

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Anna Shapiro

2012

Education Civique: A Case Study of Third Year Collège Classes in Paris, France

By

Anna Shapiro

Dr. Carole Hahