from the analysis to support the coded themes), but also these concepts should be explained using the literature appropriate to the field of inquiry. In this study, the critical inquiry perspective informs methodological action in both the content and interview analysis. Beyond this though, the political theory matrix serves not only to link the two data sets, but also to interweave the literature on citizenship into the analysis. While I did not use the political theory matrix a priori to conduct the coding, reanalyzing the results of the framing analysis through the political theories, reveals a better understanding of the state’s political intentions vis-à-vis citizenship education. At the same time we are then able to understand consistencies and conflicts between the state and the local i.e. system and lifeworld conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education, by comparing the interview analysis and the textbook analysis through the political theory matrix. The combination of using a critical inquiry approach and literature-informed political theories consistently in the textbook analysis meets the burden set forth by Neuendorf (2001).

Local-level research design

As explained earlier in this dissertation, I conceive of education as existing in the lifeworld, through daily teacher and pupil interaction, and in the system through
education policy and control of teacher training and retention. The textbook analysis described above examines the state perspective on citizenship education policy. Likewise this analysis seeks to examine citizenship education practice and understandings of diversity in the lifeworld by interviewing teachers, asking them to reflect on their teaching practice throughout their careers. I am seeking with this current section of the dissertation to understand:

1. In what way do Bavarian teachers consider it their responsibility to promote an understanding of diversity as a part of citizenship education?

2. In what ways have teachers seen their teaching change given the new geopolitical realities of Europeanization, migration and globalization?

3. What political theory are the teachers, through their teaching practices and in their reflections, invoking in their implementation of Bavarian citizenship education policy? In what way are political theories which conceive of a multicultural or cosmopolitan citizen present?

To this end, I designed a critical qualitative study which used interviews with social studies teachers in Bavaria to probe these questions. In the Appendix, I have included a chart detailing characteristics of the teachers interviewed for this dissertation. Below I will explain interviews as a method of data collection and generalizability, participant selection, means of initial analysis and validity measures employed.

*Interview Methodology*

Interviews are a commonly used technique of gathering nuanced and in-depth experiential data from individual participants (Fontana and Frey, 1998). My research questions require teachers to reflect about changes in the citizenship education teaching practice, given geopolitical changes and increased diversity in the population. The study also seeks to understand whether teachers value the inclusion diversity in citizenship
education and asks teachers to explain how they interpret state mandates. These queries would not easily be answered using a survey because they depend on reflection and narrative. In addition, these are questions which ask participants to become emotionally involved in their answers because they are speaking about personal experiences. As such, and in line with Oakley (1981) and Rheinharz (1992) as a researcher, I am open and engaged during the interview process which unfolds as a conversation rather than a question and answer period. We often discuss differences and similarities between US and German classrooms and my participants often question me about how diversity and citizenship are viewed in the US. I take this approach, which Fontana and Frey (1998) term a “feminist interview ethic” (65) because I want to underscore that interviewer and interviewee are equals. It also corresponds to the critical inquiry stance of this dissertation in promoting change and equality. “This personalization of the interview method makes it a potential agent of social change, where new identities and new definitions of problematic situations are created discussed, and experimented with.” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998, 36). In short, the interviews used in this design strive to create what Schutz (1967) calls the “I/Thou” (Ich/Sie) relationship. Participants in this study are not the objects of the study; rather my intersubjective understanding of their experiences depends upon my recognizing my partner’s humanity and that in this mutual recognition, new meaning can be created (Schutz, 1967, 164). As will be discussed in the Interview Analysis chapter, this relates methodologically to the ideas and techniques in reconstructive horizon analysis forwarded by Carspecken (1996).
Participant information and selection

At the lifeworld level I interviewed Bavarian social studies teachers from *Hauptschule* and *Realschule*. The schools were in both urban and rural areas of the state and had student populations ranging from 90% to 5% non-native speakers of German. It was important for this study to interview a range of teachers in terms of years of teaching experience and experience with teaching in diverse settings. In its urban areas, particularly Munich and Nuremberg, Bavaria has had a diverse population since the Guestworkers initially were recruited to work in Germany in the 1960s. The teachers I interviewed in these areas had worked with diverse student populations for most of their careers, although in the last 10 years each *Hauptschule* teacher in these urban areas explained that their classrooms had become nearly universally non-native German speaking. In the more rural areas of the state, in particular in Franken (a region in Northern Bavaria) where the majority of the interviews in rural areas were conducted, a few smaller communities with factories, the majority non-German residents have been Turkish and Greek residents since the 1960s. However, most of the areas have seen a dramatic rise in the number of non-native German speakers since 1990 mainly through the immigration of *Aussiedler* and *SpätAussiedler*. Because this study is interested in how the concept of diversity and citizenship are integrated into citizenship education policy, it was key to draw on teachers from a variety of diversity contexts. This is in line with the ideas of maximum variation sampling (Tagg, 1985) which seeks to include the widest degree of experiences within the interview participants.

---

17 This category is used as a designator because many of the students who are non-native German speakers have German citizenship because they are *SpätAussiedler*. However in the interviews, the participants universally refer to these students as foreigners regardless of their citizenship status.
Because the region of Franken had experienced the largest growth in non-native German speaking populations within its rural areas, I contacted *Hauptschule* and *Realschule* in this area to request time to observe classes and ask teachers to be participants. Likewise, I also contacted schools in Munich and Nuremburg—the two largest urban areas in Bavaria—in order to include schools with more longstanding diverse student bodies. Over a four-month time period I conducted initial observations in 32 schools in these areas. I provided every teacher with a description of my study in German (as approved by my university’s Internal Review Board) and asked if they would like to be a participant. In order to ensure that no teacher felt required to say yes, either out of politeness or because the school principal was present, I left a sign-up sheet in the teacher’s lounge with the dates and times I would be available. In total I conducted 119 interviews with social studies teachers and school principals. Although I did have to initially contact the school principal for access to the school and, in this sense a formal gatekeeper influenced the potential participation of participants, no principal refused to allow me to come to their school. This is in line with Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) recommendations for gaining access to research sites. I took steps, as outlined above, to make sure that the principals did not unduly influence their faculty’s choice to participate in my study.

---

18 In total 119 interviews with teachers or principals were conducted. I transcribed 58 of the interviews for this dissertation, but listened to and took notes on the remaining interviews. Redundancy, an accepted validity technique in qualitative research, was clear within the 58 transcribed when compared to the total of 119. For informational purposes I also interviewed Bavarian ministry of education officials and European Union education ministry officials.
Analysis of Data

Much like the textbook analysis, the analysis of the interview data proceeded in multiple steps. However, because I am interested, in particular, in the backgrounded political theories at play and how state and local level imperatives may overlap or conflict, I used the political theory matrix as a framework for the initial coding of the interview data. After developing the matrix based on the textbook analysis and the literature on citizenship education, I used five political theories to categorize the interview data. I coded teacher descriptions and reflections into one of these five categories, while allowing for possible other coding categories to emerge. After this coding I conducted two additional, but interrelated analyses, Carspecken’s (1996) meaning fields analysis and reconstructive horizon analysis. These analyses allowed me to examine where multiple political theories seemed to be functioning together or where there were clear examples of conflict between the textbook analysis (representing the system perspective) and the teacher’s actions (representing the lifeworld perspective). Examples of these analyses are provided in the Interview Analysis chapter. As in the textbook analysis this combination of analyses allows me to understand what type of backgrounded political theories are at play in teachers’ citizenship education practice. The combination provides an opportunity to examine the relationship between state intentions and teacher implementation.

Meaning Fields and Reconstructive Horizon Analysis

After conducting initial coding, based on the political theory matrix, I completed meaning fields in order to discover, as Carspecken suggests, a “range of possible interpretations.” (Carspecken, 1996, 96). This was particularly critical because it allowed
me to problematize the political theory categories and make tacit meanings more accessible. Through this analysis I clarified my first level coding and complexified how these political theories emerge in the interview data. Meaning fields are defined by Carspecken as the “full range of meanings or interpretations for an act.” (1996, 96) Any given act can be interpreted with a variety of understandings, or in other words, meanings are always experienced as possibilities within a field of other possibilities (Carspecken, 1996, 96).

**Validity measures**

There are a variety of validity techniques which I employed in both data collection and analysis. Following Denzin and Lincoln (1998) and Robson (2002), I triangulated my overall conclusions by conducting the textbook and interview analyses and relating both of these analyses to a political theory matrix thereby, completing a higher form of analysis. Further, I used standard practices of qualitative research, including taping and transcribing my interviews, taking observational notes and achieving redundancy in data collection. As suggested by Carspecken (1996) I used several validation techniques. These are: an examination of my own value orientations, member checks, peer debriefing, negative case analysis, and prolonged time in the field.

**Generalizability and Sampling in Interview Studies**

There are over 3000 Hauptschulen and Realschulen in Bavaria and I interviewed teachers from 32 of them. Qualitative research is often accused of reporting idiosyncratic findings and having a lack of generalizability. Indeed, in quantitative terms, this study potentially has threats to its external validity because I cannot claim that the teachers I
interviewed represent all Bavarian social studies teachers’ views. In quantitative methodology this could be overcome by constructing a random sample of teachers. This was logistically not possible and would have made impossible the in-depth interviewing required. It would also have violated ethical standards since interviews always require consent. However, as Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out, well-constructed interview studies have alternative means of establishing the validity of data outside of the personal and idiosyncratic experiences of the individual interviewee. Through my critical analysis I will show commonalities and contradictions between the interviewees and between the lifeworld (local) and system (state) levels. In addition, and in my opinion most importantly, the past study of citizenship in Germany has focused nearly exclusively on laws and policies and the literature on citizenship education reports learning outcomes. Absent in both of these kinds of discussions are the voices of the teachers who throughout the generations choose to educate future citizens. This present study includes this voice and connects it to the system structures which influence it.

CONCLUSION

Drawing on a conception of education as a mediating force between system and lifeworld, this research design is a critical study which seeks to understand how the Bavarian state and Bavarian teachers are conceiving of citizenship education, given the influences of globalization, immigration and new federal and EU discourses about diversity. The use of critical framing theory and critical qualitative analysis, in the form of Carspecken’s (1996) meaning fields and reconstructive horizon analyses, unites, from a methodological theory perspective, these two distinct datasets. Likewise the development of a political theory matrix out of the textbook analysis, and its subsequent
use as an analytic tool, also allows the system and lifeworld data levels’ interactions to be interrogated. Further, as a methodological decision, revealing the backgrounded political theories at play, as suggested by Gutmann (1987), allows for a more nuanced and critical analysis of state and teacher forwarded images of the ideal citizen. Ultimately all of these design features work together to show in what way citizenship education, both at the system and lifeworld level, conceives of a citizenship education grounded in ideas of multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism. Crotty argues that theory, methodological theory and methods must be directly connected in order for any research design to be internally coherent (Crotty, 1998). I have met this burden by first connecting my theoretical perspective on the nature of education and the interaction between system and lifeworld to my critical meta-methodological theory. The methods I then employ, framing theory, meaning fields and reconstructive horizon analyses, extend from the theoretical and methodological perspectives.
CHAPTER SIX: SYSTEM-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF BAVARIAN SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

“As die Schule versteht sich ihrem Begriffe nach als Ort des Beistandes fuer die Bildung des jungen Menchen. Sie will den Hearnwachsenden unterstuetzen ein Leben zu fuehren, das seiner Phaseneigentuemlichkeit entspricht. Ihre Aufgabe liegt darin, dem jungen Menschen zu helfen “recht leben” (Comenius) zu lernen” – Standardwerk des Volksschullehrers, 1969

As the above excerpt indicates, the education of future citizens is uniquely connected with a moral education and, that in turn, the school is charged with this holistic task. Textbooks, as discussed in the methodology chapter, provide a window into the content of how this education of moral citizens is conceived. In the case of Bavaria, because of the highly centralized and controlled manner in which textbooks are chosen, they illuminate state citizenship education policy. This chapter presents the results of the analysis of Bavarian social studies textbooks for 7th through 10th grades at the Hauptschule and Realschule from 1988-2006.

The process undertaken to complete the textbook analysis was threefold. First I created a sample both of textbooks and textbook sections, based on Bavarian social studies curricula and official textbook criteria. Next, I coded the data using a framing analysis, and last I examined the results for their relationship to existing political theories. Figure A shows a schematic of this coding process.

The framing analysis, which will be explained in-depth below, revealed a range of ways of describing citizenship in Germany in terms of diversity. These ways forwarded both highly exclusionary and inclusionary models of citizenship and often put forth a seemingly inclusionary model which depended on exclusionary thinking in order to
remain logical. Framing theory allowed me to explore nuanced concepts of citizenship, even when competing ideas were forwarded in the same textbook section. A traditional quantitative content analysis would not allow for this more implicit coding schematic.

The last level of analysis involved taking the results from the framing analysis and examining the emergent themes in terms of their backgrounded political theory. This final step resulted in the creation of a political theory matrix as an analytic tool. This last step allows for the results of the textbook analysis to be related back to citizenship literature by identifying how the emergent themes represent a particular political theory. The five theories used are: ethnoculturalism, assimilation, Europeanization, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism. Examining the themes and their relationship to the political theories enables me to consider, as Carspecken’s (1996) suggests, system relations to explain the findings. Further, when considering the changes in citizenship and immigration which took place at the national policy level, I am able to consider how, from 1988 to 2006, diversity and citizenship evolved as Germany moved away from a monocultural and towards a multicultural self-definition, but still failed to fundamentally establish either a multicultural or cosmopolitan citizenship education.

In this chapter I will explain the process of the framing theory analysis and give the results of the analysis. Then, I will explain the development of the political theory matrix and how the emergent themes from the framing analysis relate to existing political theories. This chapter will conclude by considering how, over the time period studied, the notions of citizen and citizenship education have evolved.
FRAMING THEORY

The content analyses of textbooks and curricula draws on framing theory as a methodological metatheory—a guiding theory for methodological practice. Rein and Schön (1993) describe framing as “a way of selecting, organizing, interpreting, and making sense of a complex reality to provide guideposts for knowing, analyzing, persuading and acting. A frame is a perspective from which an amorphous, ill-defined, problematic situation can be made sense of and acted on” (Rein, 1993). In this sense, framing offers a means of examining citizenship education curricula, policies and textbooks in a diverse set of contexts, and in a manner meaningful enough to reveal the nuances that concepts like citizenship necessarily require. For this dataset, a framing theory analysis is appropriate because there are a finite number of textbook series (19) (a list appears in the Appendix) which can be read closely and in comparison with each other (Dierkes, 2003). The theory probes how an issue is described and implemented and what relations of significance emerge. Through coding implicit frames, the range of perspectives not immediately obvious in the medium may be revealed (Gamson, 1997).

My own knowledge of framing theory comes through the work of sociologist Erving Goffman (1974). He proposed framing methodology as a micro-sociological analysis that invoked certain assumptions about the nature of the self and the place of meaning in the analysis. Goffman’s approach, often characterized as semiotic analysis, emerged through his exposure to existentialism, and he acknowledges allegiance to European phenomenology, while taking into consideration the structuralism critique. Communication studies as a discipline has further developed framing theory, particularly in terms of application to public discourse. Communication theorists, though, also draw
on phenomenology, particularly Schutz, whom Goffman also acknowledges (Embree, 1988). In the social sciences framing theory has been applied broadly to questions of bias, electoral behavior, trends in pop culture and media influence. Rein and Schön (1993), as will be discussed below, have discussed framing in terms of policy and practice, although framing theory is not widely used in policy studies or in education writ large.

In the present study, framing theory functions as a substantive social theory and as a methodological meta-theory. It explains a relation between the cultural conceptualizations and the texts of the culture as they relate to the everyday lifeworld of actors. The theory explains how people “read” cultural products. Thus, it is my claim that this theory, often applied to the media’s role in public-opinion formation, can be useful in examining textbooks insofar as they, like media, prime consumers/teachers and students with a limited number of options. As Terkildsen and Schnell (1997) suggest, such priming can be found in subtleties of language use, of what is explicitly expressed or only implied. Similarly, curricula can be conceived as a state’s expression of the cultural frames of citizen. In this sense, curricula frame an issue, in this case citizenship, and produce and maintain the meaning of citizen.

Using framing theory also allows analysis not only of cultural but also of normative frames. This may help identify unique values that have not yet been explicitly named as German, such as a value for diversity, but could serve as the basis for an expanded frame of the German citizen. Normative frames are important in Durkheimian terms because they reflect the potential to discover similarity in beliefs and values that would be necessary for even more complex social structures to function (Durkheim, 1899). Oyserman and Lauffer (2002) describe normative frames as representative of the
most fundamental notion of humanity in a particular group. Thus, if Germans fail to recognize basic normative frames, such as the value of a diverse German society, a priori, it would follow that no amount of citizenship education or education policymaking could succeed in creating a shared multicultural identity, at least in the short-term. Using framing as a methodology to code for cultural and normative images allows the implicit and tacit frames, used within a culture for making sense of cultural artifacts, to be put into practice.

In relation to citizenship education, this translates to explicating the frames that indicate how citizenship as a cultural construct is interpreted or read through the artifact of social studies texts and curricula. Consequently, framing theory allows for a substantive concept of citizen to emerge. Likewise it is through framing theory that the critical nature of this inquiry can be captured, because framing theory, unlike other forms of content analysis, examines absence and silence as significant. When power is unequally distributed, as it is in the case of access to citizenship and rights in Germany, then we can expect non-privileged members of the society to be silenced. Given this the portrayal of diversity and citizenship will likely diminish the narrative of the non-German within the textbooks. As a methodology, framing theory then helps us to organize and interpret these explicit and implicit meanings and concepts.

**Results of Framing Theory Analysis**

Through this analysis five significant meta-codes emerged as a means of explaining how diversity and citizenship are presented in Bavarian educational materials from 1988-2006. These meta-codes will be first explained individually and then will be
explained in relation to the political theories which underscore them. For clarity’s sake I have added the prevalent political theory in the title of the meta-code.

**Being us: Ethnoculturalism**

The *Being Us* frame describes German citizenship as something historic and based on a shared ancestry. Citizenship and belonging are linked directly to an essential notion of Germanness. The notion emerges strongly in the initial years of this analysis and continues through the present day. The frame is constituted by two sub-frames, which act as markers for absence of diversity or diverse voices. Ultimately this code is linked to several other meta-codes which draw on exclusionary notions. These overlaps will be explored in the political theory analysis and the conclusion to the chapter. However, the fact that the “Being Us” theme becomes a background to the other themes makes its explication particularly vital to this analysis.

Previous studies on German textbooks reveal that citizenship has been presented as an ethnic category since 1918 (Ohlinger, 1999). Ohlinger in his study of textbooks from the Wilhelmian, Weimar and Nazi eras concludes that:

> After 1918, the representation of ethnic and national issues shifted from a state-centered notion to a *Volk*-based notion which transcended state boundaries. As a result, ethnic issues became politicized and important topics for teaching history, geography and literature in schools. German and ethnic German identity became strongly interdependent after the end of the First World War (Ohlinger, 1999, 122).

Given Ohlinger’s finding and the adherence to the ethnocultural maxim laid out in the historical overview of this dissertation, it is interesting to see how the idea of Germanness emerges. As this frame reveals, the idea of Being German enacts—at least to some degree—an ethnic category. At times in the dataset, the nation is presented in
specifically ethnic terms and the concept of the German *volk* becomes synonymous with nation.

This idea is conveyed both explicitly and implicitly. The representation of Germany in explicitly ethnocultural terms through, for example, substituting the word or concept of nation with the word or concept *Volk* appears only in a few instances within the dataset, most specifically through definitions of the *Staat* (state) as comprising a *Volk*. The idea of Germany for ethnic Germans is still conveyed more implicitly. In particular we see this in discussions of the history of the German nation as temporal, rather than spatial. Descriptions, for example, of Germany of “das deutsche Lebensraum (Living space)” as the symbolic space, implies that wherever a German is, Germany exists (Politische Denken, Urteilen und Handeln, 1982, 1989, 1994, 36). Further and particularly until the late 1990’s the inclusion of German repatriates (*Aussiedler*) in discussions of the nation, the state or the idea of Germanness. In the earlier textbooks the *Aussiedler* are often described as *Heimat Deutsche* (Homeland Germans) or *Volksdeutsche* (Folk Germans) and occasionally *Aussiedler*. By the late 1990s, mention of the *Aussiedler* has shifted from sections on German history or the German state to the newly created chapters on migration. The *Aussiedler* are now held up as examples of foreigners.

While these explicit examples, particularly in the case of the *Aussiedler*, become less common in the later years of the dataset, implicit ethnoculturalism forms a central

---

19 This is in direct contrast to my findings from a content analysis of textbooks from the 1960s and 1970s where the notion of nation was explicitly defined through the concept of the *Volk*. This is inline with Ohliger (1999) Dierkes (2003) and Walsh (2003) findings about textbooks prior to the 1980s. It appears, given these findings, that a unique Germanness is invoked as criteria for citizenship in German textbooks, but that there is a movement from stating it in explicit term to a more implicit portrayal. This may be an indication that indeed the notion of German citizen is moving from exclusionary to inclusionary.
core of the German citizen in the textbooks by underscoring the idea of belonging at the state, national and supranational levels. Consistently, and in a variety of content areas, citizenship in Germany is presented as white and Christian. Yet what the Being Us frame conveys is not only these characteristics of race and religion (which are also substantively represented in the other frames), but that being German or, to some degree, European is intractable. You simply are German by virtue of your birth, your heritage and your shared values. Becoming German is not possible. A notion of Germanness emerges which makes no room for another means of being German. This is conveyed through three distinct sub-frames, the portrayal of Germany as a nation of the German Volk, which is discussed above, and the absence of diverse voices, and the stereotypical portrayal of diverse Germans. Figure four shows a schematic of these interrelated codes. Both of the sub-frames are explained below.

**Figure Four: Being Us**
Lack of diverse voices

In line with the Bavarian state curricula for the 9th grade in the Hauptschule, textbooks devote a chapter to the development of the two Germanys after World War II. The chapter, regardless of text examined, explains the post-war context including the occupation by the allies, declaration of the two German nations and the building of the Berlin wall. In the four textbooks examined from 1988/89, which were written before the unexpected revolution in the former East Germany began, much attention is given to the idea of the unification of the German people (volk) will once again be united as one. In the Realschule textbooks from the pre-unification time period, students are also made familiar with the constitutional assumption that the Federal Republic of Germany speaks for all Germans, and that because of this citizenship standard East Germans are instant citizens of West Germany. The Hauptschule texts, before or after 1990, do not provide this much detail. But the idea that the Federal Republic represents the true Germany is clear. Underlying this assumption is the notion that Germany is for ethnic Germans, and that (as in retrospect did play out during the unification process) a place for East Germans is being held in the West.

It is clear in the major emphasis when describing Being German that these earlier textbooks rely on demonizing the division in Germany and envisioning a nation where all Germans are included. In and of itself this is not problematic, and this is in keeping with the dogmatic intentions of the Cold War, found by Walsh (2003). However, in both the pre-unification and post-unification textbooks, diverse experiences, e.g. the experiences of non-Germans living in Germany, are largely left out of the description of the German nation, despite their effect on its development. In the post-unification textbooks,
especially those of the late 1990s, the difficulties of Unification are described and the rosy picture of all Germans living happily in one nation is less idealistically portrayed. Yet even with this more critical stance being adopted, the picture of the German citizen is not expanded to include non-Germans.

In describing life in West and East Germany, the textbooks highlight youth culture and economic recovery through 1989. Special attention is paid to the “economic miracle” in West Germany and protest movements in the 1960s. With the growing stability of the West German economy, the everyday German’s life is described as dreaming of one’s own house, traveling internationally and being involved with group activities. Yet there is no mention of the Guest Worker immigration, either in terms of policy, nor any mention of the fact that it was at least in part through these economic migrants’ labor that the economic miracle continued (TRIO 9, 1997, 1999, 2004; Begegnungen 9 1999, 2004) In the 9th grade textbooks, because of the curricular mandates, there is a separate chapter which focuses on migration that includes mention of the Guest Workers, but they are excluded from the description of the growth of the German nation. Life for the everyday German does not include immigrants or other non-German groups.

In the same chapter youth culture in both East and West Germany is described and showed that in the FRG, in comparison to the former East Germany, youth are allowed to develop individually. Indeed, freedom of individual development and the protection of that freedom emerge as major points. These young citizens, however, are clearly only ethnic Germans. There is no discussion of immigrants’ experiences or discussion of youth culture in non-German groups. Any depiction of young non-Germans
is relegated to chapters on foreigners or Islam. This is true also in depictions of everyday Germany. Picture A provides a typical example in its portrayal of Citizens’ Wishes (TRIO 8, 1998, 18).

**Figure Five: Citizens’ Wishes, excerpt from textbook**

Diversity exists in terms of age and gender, but this representation of ‘citizen’ forwards a white and Christian view of who these citizens are. We see this through the names, race and occupations. Throughout the whole dataset, chapters and subchapters which focus on the local community or everyday life in Germany, feature pictures or representative quotes from citizens who are universally White Germans. Immigrants and any non-ethnically German residents of Germany are absent in this way, not only from the history
of the FRG becoming a nation, from being young in contemporary Germany and from being included in activities undertaken by citizens\textsuperscript{20}.

*Inclusion of diverse voices superficially or without context*

The *Being Us* citizen frame is also supported by the inclusion of diverse voices but only in a superficial or decontextualized manner. The following picture (Durchblick 8, 2006. 51) typifies the way non-German experiences are added to textbooks in a manner which provides students with no context with which to make sense of these experiences. In this picture an older man, probably a Roma or Sinti (Minority throughout Europe, referred to often as gypsies) or a Palestinian refugee is pictured begging.

**Figure Six: Rich and Poor, photograph from textbook**

\textsuperscript{20} In reality, as laid out in the historical overview, it was not until 1998 that the more liberal citizenship laws would have allowed so-called foreigners to attain citizenship with voting rights. But the representation of citizens here is not just voting rights but participation in the community, attending festivals, bicycling, being involved in community groups. Foreigners remain, as the continued use of the term *Ausländer* reinforces, foreigners and not a part of the citizen’s community.
He holds a sign which reads: “State-less, no home, not allowed to work.” The picture is the cover page to the chapter on Germany as a social state, in which the disparity between rich and poor is highlighted. The man sits next to a boutique window in which a mannequin wears an expensive dress. The caption reads: poor and rich. The picture is not integrated into the chapter, nor is the fact that this person who lives in Germany is part of the German nation. Indeed, the experiences of immigrants, refugees and migrants within the social state are not part of the chapter at all.

Throughout the textbook sample, most of the images of non-Germans living in Germany are in stereotypical roles, as vegetable sellers (cf. Durchblick 9, 1998,77; TRIO 8, 1992, 44), beggars (see above) or the underclass. This typification is made very clear when we examine the images of the non-German in contrast to the pictures of the average German presented above. The latter are the picture of the everyday German citizen contributing to the well-being of the German state through voting, community service, work and political leadership.

These findings demonstrate that exclusionary forms of the German citizen are still central to the notion of citizen despite the overall lack of explicit use of the volk-based sense of nation found in earlier studies of textbooks. The Being Us frame conveys that being White and otherwise typically German is a requirement for citizenship, but in so doing, underscores that being German is immovable; you simply are German by virtue of your birth, your heritage and your shared values. Becoming German is not possible. As the rest of the data analysis reveals, Europeanness will draw on this same idea of uniqueness and shared values. In this frame we see a monolith of Germanness as an
inherited ethnic (and therefore racial) trait emerge which makes no room for another means of *Being Us*.

**Becoming Like Us: Assimilation**

This frame, unlike the *Being Us* frame, suggests that there are criteria which can be achieved in order to become a member of German society. These criteria emerge under the banner of shared German and European values, which themselves draw on Christian and regional traditions. As a result religion and tradition form the foundation of this frame, with several sub-frames, *Christianity and the State, Muslims in society* and *Good Foreigners*, supporting the religion code. Figure seven shows the interrelationships of the *Becoming Like Us* frame.

**Figure Seven: Becoming Like Us**
Overall we see religion and tradition creating a sense of Europeanness, Germanness and Bavarianness which must be shared or taken up in order to become a part of this social grouping.

**Tradition**

Adherence to tradition is stressed as important and positive. In one textbook, tradition is defined in a sidebar as “Transmission of customs, beliefs, and songs about a particular time period. A state with tradition puts effort into supporting this transmission process.” (Durchblick 8M, 1999, p. 189). Here the message is clear that states should be concerned with tradition. The curricular point generally, as per the state plan, is to have students come to understand the role of traditions in society (Bavarian Ministry of Education, *Hauptschule* Lehrplan, 2006), and to familiarize students with the specific traditions which form the foundation of the Free-State of Bavaria. However, one expects in a more multiculturally-oriented curriculum that the traditions of the different groups living in Bavaria would be forwarded as equally important or contributing to the state’s well-being.

The Bavarian traditions which are appropriate and acceptable, as shown in the textbooks, are defined in very narrow terms. Wearing of traditional Bavarian clothing, for example, is often held up as an example of a good tradition or, as the quote above implied, a tradition which the state should take an interest in preserving. Lederhosen are presented as part of the fabric of Bavarian life. One book claims in a subheading “Lederhosen are not worn, they are lived.” Pictorial representations of being Bavarian are also very exclusionary. Attending beer festivals in traditional dress is a common picture, but so is being in community groups or serving on local government boards.
These pictures define the Bavarian as White, and being Bavarian as something which requires participation in only specific traditions. Again introducing students to the tradition of wearing Lederhosen or drinking beer is not problematic, but then emphasizing only rural Bavarian traditions presents a narrow vision. There have been people of different religions, ethnicities and races living in Bavaria since its inception and the current population includes people who celebrate a wide variety of traditions, but these experiences are absent from the discussion and pictures.

*Christianity and the State*

Christianity as an integral part of the Bavarian state is made explicit in each chapter or sub-chapter on the Free State. “Christian and Multicultural” reads the title on the two pages describing Bavaria. The text goes on to explain that the Bavarians (the Germanic tribe known as the Bayern who settled the region) were influenced by a variety of other German tribes and the Romans, but became Christian by 550 B.C.E. as recent
archeological references show (Durchblick 8M, 2006, p. 189). Neither the influence of Christianity nor a more modern interpretation of multiculturalism is offered on these two pages. This text conveys that Bavaria is multicultural because different peoples came together and then converted to Christianity. Implicitly we understand that this conversion is still expected for membership in German society. Bavaria is consistently presented as immovably Christian. A pluralistic view of being Bavarian does not emerge in the textbooks.

The relationship between Church and the federal government, as well as the role of the Church in everyday lives is a required topic in the 10th grade Realschule and 7th grade Hauptschule curricula. The curricula require discussion of the Church, meaning the Lutheran and Catholic churches. Neither in the curricula nor in any of the textbooks is there any mention of Mosques, Synagogues or other religious institutions as contributing to the everyday lives of Germans. Occasionally, and as will be explored more fully below, there is discussion of Islam or Orthodoxy, but this is relegated to separate sections on foreigners or immigrants. The textbooks lay out in this section the legal relationship between church and state: that there is not a state church and that the state cannot interfere in church matters. However, the textbooks also present the Christian churches as an integral part of German state because they provide social services and serve as the moral compass for the nation. Here the absence of discussion of other religious organizations’ contributions to the social and moral welfare of Germany speaks volumes. In other words, the Christian church is the sanctioned church and the one which has the central role in the well-being of the German state. We see Christianity as being synonymous with membership in the German nation.
Direct Representations of Muslims

In response to changes in the *Hauptschule* and *Realschule* curricula, Islam became a required separate unit within the textbooks in the early 1990s. Unlike the rest of the sections of the textbooks, this section directly addresses the issues of diversity and citizenship and seek to include the voices of Muslim-Germans. While there is normative information about Islam and Muslims in Germany, the nature of this information implicitly serves to underscore the difference between Christians and Muslims.

Examining, for example, the photographic representation of Muslims, we see a very narrow image of what Muslim’s look like. With few exceptions every picture of Muslims in chapters on Islam portray veiled women. When examining the sub-chapter headlines, we also see difference, backwardness and danger being implied. Examples from two 1999 textbooks are below; they are good representations of the other textbooks in the dataset.

Begegnungen 9, 1999, pp. 188-191:

Islam—a religious challenge

Islam—a political threat

The Islamic people—ruled by Europeans

Theocracy—the goal of fundamentalists

Trio 9, 1999, pp.188-196:

Muslims also live with us (bei uns)

German vacationers murdered in Cairo

Terror and Violence in the Name of Islam

Muslims: Islam as a World Power
Islam: Hereditary enemy (Erbfeind) of occidental Christianity

It is not that historically-speaking these sub-headlines are inaccurate, but rather, they contribute to an overall portrayal of Muslims as terrorists, chauvinists and extremists. Islam is a problem which the German state has to deal with, it is not a vibrant portion of it.

In chapter sections on Islam, Muslims living in the predominantly Muslim countries are profiled as are Muslim-Germans. Nearly without exception, in every book where a separate chapter on Islam is included, these profiles are of women living with the limitations of Islam or of Muslim men who are discussing the problems with Western culture. Begegnungen 9 (1997, 1998, 2005) highlights the experiences of Halima, an illiterate woman from the Sudan who believes it says in the Koran that men and women cannot eat together and contrasts it with Sausan, a university student in the Sudan, who believes her education is suffering because of gender separation. Sausan disagrees with the Koran’s statement that men can have four wives, but she agrees that women are weak and therefore cannot take certain jobs, such as that of a judge. A text box then reports that many women who veil feel more freedom with the veil than without it. It asks: Freedom behind the veil? The male Muslim voices throughout the textbooks tend to confirm this narrow perspective of gender (in)equality and the western world. The opinion of a German-Turk is presented in a text box:

Some have voiced their opinion that one day the woman will be equal (am anderen) to the man. And this is because there are equality and justice and laws. Does the woman, on the side of the Man, have any legal right to invoke, what is equality? The woman is the slave of and is responsible to fulfill all of his wishes (Begegnungen 9, 1999, p. 194).
In a small box next to this statement is a quote from a well-known German soccer coach, expressing frustration with Germans unwillingness to allow Turks in Germany to be different from the Germans themselves. The sentiment raises a good question and is part of a general trend towards supporting pluralism which will be discussed below, but in juxtaposition to the large and polemic statement by the Turkish-German it makes the coach’s statement seem naïve. (Begegnungen 9, 1999, p. 194).

While the mainly negative portrayal of Muslims in these textbooks could be construed as purely a part of the Bavarian state’s adherence to monoculturalism, this sub-frame takes on a new character when considered in relationship to the few positive portrayals of foreigners, including Muslims. Nearly universally in the textbooks, regardless of year of publication or amount of time devoted to Islam or migration as topics, positive images of foreigners are those who reject their homeland. Below are two typical examples.

A middle-aged woman wearing western dress and without a veil is pictured with her two children. The apartment in the background, from what we can see, seems typically old German with heavy wooden furniture and a calendar advertising a German trucking company. On the door there is a printed sign which in German reminds people to shut the door. It is only the woman’s Turkish name, Mine and her slightly darker skin which hint at her origins. She concludes the biography of her life by stating: “… Now it is much better for us. I have many German and Turkish acquaintances, my children feel at home here and I am a Municher.” (Trio 9, 2002, 223). Another profile states: “Perla C., 26, Office Assistant… I have been in Germany for 15 years, and I feel more German
than Filipino. I can hardly identify with the culture in my earlier homeland anymore.” (Begegnungen, 1999, 210).

 Particularly when Muslim women are portrayed positively, a rejection of their home, religion and/or family is implied. The example cited above of the Turkish woman who sees herself as a Munich resident is relatively mild in comparison to the more widely seen characterizations of women forced to leave their families. The following typifies this sub-frame: “The main problem was actually my father: he wanted to marry me off in Turkey. I resisted but I had to move away from home. It was very hard! In his opinion my behavior brought shame to our family.” (Begegnungen, 1999, 208).

 Religion will continue to play a part in defining European, German or Bavarian belonging in books examined for this study. In this constellation tradition and religion work together to set the minimum membership standards for being European, German or Bavarian. Professing a faith other than Christianity means not belonging. Belonging, or being recognized as an equal citizen, becomes something achievable, or at least conceivable through assimilation, in this case conversion, and defining tradition in Bavarian terms.

 Others Like Us: Europeanization

 Given the formation of the EU in 1993 and the adoption of the EURO in 2002, among other policy milestones, it is not surprising that the European integration process features large in the social studies books, but with certain caveats. Europeanization, invokes a supranational or post-national sense of citizenship. Yet in the textbook data Europeanization is not post-national, as Habermas (1996) would describe it in that it does not seek to identify multiple identities and embrace pluralism (Ibid). Rather
Europeanization is shown as an additional means of invoking uniqueness and marking difference. This is revealed through a series of subframes: *integration to protect peace, integration because of shared values, lack of inclusion of diverse voices* and *Europe as the provider of the future*. Taken together, these subframes underscore the historical justification of European integration due to the primordial differences between Europeans to now stressing (equally primordial) similarities. Figure nine sketches these relationships.

**Figure Nine: Others like us**

Diversity is absent from the forwarded image of the European citizen. European, like German, becomes narrowly defined. The *Others Like Us* frame draws implicitly on the *Being Us* frame in so far as being German is a requirement for being European. Inherent
in this link is the condition of ethnically, rather than geographically, being a part of these
political entities.

*Integration to protect peace (emphasizes difference)*

The description of European integration moves from emphasizing the differences
between European nations historically to emphasizing shared cultural values. Given that
the textbooks analyzed in this study were published between 1988 and 2006, it is not
surprising that the idea of a united Europe is fairly well established. Previous studies, in
particular Soysal et. al. (2005), show that in the early years, the European integration
process was portrayed as preventative action and a means of ensuring peace. This
difference between neighbors then requires deliberate political action in order to ward off
conflict. This emphasis on difference appears, but the similarity among Europeans is the
main focus. The unification of Europe is ‘necessary’ (Trio 9, 1999, 2002, 86) and a
‘vision’ (Begegnungen, 1999, 2005, 82). The centuries of wars between European
nations, in particular the 30 years war between Catholic and Protestant groups sets the
context for difference. Yet even in underscoring the wars between Europeans, however,
there is still an implicit similarity implied. The two World Wars and subsequent
destruction of Europe is given as the reason for the necessary integration. These wars, as
one text explains, started because of long-standing *Bruderkriege*—fratricidal wars or, in
another words, wars between brothers. Usually we see this term used to describe, for
example, the war between North and South Korea, because it emphasizes the shared
ethnic and family origin of the opponents. This explanation posits an a priori condition:
We are, and have always been, a European family.
Integration of similar groups (emphasizes similarities)

Textbooks pay close attention to European integration, even before the European Union was created with the 1993 Maastricht Treaty. Previous studies have noted that Europe has become a topic of increasing importance in textbooks in Germany since the 1960s (Soysal, 2005). For the books published in the late 1990’s, the curricular mandate to teach about European integration results in a full chapter about the European Union in most books. The idea of European integration as a means of keeping peace remains very strong, but is likewise we see more emphasis on the commonalities of European cultures. European integration is no longer just necessary to protect the peace and the German nation, but a desired union of similar groups.

A good example of the stronger emphasis on similarity while still recognizing the peacekeeping mission of European integration comes from the Europe Chapter in TRIO 8. This chapter begins with a questions: Do you know your “Haus Europa” referring to the shared European culture. The question is ‘answered’ in a sense with a quote from former German president Roman Herzog: “It is a mistake to understand Europe first and foremost as a political or even economic term. That which unites us Europeans is our shared European culture. It is the roof under which we all live. More than once the wars which we have fought against each other have almost brought down the house” (Trio 8, 1998, 40).

Lack of inclusion of non-Europeans

The lack of inclusion of non-European minorities’ voices, histories and participation in the descriptions of the European integration project, is very apparent. In this sense this part of the Others Like Us frame draws on concepts of ethnoculturalism,
defining the culture as European rather than German. It uses ethnoculturalism to underscore the uniqueness of Europe and European integration. Backgrounded, of course, in this claim is the idea that the Europeans have more in common with each other than they do with the other, whether it be the American hegemony or the Muslim world.

**Figure Ten: German students discuss the EU, photograph from textbook**

In this picture, which represents the students’ relationship to Europe, we see at first glance that the included voices do not show any racial diversity. Beyond this immediate visual image, however, the voices provided serve to explicitly exclude non-European minorities. For example one bubble reads: “Most Europeans share the same roots for example Christian beliefs and Indo-European languages. Are we therefore all the same?” The student is questioning whether these ‘European’ traits mean Europeans are all the same, yet these very traits limit severely who can even be European. Christianity is often
invoked not only as a cultural trait, but as a truth. One textbook, under the headline
*Unification of the Western Christians* describe how Christianity underpins European
culture: “For 2000 years the belief in Jesus Christ, who as the son of God came to earth in
order to free humanity from its sins, has connected the people in the European area. As
‘Brothers in Faith’ the Christians from different countries stand continually together (Trio
of man became the central cultural asset of the Occidental world and led ultimately to the
values, which now unite the peoples of Europe: peace, freedom and social justice (Ibid).

The equating of European with Christian is underscored by the inclusion of a
separate section on “Europe and Islam,” which stems from a series of changes in the
*Hauptschule* curriculum over several years beginning in the late 1990’s. While this
change does signal a movement towards a more pluralistic conception of German
citizenship which will be discussed below, the “Europe and Islam” section continues to
enact an exclusionary image of citizen. The title paragraph of this section in one textbook
simply asks: “The Christians have always seen Islam as a threat. Can Christians and
Muslims live beside and with each other in peace?” (Begegnungen 9, 1999, 181). Such
hyperbolic statements, using the word *always* for example, typify how Muslim and
European relationships are described. Another textbook uses the differences between
Muslims and Christians or the *Morgenland* (Orient) and *Abendland* (Occident) to
introduce the development history of the European Union. In this case the story of the
name Europe is recounted. Europa was the daughter of a Phoenician King who was
kidnapped by Zeus from what today would be Lebanon to the island of Crete. The section
on the European Union then comments on this story:
The story about the origins of the name Europe, which is in the textbox on the side, shows that this saga has for centuries been a metaphor for the contrast between the Western Christianity of the Occident as opposed to the Islam of the Orient. Still today this opposition influences both cultural areas—the Orient on the one side and the Western Occident on the other—the discussion about the expansion of the European Union, for example by including Turkey. (Forum 10, 2003, p.138).

What is interesting with this example is that it does not seem to be logical. In the time of Zeus neither Christianity nor Islam existed. Further, if we examine how the legend of Europe’s name continues, emphasis is always put on Athena foreseeing that a land mass would be named for Europa in honor of her sacrifices. While the strong line between the Islamic and Christian worlds is certainly accurate, this rather confused way of making this point implies that the differences are something primordial or mythical, influenced by Zeus himself.

Christian becomes a synonym for European, and Muslim for foreigner. Christianity is presented as a common normative underpinning of Europeaness in a very overt and explicit way disallowing alternative interpretations. Any non-Christian is not European.

*European integration as the way of the future and provider of opportunity:*

Being European is presented as nearly wholly positive and providing great opportunities for those who belong. Such positives as the following are in the books: travel without border crossings, the common currency, work opportunities through Europe and friendships with other Europeans, such as the French. Special emphasis is placed on the possibility to work in the European Union. Mostly this emphasis involves providing examples of training possibilities funded by the EU and sketches of professionals from nearby countries who are working in Germany. Durchblick 8, for...
example, highlight four fictional people: a baker from Austria, a dentist from Denmark, an apprentice in the Netherlands and a CEO from Germany all of whom have had greater employment opportunities through the EU.

Interestingly, diversity of voices is present in two distinct ways. First, and as noted throughout this analysis, there is essentially no representation from non-German German residents either pictorially or through prose. Whether fictionalized textbook characters or interviews with real people, the voices represented in these textbooks are White ethnic Germans. Second the countries described as providing great opportunities for these white ethnic Germans are nearly universally Northern European. Austria, the Netherlands, Denmark and France are held up as examples of countries which contribute expanded opportunity for young Germans. Italy and Greece remain vacation spots, and most other countries appear only in explanation of the differences between the ‘rich and poor’ in the EU (Durchblick 8, 2006, 20).

Expansion of the EU is often treated in a similar vein, that is, as a means of highlighting difference without really problematizing it. In one text, for example, a student is asked about her opinion and she replies: “Now there are supposed to be even more member states in the EU. I am concerned whether this large union is governable” (Trio 8, 1998, 53). However, this uncertainty about the Eastern European expansion is more often questioned in more subtle ways, such as discussing the influx of Polish and Czech agricultural workers who work for less money than their German counterparts. In a discussion about unemployment insurance, for example, an inset box highlights the experience of Frau Werner who, along with 165 others, lost her job in a textile factory when it was moved to Poland where production is cheaper. It is unclear from the layout
or information provided whether this is an actual example or fictitious; no context is provided.

Certainly no textbook could include in depth information on each member state, but the emphasis on the EU’s providing opportunity is severely limited to other wealthy and otherwise similar neighbors, while descriptions of Eastern and Southern European countries is mostly negative or not present. Likewise, as with all the other concepts of citizen emerging in the data, the German-European citizen is white and Christian, and there are simply no other possibilities provided.

The description of European integration moves from emphasizing the differences between European nations historically to highlighting shared cultural values. In the earlier depictions, European integration is a preventative measure to ensure peace. Germanness is emphasized as something unique and different and this difference between neighbors requires deliberate political action in order to ward off conflict. In the later depictions similarities are underscored: Christian religion, language and belief in social justice. In both cases an ethnocultural sense of citizenship is enacted. First, the cultural uniqueness of Germans sits in the background whereas, in the second, an ethnocultural European citizen emerges. In both cases, though, non-European residents are absent from the depicted citizen. Europe is then also simultaneously held out as the future. Job opportunities, leisure, friendships are all made easier and better through being a European citizen; these benefits are de facto and not available to the non-European. Others like us, in short, serves as an updated and modern extension of the concepts of citizenship forwarded in the Being Us frame. On the surface, it becomes a way of, talking about and including diversity, but tacitly reinforcing exclusionary notions of belonging.
Us and Them:

The depiction of Europe, Germany and Bavaria as pluralistic does also evolve in the dataset. Unlike the other frames, both the Us and Them frames and the We frame (discussed below) become stronger and more present over the 19 years examined in this study. The first sub-frame, the deliberate inclusion of non-Germans in examples depicting everyday life in Germany, is essentially non-existent in examples before 1995. Any and all treatment of Ausländer is reserved for chapters on foreigners, if these are at all present. The second sub-frame, emphasis on including diverse history and experiences as major focus in textbook section, emerges in response to state-level curricular changes in 1998. For the most part, this emphasis can be first observed in the later half of the dataset. Finally the third sub-frame examines the depiction of violence and xenophobia. All three sub-frames are pictured below.

Figure Eleven: Us and Them
Deliberate inclusion of non-Germans as examples:

In many regards the depiction of non-Germans, as explicated above, remains superficial and limited. However, it is important to note that over the entire time period of the books examined in this study, the inclusion of non-Germans in the textbooks has increased. A quick analysis of the indices of the 9th grade textbooks in the sample demonstrates this point. I selected five 9th grade textbooks from each of the time periods listed below and looked up the words repatriate (Aussiedler) foreigner, (Ausländer), Islam, Immigration (Zuwanderung or Migration). I chose the 9th grade books for this mini-analysis because the curricular guidelines require Islam and migration to be covered in this grade level.

**Figure Twelve: Textbook References to Aussiedler and Ausländer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of 9th grade Textbooks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total References in Indices: Aussiedler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausländer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuwanderung/Migration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This increased representation is particularly evident when we consider depictions of non-Germans in the everyday life in a German community. In the books published before 1995 there was essentially no representation of immigrant communities outside of chapters or sub-chapters which dealt with concepts such as migration. The pictures from a 1989 textbook depict the German family as having a white father, mother and child. By 1998 this depiction has expanded to include a single mother and a Turkish family (Durchblick 8M, 1998, 59).
There is also the occasional use of non-German names, in particular Turkish names, in the textbooks after 1995. For example, in a sub-chapter on active citizenship, the involvement of Ilhami, identified as a Turkish adolescent who is a member of the local mini-car model building club, is showcased. Being a member of a local club, the book explains, brings not only satisfaction to oneself, but contributes to the well-being of the community (TRIO, 1998, 28). Here we see a non-German being profiled for his participation in activities that are not dependent on his foreignness. Unlike the majority of depictions of non-Germans, this one seeks to represent Ilhami as a contributing and equal member of the community. However, it is important to point out that the textbook still draws attention to his ethnic heritage rather than simply using his name and picture.
The authors could have chosen to simply use his Turkish name or provide him with the hyphenated Turkish-German identification, but he remains a foreigner because he is called a Turkish adolescent.

The type of representation of non-Germans as contributing members of society as shown in the previous paragraph was completely absent in textbooks prior to 1990 and was minimally shown in textbooks until 1995. While there are still very few inclusions of non-Germans outside of chapters devoted to ‘foreign’ topics, the change is still indicative of a move towards a more multicultural citizenship education. If we think about this movement in terms of Banks’ steps toward multicultural curricula transformation (2001), we can consider such examples as stage three: integration. The textbooks make strides in showing Germany as a nation of many different kinds of people by including non-Germans in examples of everyday life.

*Development of textbook units on non-Germans in contemporary Germany*

Prior to 1993 there was little to no mention of Islam as a force within Germany or Europe, and any discussion of Islam was reserved for religion classes. Since the required religion curricula are overseen by the Catholic and Evangelical churches and students are divided according to their religion (with non-Christians being relegated to an ethics class), adding Islam to the social studies curriculum greatly expanded the discussion. Additionally, migration to Germany becomes a topic for the 9th grade textbook; globalization is tackled in the 10th grade *Realschule* textbook. While these ‘foreign’ topic chapters do provide some of the only inclusions of non-Germans in the textbooks, the serious attention to teaching students about Islam recognizes that students in German schools will be working and living with citizens who are Islamic. This is one of the few
examples of intercultural learning directly interwoven into the textbooks. Curiously there is no mention of any other religion in the social studies texts, although students do learn about world religions in religion class. Yet it is noteworthy that, much like the examples of non-Germans which are included in the texts, Muslims, and in particular Turkish-Muslims, remain the only identified foreigners. There are of course Jews, Sikhs, Hindus, Pagans, Buddhists and a host of other religious and ethnic minorities in Germany, but Turkish-Germans serve to represent all of them. This confirms Simil’s (1996) study of Jewish and Muslim inclusion in Bavarian schools.

In the earliest textbooks used in the current study, migration is treated as a phenomenon that happens, for the most part, outside of Germany. Several books highlight the German Diaspora to North America and Russia in the past and then talk about conditions such as famine and war which encourage people to emigrate or seek asylum. Until the later 1990s, pictures of starving children in Africa and desertification abstractly explain why people might be forced to leave their homelands. The picture below is more typical of the books published before the late 1990s. It shows Africans without a home because of drastic climate changes (Begegnungen 9, 1992, 205). Starting in this later time period, books present both asylum and economic migration as part of the German experience. The textbooks relate the experiences of refugee children who live in Germany or picture refugees from the Yugoslavia conflict first fleeing from war and then finding peace in Germany. The experiences of Aussiedler are also included in this section, and this group is expressly identified as foreign, although their German heritage is explained. The difficulties of learning German and of finding work are presented as part of their story. In every textbook after 1998 integration is presented as
something difficult (schwierig), but necessary (notwendig). The textbooks profile youth (always Muslims) who have to live between two worlds. In several textbooks other difficult social questions regarding Islam are posed, such as whether a young Turkish-German woman who wears a headscarf should be allowed to teach in a public school, or whether Islamic religious education should be offered in schools in addition to the already required Catholic or Evangelical religion courses. While, as discussed above, the representation of Muslims, serves to implicitly criticize Islam, it is equally important to recognize the presence of this perspective as a positive development toward presenting Germany and belonging in Germany as pluralistic. In a sense we can understand the development of chapters and curricular standards on Islam and Migration as invoking Banks’ (2001) second stage “Heroes and Holidays” in curriculum transformation. While neither heroes nor holidays are mentioned, these chapters in the textbooks function in a similar manner by encapsulating non-German minority depictions in the ‘Islam’ or ‘Migration’ chapters. A notion of the exotic underlies this and therefore difference and exclusion are still primary forces. Yet as Banks argues, the transformation of curricula is a process. There has been a sizable Muslim population living in Germany since the 1960s and migration has been a part of the modern German state since its inception. These chapters show that both Islam and migration are a part of understanding the structure of German society and citizenship.

Anti-Violence Education

German textbooks have paid special attention to xenophobia through their careful and consistent coverage of the Holocaust and World War II (Steffens, 1991; Pingel, 2000) For example, some aspect of World War II is the part of every grade’s curriculum
in the *Hauptschule* and *Realschule*. This is consistent with the national discussions about Holocaust education, and recognizes one of the defining notions regarding Germanness is in fact guilt over the Holocaust (von Thadden, 1998). In the textbooks, frank and open depictions of right-wing radicalism tend to focus on anti-Semitism and the Nazi past. This becomes clear when examining older textbooks and is also confirmed in Pingel’s (2000) analysis of Holocaust education. However, particularly after the anti-foreigner attacks and the arson of two asylum homes in the former East Germany in 1993 and 1998, violence in general is addressed in the textbooks. According to the curricula, xenophobia, with a particular emphasis on anti-foreigner sentiments as developed themes, should be included in separate chapters in the 8th grade texts. Also anti-violence education should be a thematic development in the 7th and 9th grade texts, when possible. In the 9th grade texts, in particular those published after 1998, the emphasis on Islam and the curriculum requirement of a sub-chapter on “Foreigners in Germany” usually profile a Turkish resident’s experiences, including those with xenophobia. One woman describes how she and her husband could not find an apartment because they would be rejected as soon as the owner heard the word ‘foreigner.’ (Begegnungen 9, 2003, 208).

Violence against others tends to be described in fictionalized accounts, which primarily include only ethnic Germans. Take, for example, the story of “Jürgen” from Trio 8, 1999, 101.
Jürgen was beaten by school bullies who wanted his soda. This fictional violence is
typical of the books’ portrayal of violence. For example, in this chapter the only mention
of xenophobia is in the title picture (TRIO 8, 1999, 100) which shows anti-foreigner
graffiti. The picture is not discussed nor is the concept of xenophobia represented with
the “Ausländer Raus” graffiti taken up. Instead the violence is thematized through
Jürgen’s story.

Figure Fifteen: Portrayal of violence, photograph from textbook
In chapters where violence against foreigners is dealt with directly, it is approached from the perspective of the perpetrator. Neo-Nazism is approached in each 8th grade textbook. The reasons neo-Nazis give for joining their movement are presented and criticized, and the consequences of illegal actions are explained. In one example, a neo-Nazi is arrested and writes a letter to his girlfriend, whose letter condemning his actions, is also printed. Much like the attention paid to the Holocaust, neo-Nazism is problematized and presented in an open fashion. Of course this perspective is important for critically approaching the topic of violence and motivation for violent acts, but it is curious that, as in the example discussed above, the conversation remains between two members of the majority; the minority voice, the victim’s voice, even here is silent.

In the 8th grade texts, only one series, Begegnungen, specifically addresses violence against minorities in the school setting. Yet, here again the perspective of a majority student is highlighted. Accompanying a picture of a darker-skinned student sitting alone and a group of white boys in a group, Sandra, a twelve-year old student explains how her classmates called a new student ‘ein Schoko’ (a chocolate). She expresses shame over the behavior of the boys. As with the other examples of violence, it is important that it is being directly addressed and characterized negatively, but the lack of minority perspective is noticeable. The 9th grade books usually include a small section on xenophobia in the Foreigners in Germany subsection of the migration chapter. Right-wing radicalism is again addressed, but as with the 8th grade textbooks, the victims’ voices are not included. Finally it bears mention that the discussion of violence, xenophobic or otherwise, never includes a non-German in the role of the perpetrator even
though, in fact, Turkish and Russian youth gangs are a growing problem (Dietz, 1999). While one can imagine that not addressing this issue comes from a fear of stereotyping, integration of non-ethnic Germans into citizenship education requires a true and honest integration. Considering this within the Banks’ (2001) framework mentioned above, the inclusion of Turkish, Russian and other non-ethnic German’s contributions to criminality and violence is necessary in order to achieve what Banks’ terms structural reform. This level of transformation indicates that all previously segregated histories (e.g. Guest worker history) are a part of the mainstream perspective. Leaving them out of the presentation of anti-violence education, both as victims and perpetrators, marginalizes their inclusion in the larger German society.

Interestingly in the 10th grade of the Realschule, which is the only year social studies is part of the Realschule curriculum, texts do not address xenophobia or foreigners in Germany at all. In speaking with state officials on this curricular decision, they explained that issues of violence are more appropriate for the Hauptschule, and as one official explained, most of the foreigners are in the Hauptschule. This, as will be explored more in depth in the next chapter, is in line with the overall view that intercultural and multicultural education are necessary for schools where there are foreigners. Paradoxically, the federal-level education board (KMK), which is comprised of ministers of education from the sixteen federal states and can only provide recommendations, now requires intercultural education in all grade forms. Likewise the Bavarian government recognizes intercultural education as an integrated theme in the Realschule (as well as all other school forms). Yet in application, the textbooks and
curricula for the Realschule do not implement this in terms of addressing xenophobia or non-ethnic German residents’ lives in Germany.

Despite the presence of the Us and Them code throughout the textbook dataset, and particularly in the texts from the most recent years, the textbooks remain for the most part Eurocentric. While each of the examples above represents aspects of Banks’ stages in multicultural curricula transformation, even engaging at times with the final stage “Multicultural Social Action and Awareness” (Banks, 2001), the intertwining of diversity and citizenship is limited at best, and for the most part is totally absent. Indeed as the name of this frame suggests, the distinct categories of German and Non-German, Us and Them are not further subdivided. Even the more politically correct words such as Mitbürger (co-citizen) or Turkish-German which themselves still draw lines, remain unused in the textbooks. The non-German, while growing in presence within the textbooks, is still an Ausländer.

We: Cosmopolitanism

In this frame we see citizenship being framed as a human endeavor. The citizen is concerned not only with his community, his state and his nation, but also with the global community. Attention is given to the effects one’s individual actions have on the lives of others, and implicitly, the textbooks convey that all humans should have the same rights. There are two main sub-frames within the We frame: explicit concern for human rights and understanding of interconnectedness of the world. Interestingly in both of these sub-frames, Christianity and Christian values play an important mediating factor. Figure sixteen graphically displays the sub-frame relationships, which are explicated below.
**Figure Sixteen: We**

**Human Rights**

Concern for the conditions in which human beings live and how they should be treated is presented as a European and a German value by emphasizing Germany’s and the EU’s role in ensuring universal human rights. As the examples below will illustrate, this vision of a common humanity, emerges but primarily in discussions external to everyday life in Germany. Textbooks often present a variety of problems such as famine, war and lack of infrastructure which contribute to poor quality of life for people in other countries. Then, in both prose and pictures, German or European contributions to solving these problems are laid out. Solutions such as humanitarian aid, technical assistance and
economic development, are conveyed. The following picture from TRIO 7, 1998, 2004, which portrays the German as the bearer of knowledge is typical.

**Figure Seventeen: A German helping in a developing country, photograph from textbook**

![Image of a German helping in a developing country](image)

There is also a more open discussion of human rights which is developed. One textbook, for example, highlights the plight of the Palestinians by examining the disparity between Jewish and Palestinian living conditions, contrasting swimming pools in the Jewish sectors and the hose shared by several households in the Palestinian sector. In another textbook the human right to food, water, housing and education is explained. Further, the Geneva Convention is also included as a means of ensuring fair treatment of all people. Finally, Germany’s participation in both the United Nations and the European Union is presented, without exception and regardless of grade, as a means of protecting and ensuring peace. While there is, as discussed above, a newly included emphasis on Islam
and migration in the textbooks, this is not directly connected to human rights. In two of
the textbooks there is a more explicit discussion of viewing non-Germans as equal. These
discussions include, for example, setting up hypothetical situations where Germans are
a good example.

Figure Eighteen: Africans affected by climate change, photograph from textbook

Yet the even in this example, humor is used and the portrayal of the African speaking
broken German pokes fun at him. Unlike the examination of world politics and the
situation of humans outside of Germany, this connection between equality and human
rights remains tacit and uneven when it concerns those who live in Germany. The frame
titled “We” connects Germans and Europeans to non-Germans and non-Europeans
outside of the political borders. It does not engage in a pluralistic sense of We-ness which would include the minorities living within the German and European spaces.

Interconnections

Human rights and social justice are brought up as critical goals of German and European Union policies, but also as concepts which are often trampled because of Western practices. Divisions between the North and the South, as in the cartoon from TRIO 9 (1997, 161) below are emphasized in the textbooks until the late 1990s when globalization becomes more of the focus.

Figure Nineteen: Cartoon depicting North-South divide, excerpt from textbook

In the most recent edition of the 10th grade Realschule textbook series Politik nicht ohne mich!, for example, a chapter entitled Globalization, Our World Grows Together, has been added. A section analyzes the winners and losers of globalization and informs the students that 80 percent of the world’s population live in developing countries, but that these countries only produce 20 percent of the gross domestic product. Explicit connections between the creation of jobs and high incomes in industrial countries and
poverty in Africa particularly are made. In the books published since 9-11, there is also a connection made between terrorism and globalization. Westernization and conditions of poverty in some Islamic countries are given as reasons for the development of radical Islam. Indeed, one textbook opens its chapter on “Germany, Europa and the World” with a picture of the World Trade Center attack. While the emphasis on Islam as a backwards religion, as discussed above, continues with this example, there is a clear attempt to impart to students that actions in Germany and Europe have consequences all over the world. A few examples of this sub-frame are revealed in chapters on European integration in which the role of the European Union as an economic power is often connected with a portrait of what or who contributes to that power. One book highlights the flower trade, a specialty of the Netherlands, which also involves several Third World countries. A quote from an activist magazine (*Brot für die Welt*) highlights the difficult work conditions faced by flower workers in these countries. Likewise the heavy use of pesticides is cited as a cause for concern. Students are asked whether this disparity in working conditions between flower traders in the Netherlands or florists in Germany and flower laborers in Columbia is fair. (Trio 8, 1999, 2003, 61) However the majority of the emphasis on global interconnections comes in chapters which directly deal with the Third World or globalization and in this sense, much like the inclusion of minority experiences, remains segregated and not structurally integrated into the depictions of Germanness.

Last, it is important to point out that concern for humanity, particularly through social justice, is forwarded only as a fundamentally Christian value. Here we see Christianity again being put forth as a necessary condition for being European or German. As with the other meta-codes emergent in this data-set, the portrayal of
Christianity plays a tempering role. Cosmopolitan values, in particular social justice and universal human rights are often presented as part of being German because they are Christian values. The Christian textbooks use Christian church involvement in the charity as a way of underscoring not only how Germans contribute to protecting human rights, but also why they contribute to it. The church, as in the Realschule textbook Forum 10, is described as the sole moral guardian in German society. As such it ensures social justice, an end to war and the protection of human rights, and it forms a foundation of German society and politics (Forum 10, 2006, 55).

**Political Theory Matrix Results**

The results of the framing analysis are interesting in and of themselves as they reveal Bavarian state intentions at the time when global and federal discourses on citizenship and diversity are moving towards multiculturalism. However, in examining the results, it became clear that it was important to problematize them as they relate to the larger discussion of citizenship and diversity, and to contextualize them within system relations (Carspecken, 1996). As mentioned before, Gutmann (1987) argues that citizenship education policy enacts political theory. She posits that all education policies implicitly draw on a political theory about the role of the State in the formal education of future citizens. Methodologically, I interpret this as meaning that any informed analysis of policies on citizenship education therefore requires making explicit what political theories are at play. In this case, multiple theories of citizenship will serve as standards against which evidentiary results, both from the textbook and interview analyses, can be critically evaluated.

---

21 An application of this approach is Bull’s discussion of multicultural education cases through the lens of three political theories (Bull, 1992).
To capture spectrum of possible political theories of citizenship and relate it to the results of the framing theory, I developed the political theory matrix, to be used as an analytic tool. Conceptually doing so draws on the literature and connects it to the results of the framing theory analysis. In theory it would certainly be possible to use the literature to operationalize certain political theories and then test for their presence in the textbook and interview data. However, this would have lacked nuance and risked imposing too rigid a structure on the data. Likewise, I could have chosen a range of political theories on citizenship from which to build this analysis, but it was important that the theories emerge from the historical and sociopolitical context of citizenship and diversity in Germany. To this end I will explore theories on ethnoculturalism, assimilation, Europeanization, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism using European theorists or theorists writing about the European case.

Because my research query asks how citizenship education policy has responded to ethnic diversity, understanding the backgrounded political theories at play in the textbook data requires me to first outline how diversity is conceived of within the political theories themselves. To this end I have explored how ‘the stranger’ (Appiah, 2005) is conceived in each theory. Appiah posits that within the modern-day polity we differentiate between strangers who are our neighbors e.g. are members of the polity, and what he terms “political strangers” (Ibid, 217), those we exclude from the community. Drawing on Appiah’s idea I expanded the dichotomy between citizen stranger and political stranger to consider, how each of these citizenship theories conjures the family, the neighbor, the stranger and the infidel. Through these images, I will show how citizenship and diversity emerge within the theories, and then how this relates to the
results of the framing theory analysis results. Undertaking this additional analysis reconnects the potentially idiosyncratic textbook coding to the political theories which underscore the Bavarian state intentions.

**Ethnoculturalism**

A German is, in the sense of this Basic Law unless otherwise legally regulated, a person who possesses German national citizenship or who is a refugee or displaced person of German heritage, his spouse or descendent, who has been admitted to the area of the German Empire as of December 31, 1937. --- Article 116 of the German Basic Law of 1949

As discussed in the first chapter, since the early years of the Federal Republic, political rhetoric has consistently rejected multiculturalism in favor of a volk based concept of modern Germany. In the polity which defines membership through ethnicity and culture, such as Germany from 1949-1998, any member of the community is, by definition, family. Ethnoculturalism posits an ethnic state in which citizenship is inherited. Heritage is determined by blood. As discussed in the first chapter, Brubaker explains how the notion of ethnoculturalism emerges out of the specific historical circumstances of national-building in Germany:

Since national feeling developed before the nation-state, the German idea of the nation was not originally political, nor was it linked to the abstract idea of citizenship. This prepolitical German nation, this nation in search of a state, was conceived not as the bearer of universal political values, but as an organic cultural, linguistic or racial community—as an irreducibly particular Volksgemeinschaft. On this understanding, nationhood is an ethnocultural, not political fact (Brubaker, 1992, 1).

Ethnoculturalism points to a sense of Germanness devoid of agency. One does not choose to be German and one cannot become German; one is German. As such German

---

*Belonging to the German Volk*
is an ontological category. In contrast to communitarian theory (Bull, 1992), which could explain citizenship/membership in an emerging or artificially created community e.g. a sect, ethnoculturalism encapsulates a determinism, analogous to the metaphor of blood determining social class in Plato’s Republic (1955). The ethnocultural family consists of all Germans, but only Germans.

The neighbor in this case may be someone whose heritage is similar, but not identical. In considering the results from the framing theory analysis, we can imagine the ethnocultural neighbor of the German being other West Europeans—those who share values and cultural similarities. In contrast, the stranger emerges in ethnoculturalism as any person or group with which the ethnic state has neither shared values nor cultural relations. Here the reluctance to include Eastern European neighbors in the same category of closeness as the Western and Northern European countries within the European Union is underscored. Finally we can understand the infidel as someone whose cultural values are perceived as being outside and, therefore, potentially threatening to the ethnocultural polity. There is a fear of the foreign or unknown backgrounded in the ethnocultural nation.

German author and poet Heinrich Heine\(^\text{23}\) writes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The patriotism of the German consists of his heart growing tighter, it shrinks like leather in the cold, that he hates which is foreign, that no longer desires to be a world citizen, or a European, but only a narrow German. The patriotism of a Frenchman warms his heart, expands his heart through this warmth enlarges it, so that it does not only embrace the closest family members, but the whole of France, the whole civilized country with his love (Heine, 1835, 237).}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{23}\) Heinrich Heine was a 19\textsuperscript{th} century romantic poet and philosopher. His writings on culture, history and patriotism were later transformed into underpinnings for the National Socialism.
Given the narrow depiction of ethnoculturalism, it is no surprise that Muslims are considered not only foreigners, who might minimally share in Christian values, but are put at an even greater remove as infidels.

Ethnoculturalism assumes the ontological status of being German; citizenship education is therefore not about choosing to become a member of the polity, rather heritage and blood predetermines your belonging to the volk. The Being Us frame provides evidence for this ethnocultural theory. Likewise the Others Like Us frame is an expanded version of this ethnocultural approach, replacing the uniqueness of Germanness with the uniqueness Europeanness. Another consequence is that diversity of membership is not considered an issue because the boundaries are set to be intractable. It follows that citizenship education need not be inclusive of diverse members of the polity because by definition they cannot be a part it. The sub-frames which comprise the Being Us frame, namely the representation of the community as volk-based, the lack of diverse voices in the portrayal of the German community and the superficial depictions of non-German residents, underscore belonging in Germany as ethnocultural.

*Becoming Like Us: Assimilation*

Assimilation theory, for the most part, has emerged out of traditionally immigrant nations, particularly the United States. The Chicago School of Sociology first developed the theoretical concepts underlying assimilation. Until the early 1970s assimilation was the dominant means of thinking about immigrant experiences within the heterogeneous nation-state (Park, 1964). Within the citizenship education literature, the American literature also remains dominant in terms of assimilation theory. Among others, Horace
Mann believed that one way to solve the problems created by the immigration of Catholic and South European immigrants was to create a public system of education. This system would guarantee that the outcome of an Americanization through public education would be a stripping of ethnic and cultural values in favor of American, Protestant and democratic values (Mann, 1965). The classic idea of the melting pot underlies this notion of assimilation. Gordon (1964), expanding on the work of Park (1964), conceived of assimilation in America as a unidirectional process in which immigrants aspired to and achieved middle-class American status through individual economic and cultural social mobility. More recent reconceptualizations of Gordon’s work, as well as of Glazer and Moynihan’s idea of the “triple melting pot” (1975), forward assimilation as an economic activity which does not require religious or cultural assimilation (Light and Bonacich, 1988; Light and Rosenstein, 1995; Waldinger, 1990).

Ironically, in the German context, economic integration of non-ethnic German residents, particularly through entrepreneurship has been less problematic owing to many immigrants’ categorization as economic migrants. Indeed, political and cultural assimilation has been only recently a part of discussions; although it has long been a backgrounded assumption about integration into the nation-state. It was not until after Gerhard Schroeder was elected Chancellor in 1998, that foreigners became viewed as immigrants and that assimilation, referred to as integration, became officially part of the political discourse in Germany. At that point there was a vested interest in integrating

---

24 Assimilation of the expellee population (those Germans expelled under the Potsdam Accords, was in fact a serious issue in post-War Germany (Long, 2003) However, the fact that this population ultimately was absorbed into the majority population actually underscored the notion of assimilation as a model for dealing with difference.
long-term non-German residents into the mainstream society and in viewing them as part of the long-term future of Germany and Europe.

What is interesting when considering assimilation within the textbook analysis is that it emerges in ways that harkens back to the older models of assimilation in the American context touched on above. Sharing the so-called German or European religious and cultural values is forwarded as the minimally necessary requirement for acceptance into the community. Therefore assimilation on cultural and religious grounds, is necessary. In this sense we can understand assimilation as political theory at play in the textbooks as putting forth images of family, neighbor, stranger and infidel which extends from, but does not subsume, ethnoculturalism. In an assimilationist state, the neighbor and the stranger can potentially enter the “family realm.” Assimilation theory allows for intermarriage in a metaphorical as well as legal sense. While the family is still premised on the idea of a German heritage, there is an understanding that if one adopts the cultural practices and values of Germans, then one may be invited to become a member of the social entity. The neighbor and the stranger are defined in similar ways as they would be in the ethnocultural nation; that is, where there is an overlap in cultural values, those can be viewed as neighbors.

As with the conceptualizations of assimilation by early theorists like Gordon, assimilational forces invoked in the textbooks under consideration appear to require rejection of the previous identity. We see this in particular with the portrayal of the successful foreigner as one who rejects her home culture and religion in favor of German cultural standards. Such movement is, by nature, unidirectional. It is not a full acceptance into the German family, but there is a path for becoming part of the
community, which is not present in ethnoculturalism. Following this, the neighbor, the stranger and the infidel are still outsiders, with varying degrees of outsideness. Assimilation does not change the notion of how Germanness is defined and, therefore, these categories are still premised on the ontological status of being German. However, assimilation proffers a more permeable, albeit unidirectional, boundary between inside and out.

Europeanization

From the European Union’s Charter of Fundamental Rights:

Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law. It places the individual at the heart of its activities, by establishing the citizenship of the Union and by creating an area of freedom, security and justice.

The Union contributes to the preservation and to the development of these common values while respecting the diversity of the cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe as well as the national identities of the Member States and the organisation of their public authorities at national, regional and local levels; it seeks to promote balanced and sustainable development and ensures free movement of persons, goods, services and capital, and the freedom of establishment.

The European Union draws on a humanistic view in describing its own endeavors, yet in so doing connects the European ‘moral’ heritage with the “universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity.” In this preamble we see diversity being equated with tolerance for the variety of European identities. Implicit in this statement is that ‘other’ (non-European) individuals do not share the same status. This pattern is repeated in the textbook analysis as is an emphasis on the shared morals of the European peoples. Given the dramatic role the process of European integration has played in reshaping the relations among states, it is not surprising that the Europeanization as a
political theory emerges in the textbook data. Theories of European integration for the most part examine the political and economic motivation for transferring sovereignty, in a variety of realms, to a supranational entity (Moravcsik, 1998). Many of these theories ignored the changing notions of diversity and citizenship which come out of the European integration process, both organically and through policymaking. The initial impetus for Europeanism in the modern age came from the desire to ensure peace on the European continent, after World Wars I and II ravaged the continent. As the textbook analysis reveals, however, the emphasis on similarities and shared values within the European Union has also emerged. This reflects the concept of a European-level of citizenship which, as Smith (1992) suggests, transcends mere economic and political cooperation. Preuss (1998) also theorizes that strengthening regional-European ties, such as those between Bavaria and the EU, may offer a means of conceiving of European citizenship in a manner which reflects local traditions but makes room for new post-national loyalties.

The movement towards recognizing shared values at the European level, in lieu of the national level, shows a substantial shift in the ontological status of family and neighbor. The family, conceived of as fundamentally German in the ethnocultural frame, opens to include the neighbor through Europeanization. A good example of this is the above cited instance of naming the conflicts between the European nations which ultimately led to World War II as wars between ‘brothers’. This explanation seeks to portray historical events in a manner which underscores a long-existing similarity. The emphasis on the shared values of Christianity and language to the exclusion of any non-
Christian, non Indo-European speaking resident, also contributes to this merging of the family and neighbor notions.

Although the ontological status of being German expands to be the ontological status of being European, exclusion of the stranger and the infidel remains. In following our analogy, the stranger, characterized in ethnoculturalism as he who is non-threatening in his different values say as Eastern European, becomes a little less strange. Because the notion of family has expanded, difference amongst members becomes more tolerated and there is more opportunity to find similarity with those once thought of as strangers. Here the skepticism about the expansion of the European Union into Eastern Europe and the delineation between north and south which emerged in the Others Like Us frame comes into play. There is not an out and out rejection of expansion and indeed the concept of the shared language and shared Christian values is extended to the new members of the EU, but the emphasis on sameness is not as strong.

The movement of the neighbor and stranger towards inclusion in the family is underscored by the continued separation of the infidel. Those, whose values are deemed in conflict with the constitutive beliefs of the culture, are still too different, too foreign and still viewed as threatening. The continual focus on the role of women in Islam and therefore the interpretation that Muslims do not value equal gender rights, as well as the consistently pitting European values against Muslim values in the historical interpretations, underscore the ontological status of the infidel within the Europeanized state.

The expansion of family to include the neighbor, and, to a lesser extent, the stranger, while maintaining the segregation of the infidel, can be illustrated by Quine’s
(Quine and Ullian, 1978) notion of the web of beliefs. Imagining a large spider web, the constitutive religious and cultural values are at the center of the web and cannot be expanded or replaced without the structure of the web collapsing or being seriously damaged. Ultimately the EU, as a supranational experiment, depends on member states’ ability to transform their nationally-constituted educational philosophies and policies toward a citizenship education that includes not only a European dimension, but also equips students to recognize and internalize values shared and embraced across EU countries, including a positive sense of diversity. The Bavarian citizenship education policies, as represented in this textbook analysis, do not incorporate this positive sense of diversity in its enactment of Europeanization. For Bavarians diversity remains more narrowly defined even though it includes an expansion of Germanness to Europeanness. Further, for Bavarians, the concept of diversity still largely excludes the stranger and, most certainly, the infidel.

Multiculturalism

From the German Basic Law:

Article 2 (Rights of liberty).

(1) Everyone has the right to the free development of his personality insofar as he does not violate the rights of others or offend against the constitutional order or the moral code.

Article 3 (Equality before the law).

(3) No one may be prejudiced or favored because of his sex, his parentage, his race, his language, his homeland and origin, his faith or his religious or political opinions.

The notion of difference has been protected constitutionally in Germany since its founding in 1949. Individuality, freedom of religion and politics and equality of the law,
as in the United States, form a foundation of political rights for citizens of Germany. While these rights extended, in theory, to any resident in the nation-state, the exclusion of non-Germans from citizenship retarded the development of a multicultural notion of belonging despite the diversity of the population. Gutmann’s discussion of multiculturalism argues that rather than deriving one’s personal identity from one’s culture, individuals select aspects of various cultures to constitute their identities. Multiculturalism is as much associated with individuals’ identities as the shared conditions of larger groups of people. (Gutmann and Thompson, 1996; Appiah and Gutmann, 1996). If a group is internally cohesive and its members share a set of social understandings, they cannot engage in deliberative interaction with themselves, as they do not carry divergent perspectives. In fact, differences in views that derive from multicultural perspectives are necessary for deliberative interaction, which in turn, can undermine a hegemonic set of social understandings (Ibid). Citizenship education must therefore recognize varied perspectives and include them as equally valid. Likewise, as a practice, citizenship education must be equal and accessible to all members of the community, meaning immigrant groups may need, as Kymlicka (1995; 2000) argues, groups rights in order to attain equitable education.

In the Us and Them frame an emerging sense of multiculturalism is invoked. As the analysis above suggests this multiculturalism is stilted and incomplete. Nonetheless when compared over the entire span of the dataset, a new sense of family, neighbor, stranger and infidel is revealed. Multiculturalism demands that the stranger and the neighbor be treated with equal respect. One’s rights—political, cultural, religious—may not impede on the rights of others. Multiculturalism embodies a politics of equal respect.
The inclusion of chapters on Islam and migration as well as the continued development of an anti-violence education speaks towards imparting this idea of equal respect. Yet, as the analysis of the *Us and Them* frame suggested, this joining of family-neighbor-stranger as still distinct but equal categories is still lacking. The persistence of representation of the infidel as an enemy of the state, multicultural or otherwise, emphasizes this idea. The infidel represents a caveat in the multicultural theory. When a group’s practices are completely contrary to the moral code of the ethnocentric unit, equal respect may not be granted by the ethnocentric unit. Here again we see continued emphasis on the concept of the infidel in several ways. We see it in the discussion of women’s rights under Islam, the persistence of the portrayal of the divide between the European and Islamic worlds, and in the lack of recognition of any other group outside the Muslims as foreign. In the previous theories there is a reliance on recognizing similarities, whether it be through assimilation or the expansion of Germanness to include Europeanness. Multiculturalism, however, posits difference; therefore there is a consciousness about difference that gets brought to the foreground as a *positive*. There are still, however, limits to difference, and the textbooks, in their attempts to include different voices and experiences in the German state, still clearly draw attention to these limits.

**Cosmopolitanism**

From the German Basic Law:

**Article 1 (Protection of human dignity).**

(1) The dignity of man is *inviolable.*

To respect and protect it is the duty of all state authority.

(2) The German people therefore acknowledge inviolable and inalienable human rights as the basis of every community, of peace and of justice in the world.
Much like multiculturalism, the concept of cosmopolitanism is an integral part of the legal foundation of the Federal Republic of Germany. Its commitment to social democracy as evidenced, for example by its allegiance to the reuniting of immigrant families, is an example of this human rights orientation. Yet the long-term ethnocultural citizenship laws relegated non-citizens to a second class status whereby they were not viewed as equal humans. The inalienability of human rights extends from the German ethnocultural community to the outside world, but through this outwards orientation, it disenfranchises non-German communities within Germany. Cosmopolitanism emerges in the *We* frame as a substantive perspective on the abstract treatment of others, far removed from the German polity.

As the above excerpt from the German Basic Law reflects, cosmopolitanism posits a constitutive moral basis that is appealed to as our primary identity as human beings. We recognize people as strangers (Appiah, 2005), but also recognize in these strangers our common humanity. Distance of relations remains, but shared humanity reconstructs boundaries. As Walzer (1990) suggests with his concept of the hyphenated American each person, whether family, neighbor, stranger or infidel becomes a hyphenated human. Nussbaum (1996) develops the concept of cosmopolitanism as a means of citizenship which requires citizens to be, above all else, committed to moral goodness and humanity. Contemporary citizenship education, she explains, must then prepare young people for this commitment. As Nussbaum defines it, cosmopolitan education is an “allegiance to the worldwide community of human beings” instead of one’s own nation.(Nussbaum, 1996) By emphasizing shared aspects of humanity, she argues that we can begin to recognize and appreciate the rational and “moral capacities”
(Nussbaum, 1996, 133) that make us human. By realizing that all human beings share these capacities, we can see that human beings are inherently equal, thereby allowing us to compare ourselves to others in a nonhierarchical fashion (133, 138).

An embracing of cosmopolitanism, as a political theory underscoring citizenship education, would result in textbooks which seek to dismantle hegemonic tendencies while simultaneously presuming differences among participants while observing their equal rights to access and respect in the discussion. The textbook analysis results, however, indicate cosmopolitanism only emerging in certain contexts and not as an overarching political theory for citizenship education. The We frame is highly limited and the cosmopolitan notion forwarded by it is undermined by restating respect for human rights and dignity, not as universal values or even German values, but as Christian values.

**Citizenship and Diversity in Bavarian Social Studies Textbooks from 1988-2006**

The weak presentation of cosmopolitanism, coupled with the fragmented conceptualization of multiculturalism as revealed in the Us and Them frame is indicative of an underlying political philosophy that still conceives of the citizen in monocultural and national terms. The political theory matrix, as an analytical tool, allows us to see that more exclusive citizenship theories are not replaced or even augmented by theories of citizenship which seek to be inclusive. Rather, there is overlap between the theories with assimilation and Europeanization drawing implicitly from the ethnocultural sense of citizenship, and multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism failing to fundamentally address issues of internal diversity. Figure twenty graphically shows the relationship between the theories revealed in this secondary analysis of the textbook data.
Taking these relationships and examining them in terms of the time span studied, an interesting pattern emerges. We see the most exclusive and narrowly defined sense of citizenship is predominant in the early time period (1988-1994); the more inclusive concepts which encompass diversity appear more consistently after the election of Gerhard Schroeder when monoculturalism began to be questioned on a national scale. However, as explained above, the Being Us frame remains throughout the entire time period, and is often backgrounded within a seemingly more multicultural concept of citizenship. It appears that the Bavarian state’s notion of the German citizen has moved to encompass more diverse concepts, enacting multicultural and cosmopolitan frames at times, but remains fundamentally ethnocultural.

In turning toward the results of the interview analysis in the next chapter, the political theory matrix can be applied as a framework for organizing that data. This
allows these two distinct forms of data to be linked methodologically. In so doing, I am better able to interrogate overlaps and conflicts not only within the lifeworld data, but also between the system and lifeworld. Given that the Bavarian state views textbooks as an extension of their citizenship education policy and as a means of controlling teacher’s pedagogical content choices, it is particularly important to be able to connect the system and lifeworld data.
CHAPTER SEVEN: BAVARIAN SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS’ REFLECTIONS ON CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

While the Bavarian state has a particular vision of citizenship embedded in its education policy and curricular plans, teachers, ultimately, interpret this in their everyday interactions with students. The implementation of policy at the lifeworld level must be interrogated in a manner which allows us to see in what ways system imperatives are reproduced or, contrastingly, in what ways teachers veer from the imperatives. There is the potential that the backgrounded political theories explored in the previous chapter will be taken up in a different manner or even, in an act of pedagogical resistance, rejected. Teachers, reacting to the diverse make-up of their classrooms, could also see multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism as fundamental, as opposed to additive approaches to citizenship education, as they are set out in the curricula and textbooks. Indeed, the tradition of German didactics views the teacher as an independent scholar and reflective practitioner (Westbury et. al., 2000). This tradition presents the possibility that the political theories framing the concept of citizenship education in Bavaria would be different at the lifeworld level then at the system level. Further, because of the structure of education in Bavaria, in particular the highly centralized control of content, it is important to understand how the teachers take up citizenship education within the framework of state intentions.

This dissertation seeks to examine citizenship education practice and understandings of diversity in the lifeworld by interviewing teachers with varying number of years of experience, and by asking them to reflect on their teaching practice throughout their careers. I am here seeking to understand: 1. In what way do Bavarian teachers consider it their responsibility to promote an understanding of diversity as a part
of citizenship education? 2. In what ways have teachers seem their teaching change given the new geopolitical realities of Europeanization, migration and globalization? 3. What type of political theory are the teachers, through their teaching practices and in their reflections, invoking in their implementation of Bavarian citizenship education policy, and in what ways—if at all—are political theories present in the minds of teachers which conceive of a multicultural or cosmopolitan citizen?

To this end I designed a critical qualitative study which used interviews with ninety-three social studies teachers in Bavaria to probe these questions. In this chapter I will discuss the methodology informing the analysis of the interviews before turning to the results of the analysis. I will first provide evidence for each of the political theories within the interview data, and then explain the theories’ interrelationship to each other at the lifeworld level. Finally, this chapter concludes by examining overlaps and conflicts between the system and lifeworld levels. In so doing I am able to show a more exact picture of how citizenship education and diversity are presented both in policy and practice. As the results presented below will reveal, there is a deepening of the political theories underscoring Bavarian state citizenship education imperatives as the teachers, through their reflections, explicate them more specifically.

**Methodology**

*Review of Design*

As outlined in the methodology chapter, I conducted interviews with 119 social studies teachers at *Hauptschule* and Reaschule in Bavaria. Fifty-eight of these interviews were transcribed and used for the write-up of this chapter. I listened to and took notes on the remaining interviews, but since redundancy within the whole set was achieved, I did

**Coding Procedures**

Methodologically, I undertook a multi-stepped coding and analysis process in order to reveal teacher interpretation of state intentions. First, I used the political theories revealed in the textbook analysis to organize the interview data. In order to be sure that there were not other possible political theories at play, I first coded the data for emergent themes26. I then related these themes to the political theory matrix which was used in the textbook analysis. Once the data were organized into the political theories, I undertook a two-fold coding process in order to really interrogate in what ways the teachers were invoking the political theories. This process all helped to validate that the data were indeed representing the political theories I ascribed to them. The two-stepped coding process used Carspecken’s (1996) meaning field analysis and reconstructive horizon analysis. Both of these are elaborated below.

**Meaning Field Analysis**

The meaning field ranges from the “tacit” to the “discursive,” referencing the potential ambivalence or vagueness of meaning with statements such as: and, or, and/or (Ibid, 96). By using meaning fields I am able to wholly understand the act, revealing tacit meaning as part of the process of coding the data. In elucidating both tacit and

---

25 I transcribed roughly 1/3 of the interviews myself, another 1/3 were transcribed by a native German speaker and the last third by a native speaker of English who is fluent in German. I checked the accuracy of all of the transcripts by listening to them while reading the transcripts. I did not translate all of the transcripts; rather I worked with them in German and have translated only the sections needed for examples in this dissertation. The translations are my own, but have been checked by a native speaker.

26 While there were some other interesting meta-themes such as the nature of educational leadership in German schools or the situation of the *Hauptschule* in present day society, I am limiting this findings chapters to the results which specifically address citizenship education and diversity.
implicit categories of meaning, meaning field analysis is linked to lifeworld level norms, beliefs and values. For this study this is an appropriate analysis tool because I ask, in part, what are the teachers’ norms and values regarding citizenship and citizenship education. Understanding these norms, values and attitudes is also critical because it assists in understanding where there may be conflict between system concepts of citizenship and lifeworld concepts of the same.

One example of a meaning field constructed around a statement regarding citizenship would be the statement, “Germans are very punctual.” The meaning field could be as follows:

MF: “Germans are more punctual than other ethnic groups” AND “Other ethnic groups are not as punctual” AND/OR “I am not as punctual as a German” AND/OR “The German ethnicity makes you be punctual” AND/OR “Being punctual is a good and valued thing in Germany” AND/OR “Not being punctual in Germany is unacceptable”

As evidenced in the example, the meaning field analysis reveals all the possible meanings for a statement. As an analytic tool it also shows how meaning is bounded. In examining the statement above, for example, “Germans are punctual” cannot mean “ Pillows are soft” or even “Germans like to drive fast.” In brief, by using meaning field analysis I was able to understand the full range of possible, and less possible, meanings for a statement. This assisted me in understanding the range of possible political theories being enacted.

Reconstructive Horizon Analysis

After the meaning field analysis, I conducted reconstructive horizon analysis on the data. This form of analysis is an extension of the meaning field analysis because it


enables the researcher to view the ‘horizon’\textsuperscript{27} of possible meanings in any given statement. The horizon is conceived by Carspecken as having both vertical and horizontal axis. The horizontal analysis codes for the objective, subjective, and normative validity claims; and a vertical analysis, considers the foregrounded and backgrounded claims. Practically speaking, speech acts (or parts of statements) are categorized in a continuum ranging from highly foregrounded, or overt to highly backgrounded, or tacit (Carspecken, 1996, 105) and then are likewise coded for objective, subjective and normative claims inherent in the speech act.

In this case, normative claims about who is a German citizen, who can become a German citizen and what values underscore this concepts, are critical for understanding the how teachers enact the political theories underlying the Bavarian citizenship education policy. Likewise, whether a statement is highly foregrounded or highly backgrounded reveals to what degree certain normative claims about citizenship and diversity are taken for granted within the lifeworld. An example of a reconstructive horizon analysis from this study is reproduced below:

\textsuperscript{27} Gadamer developed the concept of “horizon” as part of the hermeneutic process to refer to the world affiliations of researchers (Bernstein, 1983). He deemed the researcher’s hermeneutic acts of interpretation, specifically with regard to analysis of tests, as a “fusion of horizons” (Habermas, 1984, 134; Bernstein, 1983, 143). Carspecken (1996) draws on this concept of horizons and pairs it with Habermas’ (1987) idea of validity claims, in order to develop his reconstructive horizon analysis (103).
Figure Twenty-One: Reconstructive Horizon Analysis Example: The teacher said: Because we are Germans, and we will always have it [Holocaust] in our baggage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foregrounded</th>
<th>Intermediary</th>
<th>Backgrounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>There was a Holocaust and millions of people died because of the actions of Germans.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germans, then and now, are responsible for the Holocaust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective</strong></td>
<td>Germans feel shame because of the Holocaust.</td>
<td>I feel shame because of the Holocaust.</td>
<td>It is hard to deal with these feeling of shame for something that happened so long ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong></td>
<td>Germans should feel shame and should remember this feeling of shame</td>
<td>Germans should be careful to remember so that it does not happen again</td>
<td>It should be okay to be proud of being German, but it is not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of methodological decisions

By structuring this data around the political theories, a more nuanced and careful understanding of the theories’ interface with citizenship education as conceived by the teachers is revealed. Using Carspecken’s meaning field and reconstructive horizon analyses allows me to examine the normative claims about the ideal citizen in terms of diversity. It is also appropriate because both analytical tools are critical in nature and draw from the Habermasian understanding of system and lifeworld analysis. Thus, the critical nature of this study, as outlined in Chapter Five and the theoretical orientation, discussed in Chapter Four, are complemented by these analysis tools. Studies which integrate theory and methodology are important for validity (Korth, 2005). The results of this multi-stepped analysis of teacher interviews are presented below.
RESULTS

Ethnoculturalism

Much like the notion of ethnoculturalism in the state-level analysis, ethnoculturalism is invoked by the teachers as a way of explaining German citizenship as something historic and based on a shared ancestry. Citizenship and belonging are linked directly to an essential notion of Germanness and, consequently, diversity is secondary, imposed or viewed as necessary only if foreigners are present in the classroom. This idea is expressed more complexly than in the textbooks where the idea of the nation of the volk is reinforced through the absence of other voices. In the teacher reflections ‘being German’ emerges, as in the textbooks, as an ontological category, but this interpretation of ‘being German’ is further reinforced by teachers’ explanations of Germanness as a temporal notion. Failing to recognize diversity as a critical aspect of citizenship education is also revealed in the interview analysis, but again is complexified through a comparison with earlier times. Consistently teachers, even those who have only been teaching for five years, discuss the way schools used to be better. In this reflection, both implicitly and explicitly, the presence of non-Germans is forwarded as negative. Ethnoculturalism is expressed in two distinct ways: presentation of Germanness and belonging to the German state as ontological, and as a rejection of diversity. Figure twenty-two shows the code development for ethnoculturalism in the teacher interviews; each theme is then explained below.
The notion that being German is something ontological—one is German, one cannot become German—is represented in two distinct ways. The first is in the explicit stating Germanness as a state of being or explaining the idea of *Heimat* as accessible only to Germans. Teachers would, for example, say: “our love of our homeland (*Heimat*) is born with us, I can talk about it, give examples of it, but the children come to the classroom as Bavarians and through that as Germans and Europeans.” The incorporation of *Volksmusik* was often brought up as an important way of reinforcing Germanness. This was probably a typical example because of recent changes in the *Hauptschule* curriculum which made it a requirement for the younger students to learn Bavarian
music. Teachers described this addition as good and important because the music belongs to Bavarian and Franken (a region in Bavaria) heritage and should be valued.

In schools where there were high numbers of Russian-Germans, their story (which, as described in the first chapter, is tied to the notion of the German Volk) was often used as an example of Germanness. Teachers would express the need to help these students find their German roots again. One teacher explained that she spends extra time with her Russian-German students in social studies:

One has to find their way to the German state. It is our system and they cannot make it better without being familiar with it. I must make it clear to the children, but especially the Russian-Germans that they are Germans. That they must speak German and understand German rules. But they have to recognize their own Germanness.

This recognition of Germanness, however, was never used in conjunction with other student groups, such as the Turks. The same teacher explains that of course non-Germans have to understand ‘our’ rules, and they should speak German, but they will never have the same relationship to our homeland (Heimat). “For them the best hope is that they can live between both cultures. It makes me angry when it is only Turkish or only Greek, but I know they won’t just be German. It cannot work like that.” Several school directors explained, in fact, that they would remind their teachers about the tragedy of Russian-Germans if the teachers were getting frustrated with them. One, for example, remarked: “They are a beaten people and this tragedy from being German; they paid for all of our sins.”

*Shame and Germanness*

This last example explicitly names the Russian-Germans as German and thereby enacts the enthocultural concept of Germanness. However, it also connects to ideas of
shame about being German. The notion of shame was consistently forwarded by the
teachers as a reason why no one, except a German, could be German. Here there was a
tendency for the older teachers, those who had been teaching for more than fifteen years,
to reflect on this in relation to their teaching of citizenship and to diversity. However,
shame was not a theme exclusively coded in older teachers’ reflections; several younger
teachers also forwarded this idea. In some cases these reflections were a way of
explaining why there is something unique about being German. One teacher explained:

    We Germans, we are very susceptible, more susceptible than others [to
    nationalism and xenophobia], and we don’t know how to handle it. I don’t
    know, maybe the younger people can handle it. I would wish it for them,
    that we, like other countries, have finally learned.

Teachers also explained how this fear and shame affects how they teach and what they
Teach. A Realschule teacher said:

    One must also give them both sides. One must say: you are not guilty,
you were born much later, you have not done anything. But you will
forever, as long as there are Germans, have to help carry this package. We
must stand by it, because otherwise the world will not recognize us. It is
luck that the people of the world even acknowledge us now, because it did
not look like they would for many years and we must be careful not to
destroy this accomplishment. There are two sides, that belongs together.
When the media say that we should draw a line under this history, I say we
can never do this. Because we are Germans, and we will always have it in
our baggage. And the students understand this well.

In her eyes it was one of her most important jobs, both in the social studies and religion
classes she taught, to convey this special burden of being German to her students. This
idea of shame for being German was often given as one of the key aspects of raising good
German citizens, but it was likewise explained that non-Germans cannot understand this
guilt nor should they be expected to. One younger teacher, who was in his second year of
teaching social studies and English, told me that since my last name is German perhaps I
would understand it better than the Turkish students. “They cannot get it, they think it is funny to call us Nazis, there is no way they can be German because they cannot feel what we feel. I don’t know how else to explain that, so I just stick to the content in the book about voting in Germany.”

Temporal notion of Germanness:

In saying that no one except a German can feel the guilt of being German, the teachers touch upon Germanness as a notion not bound to place but to emotion, in this case the sense of shared guilt. In essence this itself is enacting the temporal nature of Germanness which hallmarks ethnoculturalism. The German lands unified around the temporal aspect of ‘being German’ and thus citizenship and access to the German nation-state has been maintained within this temporal plane. This recognizes, on the one hand, with respect to history, the diasporic nature of the German tribes, and later the German Volk, but on the other hand, rejects the spatial relationship developed towards the place one lives (Cornwall and Stoddard, 2001). Temporality as conceived by Cornwall and Stoddard is not merely the lack of a spatial relationship, but refers to the notion of Germanness transcending place through time; Germanness is passed from generation to generation regardless of physical location. This temporality is touched upon frequently as teachers discuss how one teaches ‘being German.’ Often they connect their own personal experiences with being German to German history or the uniqueness of the German experience as a means of explaining how they approach the subject in the classroom.

One teacher talks about her own family’s roots:

My parents are expellees from the East, but they are already dead. Myself I was born here in Bavaria, but my whole family was
uprooted people. Until the end of their lives they still mourned their old homeland. … I inherited this feeling. I am at home where my family is. I could live anywhere even on the moon as long as I had my people with me. I am not tied to the place and cannot pass on this sense of belonging to a place. I don’t have it in my heart.

She then proceeds to relate this personal experience to the notion of Germanness.

It is like this for us Germans; it is not about where one is, but about the feeling of home and the creation of homeland (Heimat). Actually I think this idea is fairly clear in the curriculum; we discuss the concept of Heimat, we discuss our history and our future as a people.

Finally she explains how this is realized in her class and how it extends from the Bavarian state standards.

This is important, so I stress it a lot in German class, and in religion and in social studies. I start with the textbook and then we discuss our own families a lot. With the Russian-Germans, it is nice because they can contribute to the discussion—they are uprooted as well.

This excerpt relates the temporal notion of being German back to the Russian-German history, in this case connecting their experiences to the experiences of other Germans and reinforcing the idea of German as an ontological category.

Rejections of diversity

In addition to these more personal and abstract explanations of Germanness, teachers also rejected diversity as important for citizenship education. This mirrors the findings of the textbook analysis, in which non-Germans were either left out of everyday descriptions of German life or were only presented in stereotyped forms. Here the rejections of diversity take on the same role of silencing and stereotyping as in the textbooks. The majority of teachers interviewed (~60 percent) were not aware that
intercultural education is a required topic that should be interwoven into all aspects of the curricula (Bavarian Curricula for the *Hauptschule* and *Realschule*, 2006). Most expressed surprise that the requirement was so explicitly stated. The following constitutes a typical response from the interviewees: “Intercultural education, that is in there. My goodness (laughter). That is the same mistake, in Finland the curriculum is 18 pages. Here everything is decided for us and we can never get it all done anyway.” Others simply disregarded any notion of intercultural or multicultural education in the schools, whether it be a part of citizenship education or not, because it was regarded as a problem for other school forms or for schools in urban areas. Teachers explained “We don’t have that problem here because we are in the countryside, and there are very few foreigners” or “We don’t have the foreigner problem because we are a *Realschule*, at the *Hauptschule*, they have to deal with that.”

In a few cases the teachers were much more specific about their problems with diversity. Teachers discussed how students could not learn to work together if there is a constant pointing out how everyone is different or how one group needs special treatment. Several teachers said they interpreted the curriculum’s requirement to educate legally mature citizens as teaching students to work together and work with different types of people and that these two requirements meant they needed to focus on getting students to understand themselves as a unit, not as separate, different individuals. The French system (where French republican values are above all else) was referenced as a positive, in particular because of the decision to ban the wearing of headscarves in public schools. This latter point was also a common theme in explaining that Germans believed in the equality between men and women and that this must be a consistent part of the
citizenship education. A few teachers, all women, expressed an unwillingness to teach Muslim women who wear the headscarf because they view it as a degradation of women. One teacher, a professed ‘old feminist,’ said she was particularly frightened by the trend to have German women (mothers of her students) who had converted to Islam, “showing up in school with a veil.” In this case it was not just the presence of Islam in the schools which concerned her, but the fact that Islam was affecting ‘real’ Germans.

Several teachers also discussed the need for Bavarian state officials to step in and regulate the ‘headscarf’ problem. Students should not be allowed to wear it in the school because it makes it impossible for them to be seen as anything but different. In one school, a group of teachers had made it clear to their headmaster that they will not teach students wearing headscarves; the headmaster has managed to reassign the students to avoid conflict within the faculty.

This rejection of diversity education was also expressed by teachers who believe integration, in particular of Muslim students, is not possible. When asked what type of citizenship education would contribute to integration, commonly teachers would say it was nearly impossible to teach a totally different value set. One teacher said the best she could do was hope her students would observe her and the way she is in class so that the [foreigners] can absorb as many German and European values as possible. “Tolerance for example, that is not important there (in Turkey). The value of life is less there than it is in our society. In our society there will be huge problems when all these children really do become citizens and can vote.”
Teachers also recognize degrees of Germanness in their discussions of diversity in citizenship education. Several teachers described the Romanian-Germans (the first Aussiedler to return after the fall of the Berlin wall) as the most German, then the Russian-Germans and finally the Turks. For many of the teachers this reflects how they personally think about the students, but it also reflects how they approach the idea of citizenship education. After explaining that in his experience the Romanian-German students think of themselves as German and that the Russian-German families want to think of themselves as German, a teacher adds:

And with the Turks there is absolutely no thought that they will become German. Sure, in some families some of the children want to apply for citizenship now that it is available. But they are in no ways ready to take on West European values. I don’t know how any amount of education is supposed to change that.

Finally the perceived treatment of women in Islam plays a fundamental role in the rejection of diversity by the teachers. As explained in the headscarf example above, teachers enact gender equality as a particular German and European value which must be observed if one is to be German. Although in some teacher reflections there is discussion of how gender equality education would contribute to integration or assimilation (which will be discussed below), in the rejections of diversity, the value is held up as uniquely western—a value which Turks and even the Russian-Germans will not be able to acquire, as this next excerpt demonstrates:

When we are talking about the value of a woman, the Turkish parents raise their children exactly as they always have. The girls are to serve the boys and how are the boys supposed to learn otherwise when not in the family? The Russians are often not much better, especially when they are from mixed marriages.
Alcohol is second nature and they skip hash [hashish] and go right to heroin. It is not surprising that domestic violence starts then.

As in the textbook analysis, the reduction of diverse voices to stereotypes, macho and alcoholic in this case, leaves little room for a citizenship education which recognizes the value of diversity.

*Heile Welt--Intact World*

The rejection of diversity also emerges very specifically in the description of schools where there are fewer than 10 percent non-Germans enrolled. In each of these schools, the teachers always explain that they have not really considered issues of diversity because they don’t teach foreigners. The schools are described as *Heile Welt*, the intact world or *Insel der Seligen*, the island of the blessed. The normative claims revealed in the reconstructive horizon analysis of these descriptions ascribe an inherently positive value to such schools in the teachers’ eyes. In the *Heile Welt* the world was simpler and the (German) students better students. Respect, punctuality and a lack of complexity all mark the *Heile Welt*. A common reflection would be: “About our school I must say we have very few foreign children. We are really still an *Insel der Seligen*. When one looks at the classes, in one class there are two *Aussiedler* and one Turkish child and that’s it.” Teachers who had taught both in urban areas and in more rural areas would contrast the two in a similar vein. “Here in the country there is also a different kind of child than in the big city. The context is different. Families are together more, there are fewer single parents and fewer foreigners. The children are better behaved, smarter, all of it is better than in the city. … In Nuremburg that was a rarity.”
Even teachers at schools with some foreigners or repatriates use this imagery to describe the degree of ‘foreignness’ present. “Here we are an island of the blessed. We don’t have any real Aussiedler children, according to the Ministry of Education’s definition. We do have a host of children who come from families of Aussiedler with all of their problems.” Teachers at schools with large numbers of non-German students, in all cases Hauptschule, also either explicitly or implicitly invoke the sense of Heile Welt to explain what their school is not. A teacher, when asked if she had anything additional to add at the end of our interview said the following:

Perhaps one more thing: In the Federal Republic and especially in Bavaria, there is a huge emphasis on increasing the educational opportunities for children of migrants [another term for children of immigrants] That is a nice idea, that one can support, but, if [one] is not capable of learning, then [one] cannot have increased educational opportunities. I cannot make the pupils equal. And at this school where I only have 6 German students in my class then I don’t know what the politicians expect anyway. They are crazy. This is not some nice little school in the country.

In this reflection, the teacher is contrasting her school full of foreigners with the abstract notion of a ‘little school in the country’ and, in so doing, accesses the idea of the more pure world of schools with fewer foreigners. She separates her non-German students from students who are capable of learning and in so doing normatively forwards a capable student as a German student. Teachers, who have seen major shifts in the types of students their schools serve, often reflect positively on earlier times. In explaining the changes his school had seen in the last twenty years, a teacher and school director summarized: “It was the end of the eighties when I switched from [a school in a larger town] to this country school. I thought it would be an easy first assignment as a school director. It was before the opening of the East. The world was still in order. We had very
few migrant children.“ Ethnoculturalism backgrounds the idea of the Heile Welt because it serves as a means of explaining diversity as a dangerous development which threatens the more pure environment of the school.

The citizen forwarded by the teachers still relies on an ethnocultural concept of citizenship. If we consider the metaphor used to describe ethnoculturalism in the previous chapter, we see the teachers’ reflections on teaching citizenship education deepening the notions of the family and stranger put forth. The ethnocultural family remains for Germans, but there is a willingness to see Romanian-Germans and by some teachers, Russian-Germans, as a part of this heritage-based family. The shared history and shared guilt of being German excludes others from this family in the eyes of some teachers. Others, however, reject diversity because they perceive Germanness as resting on shared values –values which cannot be taken up by the stranger. As in the textbook analysis, we see a fear of the stranger backgrounding the teachers’ reflections on what it means to be German and what it entails to teach students to be future German citizens. This affects the way they talk about their teaching insofar as they describe teaching Germanness as something ‘not possible,’ or interweaving diversity as only necessary at schools with the foreigner “problem”. However, through the interview analysis, the notion of the ethnocultural nation as a temporal and emotional feeling emerges. Normatively the citizen set forth by this notion, should not just be German by heritage, but by feeling. “This feeling and sense of Heimat is”, as one teacher explains, “simply present. The knowledge is much easier to teach and test, but these values, that is difficult.”

As in the textbooks, ethnoculturalism serves as a backgrounded political theory which blocks the implementation of multicultural and cosmopolitan concepts of
citizenship. However, it emerges alongside of assimilation, with many teachers admitting that if their non-German students could be more German or more European in their mannerisms then citizenship education would be more successful.

Assimilation

Unlike the ethnocultural reflections on citizenship and diversity, outlined above, when teachers’ talk enacts the assimilation theory it forwards criteria which, when met, would allow their foreign students to belong. Complementing the textbook analysis results, we see Christian and Western values emerging as a way of being German or European which could and should be taken on by non-Germans. The teacher reflections extend the notion of assimilation in comparison to the state-level analysis by assigning blame to the foreigners for not assimilating—for being too foreign. As in the textbooks, the latter is reinforced with images of good foreigners being those who are most German. Figure twenty-three graphically represents the codes and sub-codes which support the assimilation theory.
Interestingly, and as will be discussed more at length below, the teachers’ reflections which invoke assimilation are only loosely connected to pedagogical objectives. Rather, the discussions of assimilation are offered as a reason why teaching foreigners to be ‘German’ is unsuccessful. In this sense assimilation serves to reinforce the underlying assumptions of ethnoculturalism.

_Christian like us_

In discussing which values all students need to learn in order to become good citizens in Germany, teachers took care to stress that all students, but especially non-Western students, needed to learn German and European values. Below is a typical response of teachers when they are asked about the values associated with citizenship.
education. The question does not include references to foreigners and at this point in the interview, I have not brought up issues specifically relating to diversity or non-Germans.

I think that there are surely values that are necessary to teach—politeness, punctuality, the ability to follow-through. With our foreign students, the Greeks and the Turks, politeness is rarely a problem. But punctuality is a mess. It is a stereotype that Southern Europeans take everything so lightly, maybe we are just too tight in Germany… But with us in Germany there are simply time clocks and those who don’t follow the rules, well he is going to have problems. And when there are two to choose from when someone has to be let go, the one who is always late is going to be the one fired. So then these people, of course, make it difficult for themselves when they don’t internalize this premier of all virtues. Whether they accept it that is another question it is enough for now when they just live it.

The idea of German values, in this case punctuality, being something which must be internalized in order to be successful, is underscored as something particularly German. This happens not only through the teacher’s references to those from southern regions, but by his use of what non-Germans do, in answer to a question about the values connected to citizenship education.

The idea of German and European values was also stressed as being founded on the principles of Christianity. This is very much in line with the results of the textbook analysis. Indeed many teachers, even those who were not dual religion and social studies teachers, commented on the textbooks being effective at underscoring Europe’s common Christian heritage, and thereby enabling the teachers to examine values in the social studies class. More explicitly though, teachers reflected on the role of religion in the school and the religious education that non Christians receive. There was great concern expressed by some teachers that European values could not be effectively taught without
religious education. One teacher, who taught Catholic religion and social studies, remarked on the ethics class required of non-Christian students in the Realschule (2 hours per week from grades 5-10).

I am concerned that they don’t have enough time with European values. These are inherently Christian values and even though the ethics class is supposed to cover the same material as the religion classes but just not be from the perspective of the church, I wonder how you can really cover that material by removing the Church’s perspective. Sure, in social studies they talk about some of this, but that is only in the 10th grade and it is very political about the system and so on. But the value for human life, the treatment of men and women equally, the respect for different beliefs, this is so much a part of our belief system.

In the Hauptschule, the presence of Islamic religious education until the fifth grade and then the voluntary election of an ethics class was problematic for teachers working in schools where this was the case. The teachers explained that without the ethics class non-Christian students were not systematically exposed to “middle European” values. Here we see not only a connection with citizenship and Christian values, but also the teachers’ expectations of the role of religious education within citizenship education. The fact that at the Realschule many of the teachers interviewed taught religion in addition to social studies, and that religion was a commonly studied subject for the Hauptschule teachers, certainly influences this finding. The large number of interviews where the emphasis on religious education is viewed as essential to the preparation of citizens, particularly non-German citizens, normatively claims Christianity as a guiding foundation to citizenship. Commitment to Christianity, as in the state-level analysis, emerges as a minimum requirement for belonging. As we will see in the discussion of multiculturalism and
cosmopolitanism, this pattern of emphasis on Christian values continues to shape the way teachers talk about citizenship education.

**Good and typical foreigners**

Assimilation, as a theory underscoring citizenship education practice is especially revealed in the ways teachers talk about the integration of their non-German students into school and the classroom. Reproducing the results of the textbook analysis, two types of foreigner emerge the “good” and the “typical”. The teachers use these descriptions to show that non-Germans can be successful in German schools and can be an integral part of society. The typical foreigner, however, is used as a way of explaining why non-German students are not successful; this image serves as means of distancing and assigning blame.

**Good Foreigners**

Good foreigners are often referred to as integrated, but more often the word *angepasst*, which can be translated as adjusted or more literally able to pass, is used when referring to them. Good foreigners should be able to fit in as much as possible, to the point of passing. A typical description of a good foreigner involves a teacher giving an example, either from their classroom or in general and explaining that students are successful because they have made efforts to be like us. Below is an example:

**Teacher:** The Romanian-Germans are very assimilated (angepasst), very interested, I mean to say, sometimes almost too modest. Yes, we have families here they have tried to change their names so that no one sees that they are Romanian-German. Even though not everyone here is called Meier and Mueller. And they are very engaged, especially in the Church and of course there are the statistics that show that the children from Christians are raised better than others, [he smiles], but I
don’t want to go into that. Well they are adjusted (angepasst). They are industrious and involved and there is great pressure from the parents that the children do well.

**Interviewer:** With *angepasst* you mean?

**Teacher:** In every way and I don’t mean it negatively. First of all, the native language [meaning German] is simply spoken better than by other immigrant groups. … They are very industrious and they build their own house within the shortest amount of time because they work together. The Romanian-Germans don’t cause us any problems.

The repeated reference to being industrious is particularly interesting because this is a quality often associated with German culture and one which is particularly mentioned as an important value to instill in children in the Bavarian state curriculum. Likewise, the mention of involvement in the Christian church supports the idea of adherence to Christian values as being a minimum standard for membership in the German family. A good foreigner speaks German, is Christian, industrious and punctual, just like the Germans are themselves.

Assimilation is also explicitly referenced as a necessary and positive development. Teachers discuss how hard it is on the students when they are so obviously different. One teacher discusses how with the Russian-Germans you used to be able to ‘tell’ they were not German, based on their place of birth, but now the students are born in Germany—“a joyful development.”

For students who cannot pass as Germans because they are, for example, black or Asian, there is a particular emphasis on how German they act and how well they speak German. A teacher describes a Ghanaian student in his class:
She learned German really quickly. Within a half a year she was speaking German. After one year she was the best speller in the class. Now she has been here for two years and she will be going onto a higher level school. The mother basically speaks no German and the father just a little bit, but if I were to bring her here now, you as a non-native German [speaker] would not even be able to hear that her pronunciation is not pure German. It is amazing. And the class loves her. It is just naturally developed not forced.

Emphasis on how non-Germans can compensate for not being German also emerges when teachers discuss their refugee students.

I have had a few [refugee] students from Africa over the years and also a couple from Bosnia, mostly Muslims. I don’t know if it is because of what they have been through, some of them saw their fathers killed in front of them, or if it is just cultural difference. But these students work. They work at German. Sure they still have an accent, but they work. They study very hard and their parents try to stay involved. Of course everyone knows they are not German, but they are accepted. They don’t usually form little cliques like the [Turks and the Russians]. I think the class accepts them because they are working so hard and because they want to fit in.

Here again the ability of a student to physically pass backgrounds the normative claim that acting like a German should allow you entrée into the community. Germans should be white and should be Christian, but working hard might help you overcome these deficiencies.

Typical Foreigners

The deficiency model is further developed when we consider the typical foreigner image put forth by the teachers. This emerges as a foil to the good foreigner and they are often described together. For example a teacher would discuss a good foreigner and then say “but most of them are not like that.” Or a teacher might say something like: “well of course their or exceptions, but most of the typical non-German student are…” In
discussing citizenship education and, in particular aspects deemed important for non-
Germans to learn, teachers often stressed that their students simply were not willing to
learn about German society. This became a descriptor of the typical, as opposed to good,
foreigner.

There is not a series of self-praise, but a constant basis of teaching,
to show: we are like this, we do things this way, our society goes
like this. So that they see us as role models. However, the parents
of these students are very ready to assimilate, they try to be
German and not Russian, but this generation [her students] says:
We are Russian. We are not German.

Teachers were also able to give examples of intercultural projects which they had
attempted, but which failed because the immigrant groups were not willing to participate
in the manner expected by the school.

For me it is very important and I have decided years ago that we
should have a party together with the Turkish children and their
parents. It is a still a desire. That the Turkish families bring
Turkish food to the table and that we maybe all learn a Turkish
song together that we simply sit together and chat a little—but I’ve
given up. Because everything what I said before about them being
[lazy, dirty and not smart] is true. They don’t come, they are not
reliable. It does not work. They don’t speak in German at such a
party and what should 20-25 German children do while the
[Turkish] families are speaking Turkish to each other. But I’ve
given up. It is too bad, I would have enjoyed it.

In this sub-code we see the normative claim that immigrants should want to assimilate and
should act German being explicitly underwritten. There were two interviews which
provided important counterexamples of this dominant normative claim made by teachers.
In both of those cases the teachers were employed in schools which had served immigrant
communities for a long time, although neither was in a major urban area. In both cases the
teachers provided countless examples of successful intercultural projects. In one case the teacher talked about exactly the type of party described in the previous excerpt.

Here at this school we have every nationality under the sun, thirteen in all. Mostly Turkish and Russian, but also American and Ghanaian and Vietnamese etc. We all bring in different specialties and the parents sell the foods to raise money for the school. We put little flags out and the parents and kids explain the specialties. Our music teacher had the kids sing in different languages and we even did a theatre piece in English this year—that was hard, but fun. Sometimes the parents sit with other of their compatriots together, but who cares. At least they are here and maybe next time they will dare to [to talk to more people].

While there were only two teachers who so enthusiastically describe intercultural activities (although in the above example the whole school was involved), it does point to the fact the school space can be more inclusive. The pervasive claim, however, both from the state and the teacher perspective is that in order to be a part of the school and in order to be successful in school, one must be German or as close to German as possible. In relation to the assimilation theory discussed in the previous chapter, assimilation does not change the notion of how Germanness is defined. Therefore these categories are still premised on the ontological status of being German. However here as well as previously, assimilation proffers a more permeable, albeit unidirectional, boundary between inside and out. The teachers are willing to see their non-German students as part of the school community and to work towards their success if they act German. The true German citizen remains white and Christian, but there are some means of adjusting which would be viewed as acceptable. Diversity, however, remains a threat to the concept of Germanness and at odds with belonging to the German polity.

As noted above, the teachers’ reflections which either explicitly or implicitly call on assimilation as a model of citizenship education for non-Germans, are only loosely
connected to pedagogical objectives. Teachers do discuss the values they see as being crucial and talk about serving as a role model. In this more explicitly education-related reflection they are posing religion as a necessary subject matter as opposed to the teaching they do in their social studies classes. Many teachers’ reflections however forward assimilation as something necessary in order for citizenship education, or any education, to be successful. For the most part, assimilation is seen as the responsibility of the foreigner, not as the responsibility of the teachers or the school. The lack of assimilation and the existence of ‘typical’ foreigners serve as a rationalization for the teachers as to why citizenship education for foreigners is unsuccessful or even unnecessary.

*Europeanization*

The notion of European citizenship is enacted in three distinct ways in the teachers’ reflections on teaching citizenship. First, and very much in line with aspects presented in the textbook analysis, European citizenship is viewed as a means of preserving peace. Second, in a handful of interviews, the teachers rejected the idea of Europeanization as an important factor in citizenship education. Finally, and by far the most common means of discussing the role of Europe, Europeanization and European citizenship are offered as examples of multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism. In this latter point, the teachers bound their understanding and teaching of multicultural and cosmopolitan ideas by limiting them to a European context. Figure twenty-four graphically represents the interrelated codes, which are explained at length below.
Figure twenty-four: Europeanization

Peaceful Europe

Much in line with the textbooks’ explanation of the historical development of the EU, teachers discussed European integration as an opportunity for maintaining peace. These teachers, who represented both older and younger generations, viewed teaching about European citizenship and conveying a European identity as a crucial part of their citizenship education classes. In their interviews, the teachers positioned European citizenship as an alternative to the more complicated and difficult German citizenship. Teachers distanced themselves from teaching a German sense of belonging because it necessarily entails confrontation with the past, in particular the Holocaust. By emphasizing Europe, they felt that they avoided any hint of nationalism and, likewise,
contributed to the lasting peace process. One teacher reflects on teaching about European citizenship:

The school has to use this chance to teach the students something against the prejudices about the EU that are so common in the general public, which are sometimes so shocking. We have been given a gift that people never had: we have never experienced a war. Three times a day I thank God for this, but unfortunately even I forget it sometimes. It is an unimaginable gift, never to have suffered through a war. In comparison to our forefathers: every 20 years another one, with all of the catastrophes that man can bring on himself. No, I spend a lot of time on talking about Europe. Not just in the 9th grade, but I bring in connections when we talk about World War II or about other topics.

In the above example the teacher touches upon the idea that the European integration process is not always well accepted in Germany. This reflection was not uncommon, nor was discussion of the relationship between Germany and its neighbors. Several teachers talked about EU expansion and the problems with Poland and Polish workers in Germany. However, they did so in the context of stressing that European integration works towards preserving peace where there might otherwise not be peace. An example:

One can think about the expansion of the EU as one will, but that Poland is in NATO and the possibility of a war now is below zero, is worth everything. That a reconciliation between Germany and France after this most terrible of all wars it's worth so much that everything else takes a backseat. It does not matter if Germany contributes more to the agricultural budget as other countries. What does a war cost?

As in the first excerpt, this quote also demonstrates that teachers go beyond the required curricula and integration ideas of Europe into other aspects of their teaching. Many teachers gave examples of holding a Europe day either in class or as a school. Bringing in food from different European countries and learning music from that country was a very popular project. While this does have certain consequences for how citizenship is
viewed, which will be discussed below, the teachers also consistently offered these projects as a way of stressing how they included Europe beyond the curricular requirements. One teacher summarized: “Education that leads to valuing the EU and the idea of belonging to Europe is undeniably important. It is also important given the fact that when the pupils leave school, no one will give them a neutral view of Europe. We have to try to stretch how and why we bring it in to the everyday class.” Normatively these teachers are presenting the idea that the European citizen is a safer version of a German citizen. The German past makes being German dangerous, but teaching about Europe and engaging the concept of European citizenship offers the opportunity to invoke a positive, safer and still unique sense of belonging.

*Rejection of Europeanization as a part of the curriculum*

In contrast to the above position there was a minority of teachers who rejected European citizenship. In examining this rejection, though, it becomes clear that it is based, not on a normative claim about what citizenship education in Germany should be about or even more abstractly what citizenship in Germany should mean. Rather, the rejection of Europeanization as a legitimate part of the citizenship education practice is mostly pragmatic. Teachers do not see enough class time to adequately address Europeanization as a process, or as an important part of students’ self-identity. Particularly at the *Hauptschule* level, teachers characterized students as not being able to understand the concept of the EU or even European citizenship because it is too abstract. Teachers, such as in the excerpt below, explained that they were unwilling to spend class time on topics that the students would not understand. “They have no feeling for Europe and therefore I don’t need to say we are European because what are they going to do with
that. They can say that we live in Europe, they can handle that. But otherwise, teaching them life skills like how to make a doctor’s appointment is more important.” Here we see normatively that, according to these teacher, only certain kinds of Germans can become European citizens. It places the concept of belonging in Europe in a privileged and inaccessible position for the non-elite students of the *Hauptschule*. As will be discussed below, the fact that the teachers who take this perspective are serving in *Hauptschule*, the school form in which most non-German students are tracked. A few teachers recognized this and pointed this out as evidence for their perspective. “They have no relationship. My students are almost all foreigners and repatriates. They are not Bavarian, and of course they aren’t German either. And as European? They cannot even figure out what that is. I can teach and maybe they memorize it, but it is just regurgitated knowledge. The values and characteristics? No not my students.” This rejection of Europeanization on pedagogical grounds is consequently another means of deciding who can or cannot be European or who has access to a European dimension of citizenship education.

*Multicultural and Cosmopolitan Europe*

What is most significant about Europeanization as a theory backgrounding teacher reflections, however, is how it emerges as the premier means to talk about multiculturalism or cosmopolitanism. That is, the majority of the ideas which the teachers identify as multicultural or cosmopolitan are in reality bounded by a European perspective. In this sense, as in the textbook analysis, Europeanization is revealed as an extension of the ethnocultural theory. European replaces German as an ontological category to which non-Europeans cannot belong. Examples of multicultural and
cosmopolitan Europe are provided below. Then I turn to other ways in which multicultural and cosmopolitan theories are revealed in the teacher discussions.

When teachers were specifically asked about how they included multicultural themes in their social studies classes, they nearly universally, including in schools where there were a high number of non-German students, provided European examples. Typically they said, “The students have mostly all been to Italy and also Mallorca and the Canary Islands. These classic vacation spots are great examples. I ask them what they ate when they were in Italy. Were the houses the same? In my class I let them bring in pictures and postcards from their vacations. It makes diversity much more real for them.”

Many teachers also spoke of inviting speakers to class. They made use of international students at local universities (or through other personal contacts) in order to make the class more interactive. Several teachers explained that this was a means of going beyond the somewhat abstract treatment of other cultures available only in the textbooks. In every case where a teacher had invited guest speakers to class, they were from other European countries.

We had a Finnish man here and that was very exciting because of course in Finland they live so differently from us and the weather and so on. The students were very fond of him and they wrote reports on Finland and prepared questions for him. I think they were disappointed to hear that he eats food much like us, meat, potatoes, pizza etc. But this is very useful. The students can really make more sense of the idea of difference when they have someone so different in front of them.

There were a few teachers who also had the opportunity to ask Chinese students to visit their classes, but no teacher had invited a local person from the immigrant community to come and speak. In fact when asked about engaging, for example, the Turkish-German community or Russian-German community, in a similar activity, uniformly the teachers
believed this would not work. A characteristic response to this inquiry involved describing these communities as unreliable and often not able to speak in German. “Well the people I would be able to get to do this are not typical. They are very assimilated. Sure they could talk about the history a bit, but I can do that with the textbook anyway.” This ignoring of resident minorities, in favor of, for the most part, European visitors, is similar to the focus on the Europe Day as a means of celebrating diversity. Teachers discussed planning a celebration of Europe as a means of fulfilling diversity mandates from the state and the demands to teach about Europe. In fact in multiple schools the Europe Day was given specifically as an example of integration. Consider the following exchange as an example:

Teacher: We have often held a Europe party here at the school. Each class presented a different country, France, Spain, Italy etc. Each with food and drink etc. These are the types of integration efforts we can undertake.

Interviewer: so how do you deal with the Turkey question in such school settings? It is a big issue right now.

Teacher: well why would we include Turkey in a Europe party? Sometimes in the 9th grade we will talk about whether the EU should include Turkey.

Interviewer: Do your Polish students usually present about Poland?

Teacher: Well last time we did this, it was before the EU expansion so we did not include Poland. But I guess next year we will maybe have some of the eastern countries too since they are in the EU now.

Here the teacher talks about celebrating Europe as a means of integrating, but when asked about how the two major groups of non-Germans present in the school fit into this scheme, integration in reality does not seem to be a goal. Europe, as in the textbooks, is
more narrowly defined to be Western, and even the Eastern expansion is viewed with skepticism.

When asked about their pedagogical practices related to teaching about diversity or including multicultural elements in their citizenship education goals, teachers also provided European examples, in part based on the teachers’ own experiences with diversity. “I have English friends, with whom I vacation often. I have learned a lot from them and get books and newspapers from them. I use them to bring the children closer to the topic. Especially regarding prejudices for example against the English food, I try to make it relevant for them.” Interestingly, teachers also use the EU as a reason why diversity education is important. Teachers explained that it is very important to talk about other cultures and not to be prejudiced because with membership in the European Union, students will continue to be confronted with people from different countries. “Today we are not just raising German citizens, but European ones. We cannot let racism develop because with the EU and everything, students will come into contact with other cultures automatically. I want them to have a positive picture of this diversity.” While the teachers do connect diversity education with citizenship education directly, the means of defining diversity remains European. Indeed in these discussions, the diversity present in the teachers’ classrooms, usually Turkish-Germans and Russian-Germans, is not referenced. As in the textbooks we see Europeanization emerging as an extension of the ethnocultural philosophy—in both cases, non-German voices and experiences are absent or ignored.

In addition to bounding notions of diversity, teachers also discuss creating cosmopolitan citizens in a manner which is limiting to the concept. Consistently the
teachers talk about cosmopolitan citizens, or Weltbürger, as being the most desired or best outcome of citizenship education. Yet when they explained what they meant by world citizens, like with the concept of diversity, a European limit is revealed.

I don’t think that a world citizen feeling will enter into the students’ consciousness, without them coming into contact with it. That we show them: earlier we had to sit in traffic in Italy because there was a border there. Then you had to show your passport. Now you just drive over. It is just normal. It must be drilled into their consciousness you that it was different before and now it is much easier and nicer. That I take out my wallet and with the same money that we have here am able to pay.

Consistently the idea of the Weltbürger is used as a means to describe the European citizen. Together with the use of a definition of diversity bounded by European geography, we see the enactment of multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism as limited. Normatively, the European citizen is forwarded by the teachers as the appropriately diverse citizen. We understand that European diversity is acceptable and even positive diversity, but the silencing of other diverse voices makes both true multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism suspect. When considered in relation to the textbook analysis, we see a reproduction of the state imperatives in the teachers’ reflections. The European neighbor can be viewed as a potential family member, but the non-European residents remain strangers.

**Multiculturalism**

While multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism appear to be bounded for the most part by an ethnocultural view of Europe, the teachers do also reflect on the role of multiculturalism in other ways. Multiculturalism as a part of citizenship education is presented as something necessary because of the real diversity in German society, but
usually in tandem, it is considered ineffectual. On the other hand, a counter to this view emerges in which teachers discuss how they would like to incorporate more diversity education in their social studies classrooms but, because of practical and often state imposed constraints, cannot. Here we see the only substantial pattern of resistance to the dominant state perspective, although it does not result in pedagogical action. Rather it remains hypothetical. Figure twenty-five shows interrelated codes which reveal multiculturalism in ways outside of the European boundaries enacted in most of the teachers’ reflections.

**Figure twenty-five: Multiculturalism**
The Diversity Problem

Much in the same way that teachers reinforced an ethnocultural notion of citizenship by identifying diversity as a problem for schools with foreigners, teachers at schools with high non-German enrollment connect diversity to citizenship education because they view it as necessary. In particular, teachers at schools which had a large number of repatriates, (meaning their schools had become more diverse in the last ten years) talked about having to think about multicultural citizenship education and education for integration because they had no choice. Pedagogically, though, this present diversity allows them to engage the students in discussions of mandated topics such as Islam or migration. In contrast to the teachers who view multiculturalism as something only for dealing with the foreigner problem, these teachers see real value in integrating their students’ experiences into the classroom.

Uprooted and newly replanted. Many of our students come from Eastern Europe, they came with their parents and they can really share their experiences. And they explain: how is it when one has to move? How does one feel? What kinds of problems does one have. What is it that makes setting down new roots difficult. Especially the Ausseidler children, many say very clearly: I would have rather stayed there or have just fallen over and died it was so hard. Then the others finally ask: why?

This emphasis on using students in the classroom was the most common way teachers talked about engaging in discussions of diversity. They also directly linked these activities to the state curricula. “It is nice when we have a good Turkish student in the classroom or something, then I can have them talk about their experiences when we do the Islam section in the textbook.” Yet even here in an explicit example of providing opportunity for diverse experiences, there is still a normative claim about when those
experiences are appropriate. Turkish students should share their experiences but only on the appointed day. We see, as in the textbooks, that recognition of diversity remains confined to Banks’ notion of “Holidays and Heros” (2001), or in this case, when it is time to discuss the Islam chapter.

_Tolerance and Transformation_

Three teachers, however, did reflect on the inclusion of diversity as a part of preparing future citizens, German or non-German.

It is very important for us, because we have students from many nationalities. One must know something about the other, especially customs and maybe also about religion. One must know in order to not be afraid of difference and in order to be able to deal with it. In the 9th grade we have Islam as a theme. I have my Turkish students do reports. It is better when the victim (Betroffener) tells their own story. They read from the Koran. I think it affected the students. For the first time they really come into contact with Islam. I think that through such activities people lose their fear of the other most quickly. They think: ‘I have seen that before, I know that is a nice fellow student, so this Islam thing cannot be so bad.’

Their talk embodies education as transformative, a notion which is essentially absent in all other reflections. Tolerance of difference and the idea that multicultural education is important for German and non-German children is foregrounded in these few teachers’ reflections.

There is the state on the one side and reality on the other side. Islam in the curriculum in sixth and ninth grade. I think it is very important that German children have some exposure to it, it is a foreign world. There are a lot of misunderstandings and false understandings can be traced back to ignorance. For me it is important, also to go beyond the textbooks and do more than the curriculum dictates. I am very interested in history and for me that is the key aspect of social studies. I try to make the students see
Judaism as the root of Christianity and Western thought. And they don’t know anything at all, let alone about the relation Islam has to all this. But it is only through knowledge that there is any chance for tolerance.

That it is important to recognize diverse voices and, furthermore, to let the victimized or marked as different speak, contributes to the transformative aspect of these teachers’ reflections. However, pedagogically, they still relegate inclusion of diverse experiences to the chapters set out in the textbooks or via the social studies curriculum. These teachers did directly connect citizenship education with diversity education, citing tolerance and ability to work with diverse people as normal and a routine part of their work in preparing future citizens. While there is more reflection about how German students can be influenced by hearing diverse voices, normatively the voice of the other is still depicted as acceptable or appropriate only on a designated day.

*Community Involvement*

When asked to discuss the most successful experience they have had teaching about tolerance and multiculturalism, however, these three teachers all described projects in which the whole community became involved. In each case they discussed projects, such as building a traditional outdoor oven for baking bread, or opening a youth center, which were external to the curricula and textbooks. Below a teacher explains a community-based project which he believes is the school’s only example of integrated learning.

Everybody was involved, the school psychologists, the director of the guidance center, the representative of the mayors office for foreigner affairs. We really wanted to tackle this problem of violence and help parents figure out how to deal with their own children. It was called Action Plan for “Border town”—Children
want rules and boundaries” We realized you have to educate the parents first. And then we realized that this required integration. This was not just a problem in the Russian-German families, although it is more obvious there, it is a societal problem. We developed a whole action plan from the Kindergarten through the schools. The best result was the youth center. A place where the Russian-German kids can go, sometimes the German children too. No alcohol, no violence and they help run it too. It took the whole community though, not just the school.

It is important to stress that these community-based projects were described by the same three teachers who really focused on the importance of tolerance in educating all future citizens of Germany. In each case, regardless of the projects’ scope, there was an immense personal commitment to the project on the part of the teacher, and in each case the projects were borne out of what was seen as a crisis—in the above example the incidents of violence in the school particularly involving Russian-Germans. Yet the presence of such projects and the more reflective nature of the teachers’ talk about multiculturalism and citizenship does point to the fact that such understandings and programs could be fostered in all teachers.

Fundamentally, despite the presence of the more transformative talk, much of the discussions of diversity and examples of inclusion of multicultural voices were tied to fulfilling state requirements. And importantly these examples came only from teachers working at schools where there were a high number of non-German students. In short, the presence of non-Germans in the school was a pre-requisite for such discussion. In schools, whether because of school form or geographic location, where the percentage of non-Germans was less than three percent, a rejection of diversity as relevant emerges. Diversity then becomes recognized as important, at least in certain units, only when it is physically undeniable.
I don’t know the point of teaching it

For the most part, the recognition mentioned here preceded a lengthier discussion of why diversity education and integration have been ineffective within citizenship education. Here there are two important overall explanations for this failure. On the one hand, the immigrants are characterized as not being able to learn about Western values and, on the other hand, state structures are typified as constraining. The idea of non-German students’ not being able to really benefit from diversity education is, ironically, often linked to rudimentary understanding of immigrant groups’ cultures.

I try, of course, to bring about understanding. But then I have to wonder if there is even a point to it. I mean does it make sense that I learn about work ethic here at school, when Allah has already predetermined everything for me. And then really a German employer should not be surprised when his Turkish employee just let’s some things slide because he is just going to say: it is Kismet. I don’t know if anything I can do here is going to have an effect since this is how they think. But maybe it will help the Germans understand it.

Likewise it is with very few exceptions always examples of Islamic students who are used to support this perspective. Consistently also the home life in Islamic families is given as a reason why diversity and multiculturalism education are ineffective. Mainly relations between men and women, the position of women in Islamic society, and lower overall educational level of the parents are provided as reasons why the values needed to become a citizen in a multicultural society cannot be held by non-German students. In nearly every school, for example, the teachers talked about how the school offered German courses for Turkish women and very few people participated because ‘the Turkish men won’t let their women learn German.’
The intercultural and integration learning does not work the way I want it to because most of the Turkish families are not willing to be integrated. And if they are willing they are rejected by the others. The parents don’t speak German or just enough to get by. Everything else that has to do with education, the language knowledge is just not there. The class of foreigners who come to this school are just too comfortable. And they don’t let their children even speak German after they are 13 or 14. Then it is all about Turkish traditions and mostly they are even worse than if they were in Turkey itself.

Normatively the idea of a German citizen who should be tolerant and respectful of difference is forwarded, but it is connected to a subjective claim that non-German values make being this ideal citizen unattainable for foreigners. Being tolerant is something a good citizen should be, but a foreigner cannot be a good citizen.

Teachers, particularly those who felt more should be done to diversify the citizenship education practices, blamed structural constraints to really integrating multicultural activities into their classrooms. For the most part time, lack of resources and the expectation to cover too much material that “cannot really be thought of interculturally” are given as considerable barriers. Teachers often admitted to not really engaging in multiculturalism or ignoring it at times other than when ‘we have to talk about Islam’ or ‘deal with the globalization chapter.’ But they felt that if money for bringing in speakers or assistance from a social worker to develop projects was available, then more attention could be paid to multicultural themes. Most significantly though, teachers—again at schools with higher levels of non-German enrollment—pointed to a lack of training and support in German as a second language and intercultural education as extreme problems. Below one teacher describes how her school responds to students who don’t speak German as natives:
Here at this school there were always just teachers who would privately help students, giving them extra work to try to help them learn German. Unfortunately we don’t have anybody who studied German as a second language. It is just an extra university subject. Then one does not know if one is doing it right, maybe using the wrong method despite good intentions. And one must really say that in Bavaria we have really tried to conserve resources in the wrong area. That unfortunately really must be said about our Minister President Edmund Stoiber. He is always very in favor of education, but then cuts the funding in the wrong area. And many citizens, including parents, are very taken with him.

German as a foreign language education is not a required subject in teacher training and there are no dedicated language teachers available at schools. Many teachers, such as in the excerpt above, responded to this fundamental flaw which contributed to their not being able to do much to help immigrant students. They also cited this as a reason why citizenship education which seeks to include diverse experiences is unrealistic. Over and over again, the teachers explained that you cannot teach about being a part of German society if the students do not even have the most minimum of requirements to participate in it. Teachers mostly gave, as explained in the assimilation section, the immigrant children and their parents the blame. However as the discussion of state constraints reveals, the teachers are also is critical of the education system. The following excerpt was typical of the overall commentary about state shortcomings.

This is just the way the system works in Bavaria. One always waits for people who have sympathy and therefore become involved or offer help. Or that the parents know someone or have money to pay for after school help. Or, more likely, the teacher gets loaded up with work and it is said: so you are going to do this now. I am not trying to complain, there are also good things, and here in Bavaria we are well off, but we get by with what is already available.
Teachers expressed frustration with the whole system, citing its dependence on teachers to continually just make it work somehow. While this shows some dissatisfaction with state policies it does not constitute resistance to state policies or visions for citizenship education. Ultimately the prevailing philosophy underscoring teacher citizenship education practices is anti-multiculturalism. These values are more pertinent to my discussion here than the perceptions of state policies.

In relating how multiculturalism emerges in the teacher reflections to the textbook analysis, some interesting overlaps emerge. For the most part the idea of multiculturalism is viewed as critical only by teachers who are faced with a highly diverse classroom. Mirroring the state-level policies, the inclusion of non-German voices, when present, is only prevalent when the class is studying diversity chapters. In this sense multiculturalism is, as in the state level policy, dwarfed by the prevailing sense of ethnoculturalism. This latter point, as was discussed at length above, Europeanization provides the opportunity for teachers to address diversity without engaging with the messy issues of integration and diversity within Germany. This is very much in line with Luchtenberg’s (2004) findings and serves to allow the image of European to supplant the image of German as the ethnocultural boundary. In either case, though, multiculturalism cannot develop fully.

As discussed in the previous chapter, multiculturalism embodies the politics of mutual respect. The neighbor, stranger and family must all be treated equally. While there is some recognition of the importance of this idea abstractly, particularly when we consider the minority voice of teachers very concerned with tolerance the manner in
which multiculturalism is talked about by teachers, and their reasons for its failure to influence citizenship education, reveal a philosophy of disrespect.

_Cosmopolitanism_

As in my discussion of multiculturalism above, the most consistent way in which cosmopolitanism is brought up, is through European examples. The idea of the \textit{Weltbürger} is very often brought up, but explicated using European contexts. However, there are two other ways in which the idea of the \textit{Weltbürger} is discussed. We see citizenship being forwarded as a human endeavor. As in the textbook analysis, the citizen is concerned not only with his community, his state, his nation but with the global community. Emphasis, again similar to what is found in the analysis of the textbooks, is placed with students understanding the interconnectedness of the world and the effects of their individual actions. Likewise, Christianity and Christian morals are brought up as forming the backbone of why students need to be engaged with global activities. Figure twenty-six graphically displays the sub-frame relationships, which are explicated below.
Concern for the global environment

The teachers discuss the need for students to understand that decisions made in Germany affect people throughout the world. They expressed the need to make students, “at their most selfish age, understand the world around them and their role in it.” The emphasis on taking care of the environment and understanding economic interdependence are most often given as examples of what students need to know. The teachers in particular emphasize that one cannot teach the idea of tolerance or collaboration without stressing that Germany is not an island.

It is very important that these students understand how to protect their environment. In social studies this is a huge subject, environmental protection, in the sense of considering the environment, the whole globe as interconnected, for the future. What the Czechs put in a river in Prague has real consequences for
the people who live in Slovakia and the same can be said about what we do here. I try to encourage them to see first the landscape we have here as beautiful and then explain how it is part of a greater system, just as they are.

Teachers said that by focusing on projects about the environment, it was also an easier way to convey to students concepts of interconnections. One teacher explained that “sometimes the ideas of human rights are too abstract, they cannot really imagine that people don’t have them. But I can take them to see the forest dying off and I can show them that when we put chemicals in the fish tank, the fish die.” Teachers also viewed understanding of interconnectedness, as in the textbook analysis which revealed an emphasis on anti-violence education, as a means of preventing ethnocentrism.

In my classroom this is where a love for the world, from here to everywhere, starts. Through understanding oneself as part of something bigger, so I won’t develop such a Lederhosen-mentality. I recognize my part in the world not because I can sing some song from memory, but because I am connected to the place and that place is part of something greater.

Social action and engagement were also commonly cited means of connecting students to the outside world. Many teachers talked about encouraging students’ involvement in Church-sponsored service-learning projects or, in a few cases, school organized events, such as hosting an exchange student or sending supplies to schools in third world countries. The following was a typical type of reflection, which in this case concerns the long-standing ties between the Kosovo and their school, which had been a site for refugee children during the war.

As a school we were very good about keeping up the contacts and continuing to have projects. Three years after the refugee children first arrived, we moved into our new school building and we had a lot of left over desks and such. All of it was sent to a school in
Kosovo. That was the idea of the students and they helped organize it. It was a very concrete effect of understanding that people elsewhere do not live as well as we do and need our help.

Interestingly when we follow the teacher’s reflection about the Kosovo service project, we see the other major way in which cosmopolitan ideas are discussed; viewing one’s self as a citizen of the world and showing compassion for all humanity are important because they are fundamentally Christian values.

**Christian values**

As in the textbooks, the ideas of Christianity and cosmopolitanism are directly connected in the interviews. Fundamentally this connection has implications for who can be a world citizen. When we consider the example above, the teacher continues in his explanation of the project by detailing why the school should be involved in such projects.

[Students] have to have concrete examples to see what being a good person is and a good Christian too. The church has a lot to say on this and of course in religion class they learn about it abstractly. But I think in the school, and of course at home, but who knows if that happens, we have a responsibility to make this being good more concrete.

Structurally, as is implied in the above excerpt, the heavy emphasis on religion affects what the teachers consider global citizenship education. They reflected on time constraints, knowing, for example, that in religion class Aid to Africa and different world religions will be discussed, hence they spend more time on other aspects of the curriculum. Religion teachers are generally university-trained with a major or minor in religion and obtain an additional certification through either the Lutheran or Catholic churches. However, sometimes a minister or priest will also provide the education.
Teachers from several of the more rural schools explained that topics, like comparative religion, are important for students’ understanding of the outside world. Most commonly the teachers gave as examples of comparative religion teaching: understanding that Muslims don’t eat pork, and how Easter and Christmas are celebrated differently in different areas. Religion class can be an important place for this to happen because “we just don’t have that much time in social studies.”

We would expect that Cosmopolitanism, as a political theory underscoring citizenship education would result in teacher practices which seek to dismantle as the hegemony by simultaneously presuming differences among participants while observing their equal rights to access and respect in the discussion. Although there is recognition of cosmopolitanism being a goal of citizenship education and indeed many of the teachers describe educating their students to think of themselves as *Weltbürger*, cosmopolitanism is not embraced to the extent that it translates into teaching practice. Teachers engage with cosmopolitan ideals, but as in the textbook analysis the explicit connection to Christian values serves to reinforce, rather than dismantle, hegemonic concepts in Germany. Normatively, in this case, the good citizen does not value human life universally, but because valuing human life is a Christian moral. Non-Christians then are not included in this way of being a good citizen.

**TEACHER PERSPECTIVES ON CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND DIVERSITY IN BAVARIA**

When we consider how teachers talk about engaging cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism in their classrooms, in particular the enactment of European ideas to define both cosmopolitan and multicultural concepts, it becomes clear that, as in state-level policies, the underlying political philosophy of citizenship still conceives of the
citizen in ethnocultural terms. The political theory matrix, as an analytical tool, allows us to see that more exclusive citizenship theories are not replaced or even augmented by theories of citizenship which seek to be inclusive. Rather, there is overlap between the theories with assimilation and Europeanization drawing implicitly from the ethnocultural sense of citizenship and multiculturalism, and cosmopolitanism fundamentally being bound by acceptable diversity e.g. European diversity. The teachers invoke a normative image of the good citizen as having European and Christian values. Immigrant children who conform to this image are good foreigners and have great success in the education system. Likewise, those typical foreigners should receive as much education as possible in these values, but for the most part the teachers make clear that because of the family structure, school constraints and pervasive belief in other values, that their teaching will have little effect. School and citizenship education in the schools emerges as something for Germans, Europeans and others who can pass. In this school neither the non-German nor the German will be educated for global or multicultural citizenship.

When we consider these results in light of the textbook analysis it becomes clear that the system and lifeworld reinforce each other, with teachers interpreting state policies (both implicitly and explicitly) on citizenship education very similarly to each other and to the state. This finding has clear implications for educational reform. If, indeed, Germany as a nation seeks to move toward multiculturalism and integration then educational reform at both the state and local level must be undertaken in Bavaria. These implications, as well as a discussion of the methodological and theoretical implications, will be explored in the final chapter of this work.
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This final chapter examines the implications of this current research. I do so following Habermas’s (1987) suggestion that studies should seek to have empirical, theoretical and methodological implications. I will outline what the contributions of this work are in each of these areas and address what implications there may be for policy reform and future research.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Before turning to a substantial discussion of the empirical implications of this study, I will outline the theoretical and methodological contributions my dissertation makes. I am starting with these implications because the theoretical perspective and methodological design of this study serve to ground the findings. Further, I am presenting them together because, in my view, the research design, in particular the development of the political theory matrix as an analytical tool, is in response to theoretical argument (in chapter four) regarding education’s position as a mediating force between system and lifeworld.

Indeed, the argument I make extends Habermas’s (1987) conceptualization of system and lifeworld relations to consider the role education, citizenship education and teachers might play in those relations. I argue that it is important to recognize teachers as agents, who are both state representatives and important parts of the lifeworld. In this mediating role they have the power to reject, resist or reproduce state imperatives regarding citizenship education. This theoretical perspective itself has important methodological implications for the study of citizenship education. As I illustrate in chapter three, the vast majority of research on citizenship education focuses on learning
outcomes to the exclusion of serious inquiry into both the role of teachers and the influence of the state, national or supranational. Yet, as my discussion of teachers as mediators makes clear, it is equally important to conceive of research designs which examine state and teacher intentions.

The literature, even the most recent work, takes into account teacher influences, but rarely empirically explicates the relationship between teachers’ conceptions of citizenship education and states’ policies. Thus, the discussion in chapter four needs to be further extended in order to think about how these different levels can be analyzed methodologically. Chapter Five introduces Amy Gutmann’s (1987) idea of citizenship education being the application of political theory. Drawing on this I develop a political theory matrix as a means of uniting the content analysis of state-mandated textbooks and the qualitative analysis of teachers’ reflections on citizenship education. By exposing the backgrounded political theories at play in both of these levels, I am able to consider the interaction between system and lifeworld through education in an empirical manner. In this way, my theoretical discussion of teachers as mediators is connected to the methodological design of this study of citizenship education and diversity.

On this latter point, the employing of political theories as an analytical tool also has the empirical benefit of, as was the goal of this work, interrogating the degree to which Bavarian citizenship education policy and practice have responded to national and supranational pressure to move away from an ethnocultural conception of citizenship. In short, the theoretical and methodological contributions of this work lie in my argument for studying citizenship education policy as an interaction between system and lifeworld, brought about by the mediation of teachers between these two levels and in the
development of a methodological tool for undertaking the empirical study of this theoretical perspective. Future research should include a more developed theoretical argument about teachers’ role in system and lifeworld relations. In particular it would be important to include work of other contemporary critical theorists such as Anthony Giddens (1990) in explicating this role and the consequences of it.

Methodologically, the application of political theories in the study of citizenship education policy and practice should be expanded first, to other German federal states and second to other national settings. On this point I would argue that the political theory matrix has the potential, with further development, to help scholars connect qualitative studies of citizenship education across borders. These cross-comparative studies have, for the most part, been left to large-scale quantitative studies (cf. Torney-Purta et.al, 2001), which while useful, do not provide nuanced results of state and teacher intentions. As Sutton and Levinson (2001) and Stevick and Levinson (2007) argue, socio-cultural studies of education policy, particularly citizenship education, are critical for a holistic understanding of policy processes and practices. I contribute to this field with a theoretically-grounded methodological tool for policy analysis.

**Empirical Contributions**

In examining citizenship education policy and practice in Bavaria, I conclude that both the state and teachers still primarily adhere to ethnoculturalism as a means of defining citizenship. Supranational and national revisions to citizenship and pressures to conceive of belonging in Germany in more multicultural terms are interpreted by the state and by the teachers in narrower terms. Indeed, it is paradoxical that the growth of political discourse and action relating to multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism at the
national and supranational levels, as evidenced by new immigration laws in Germany, EU’s emphasis on European citizenship and pressure to have equal rights for immigrants established in Germany, all have been translated into educational policy and practice in a manner which allows for multicultural and cosmopolitan ideas still to support an exclusionary sense of citizenship. Below I will summarize the key findings from each of the analyses before moving to policy implications and future research.

*System-level Analysis of Textbooks*

The textbook analysis, which included books from 1988-2006, shows some movement away from a strictly exclusive notion of citizenship. The most narrowly defined sense of citizenship is predominant in the early time period (1988-1994); the more inclusive concepts which encompass diversity appear more consistently after the 1998 election of Gerhard Schröder when ethnoculturalism began to be questioned on a national scale. Yet, the weak presentation of cosmopolitanism, coupled with the fragmented conceptualization of multiculturalism as revealed in the textbook analysis, is indicative of an underlying political philosophy that continues to conceive of the citizen in ethnocultural terms. The relegation and isolation of multiculturalism to the “foreigner” chapter, while better developed in the later published textbooks, still forwards an image of the good foreigner being the most German possible. Rejection of the homeland and home culture, particularly when it comes to the portrayal of Muslim women, are presented as the condition for belonging. The political theory matrix, as an analytical tool, allows us to see that more exclusive citizenship theories are not replaced or even augmented by theories of citizenship which seek to be inclusive. Rather, there is overlap between the theories with assimilation and Europeanization drawing implicitly from the
ethnocultural sense of citizenship, and multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism failing to fundamentally address issues of internal diversity.

Lifeworld analysis of Teacher interviews

When we consider how teachers talk about engaging cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism in their classrooms, in particular the enactment of European ideas to define both cosmopolitan and multicultural concepts, it becomes clear that, as in state-level policies, the underlying political philosophy of citizenship still conceives of the citizen in ethnocultural terms. As in the textbook study assimilation and Europeanization draw implicitly from the teachers’ ethnocultural sense of citizenship. A good foreigner is a foreigner who can pass, and certain kinds of foreigners, particularly Muslims, are not viewed as able to become German. Diversity and multicultural education are seen as necessary only at schools where there are foreigners. This again privileges the German way of being. As in the state-level analysis, multiculturalism, and cosmopolitanism are bound by a sense of what kind of diversity is acceptable e.g. European diversity.

The teachers invoke a normative image of the good citizen as having European and Christian values. According to the teachers, immigrant children who conform to this image are good foreigners and have great success in the education system. Likewise, those typical foreigners should receive as much education as possible in these values, but for the most part the teachers make clear that because of the foreigners’ family structure, school constraints and pervasive belief in other values, that their teaching will not change the foreigners’ attitudes. Citizenship education is not represented by the teachers as a critical aspect in integration, for the most part, because in enacting an ethnocultural sense of citizenship, the teachers
are implying that one cannot become German regardless of being educated in Germany. School and citizenship education in the schools emerges as something for Germans, for Europeans and for others who can pass. In this school neither the non-German nor the German will be educated for global or multicultural citizenship.

**System-level imperatives, lifeworld interpretations**

Through the backgrounded political theories revealed through these two empirical analyses, it is possible to compare the system and lifeworld levels. Given that the Bavarian state views textbooks as an extension of their citizenship education policy and as a means of controlling teacher’s pedagogical content choices, it is particularly important to be able to connect the system and lifeworld data in this study. To summarize, it becomes clear that for the most part teachers reproduce state imperatives. While there are outlying examples of transformative pedagogy and some discussions of state constraints, teachers talk about citizenship in ways very similar to the manner in which the textbooks present it. Indeed, the teachers often reproduce the same ways of narrowing notions of citizenship. For example, in the textbooks, good foreigners are portrayed as those who reject their homeland; in the teachers’ reflections on their own non-German students, good foreigners assimilate and can pass for German either racially or through language and values, but other foreigners cannot.

As I discussed in Chapter Seven, the use of meaning fields and reconstructive horizon analysis on the teachers’ reflections, allowed me to probe more deeply the political theories which had emerged in the textbook analysis. Thus, it is not surprising that a more complex picture of these theories is evident in the interview study when compared with the textbook results. The ideas of temporality and shame, for example, as
means of defining Germanness appear only in the teachers’ reflections. However, the overall idea of being German as an ontological category, which in part is underscored by the teachers’ discussions of temporality and shame, is present also in the textbook analysis. To wit, I conclude that the analyses produce very similar results and that teachers are, with few exceptions, reproducing state perspectives on citizenship. This perspective forwards an ideal citizen as white, German-speaking and Christian.

In both the textbook and interview analysis, though, there is an underlying assumption that German values and ways of being are unique and superior to others’ values. Multicultural and cosmopolitan notions are largely blocked by such assumptions. Further, the view that morals must be Christian-based to be valid is similar in both the textbooks and in the teacher reflections. Christianity serves as one reason for teaching about cosmopolitan acts, and religious education is often brought up by the teachers as a way of teaching morals and values necessary for children to become good citizens. In the textbook analysis, I argue that Christianity is explicitly connected to a concern for human rights and with being German.

The individual examples of going beyond the state guidelines or developing projects to foster multicultural understanding remain singular. There were instances of teachers and schools investing time, resources and energy in the project of citizenship education for a multicultural Germany, but fundamentally the teachers’ reflections reproduce state imperatives. The system and lifeworld reinforce each other, with teachers interpreting state policies (both implicitly and explicitly) on citizenship education very similarly to each other and to the state. This finding has clear implications for education reform. If, indeed, Germany as a nation seeks to move toward multiculturalism and
integration, then education reform at both the state and local level must be undertaken in Bavaria. My recommendations for education reform and future research are below.

**EDUCATION FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IN GERMANY**

I argue throughout this dissertation that Bavaria is not successful in conceiving of citizenship education as a multicultural or cosmopolitan endeavor. The image of the ideal citizen remains white, Christian and German both at the state curricula level and the teacher levels. Multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism, which are stated goals of the EU, German and Bavarian governments, need to become educational as well as political goals. To this end educational policy needs to recognize valuing diversity as a core principle of citizenship education, for all students in German schools, regardless of how many non-Germans are enrolled in any given school. Several specific reforms would aid in this overall goal:

*Structural reforms*

1. State curricula and textbooks need to be revised whole-heartedly with the intention of creating a citizenship education that values diversity. This would mean an integration of the major minority groups’ histories throughout the curriculum and an inclusion of non-Germans in depictions of everyday German life. Currently the curriculum and textbook approval processes are carried out by civil servants, both teachers and ministry of education officials, in consultation with private publishing companies. The fact that non-Germans have been systematically denied citizenship over the past fifty years means there are very few non-Germans in the civil service. A more democratic textbook selection
process, which included representatives from minority groups, would be beneficial.

2. The tripartite system (meaning the division of students according to ability into three distinct school forms) needs to be reconsidered. It is clear that non-German children are disadvantaged by it (cf. Aurenheimer, 2006), but beyond this, as my study points out, multicultural education is viewed as something necessary only in schools where there are foreigners. The tripartite system serves to artificially segregate students of different ethnic and class backgrounds. Citizenship education cognizant of diversity does thrive on that very diversity. Realistically, it is unlikely that the current system will be abandoned. Reform efforts aimed at moving towards a comprehensive school structure have been more or less unsuccessful since their inception in the 1960s. In Bavaria, in particular, where there are only two comprehensive schools in the whole state, it is likely that reforms will need to be aimed at change from within the current structure. However, such reforms are possible. Students, for example, could attend the same school until 7th grade, rather than 4th grade. There could be common subjects such as physical education or music or common service-learning projects in which all students regardless of school form took part.

Teacher education reforms

1. In-service professional development must be made available and required for both teachers and principals.

2. Teacher training needs to change to include at least one required course in diversity. Outreach efforts to encourage members of minority groups to enter
teaching should be developed. Given that a recent court case in Baden-Württemberg denied a Muslim woman the right to wear a headscarf while teaching, while another case in Bavaria affirmed this right, a federal framework for recruitment and retention of minority teachers may be necessary.

3. Schools with high non-native German speaker enrollment need to have teachers trained in German as a Foreign Language on staff.

In short, there must be a concerted effort to reform system structures which are contributing to the perseverance of ethnocultural citizenship education. Indeed the reproduction of state imperatives in the teachers’ reflections underscores the need for system-level changes. School structures and processes need to be reconsidered, as does teacher education, in order for citizenship education to successfully prepare future citizens for diverse German and European polities.

**Future Research**

Since this study focuses on one conservative state in Germany, future research must include conducting a similar study in other federal states. In particular I would be interested in studying Hessen, Hamburg and Berlin because they are all states which are highly diverse and have a tradition, much in opposition to Bavaria, of liberalism. Conducting such a study would allow me to speak more authoritatively on citizenship education in Germany as it would show a spectrum of political cultures. However, returning to the critical inquiry perspective taken in this project, I would also like to return to Bavaria and work with the teachers in this study more closely. During the member-checking process it was telling that very few teachers seemed to reflect on their
words in any substantial way. I do believe, however, that an action research project could play an important consciousness-raising role as Korth (2002) suggests.

Methodologically, the use of political theories as a means of explicating citizenship education intentions at different levels of the policymaking process should be applied in a variety of settings. I argue that it allows different analyses such as at system and lifeworld levels to be compared; this argument could be extended to the comparison of different national education systems. I would, in particular, like to conduct similar studies in other contexts where immigration has changed the demographic make-up of the area. This could contribute to a comparative understanding of citizenship education which qualitatively probes state and teacher intentions. Currently the focus in comparative citizenship education is primarily quantitative and outcomes focused. In the end, globalization has made more common stories like those of my former students Tatijana and Syed who were introduced at the beginning of this dissertation. In communities throughout the world, immigrants are seeking a means of becoming part of the polity. Education has a critical role to play in this process, but it must be constructed in a manner which recognizes students such as Tatijana and Syed as contributors. Ethnocultural nations are, as Anderson (1991) argues, created through the imagination of those members of the ethnic culture with power. These imaginations need to expand beyond ethnoculturalism and towards a cosmopolitan conception of belonging. I hope my future research will continue to contribute to this effort.
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APPENDIX A

TEXTBOOK SERIES USED IN DISSERTATION (GRADES 5-10 FOR THE HAUPTSCHULE AND GRADE 10 FOR THE REALSCHULE)


Interview Participants used in this Dissertation

Percentage of non-Germans in school refers to high-level (more than 30%), medium (10-30%) or low (under 10%). In the Hauptschule, much like in our elementary school, teachers are lead classes and therefore teach all subjects. Therefore I have noted what grade-level they teach. In the Realschule, teachers teach specific subjects to all grade-levels, therefore I have noted their subject areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School Form</th>
<th>Subjects Taught/Grade level</th>
<th>Years in Service</th>
<th>Percentage of non-Germans in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>History, German and Social Studies (H, G, SS)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>H, G, SS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>Religion, History, Social Studies (R, H, SS)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>R, H, SS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>R, H, SS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>R, H, SS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>R, H, SS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>R, H, SS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>R, H, SS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>R, H, SS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>R, H, SS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td>Religion, German, Social Studies (R, G, SS)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Realschule</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>R, G, SS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>R, G, SS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>R, G, SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hauptschule 5 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hauptschule 5 17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hauptschule 5 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hauptschule 5 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hauptschule 6 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hauptschule 6 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hauptschule 6 12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hauptschule 6 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hauptschule 6 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hauptschule 6 33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hauptschule 7 18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Hauptschule 7 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Hauptschule 7 22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hauptschule 7 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hauptschule 8 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hauptschule 8 33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Hauptschule 9 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hauptschule 9 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hauptschule 9 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Hauptschule 9 23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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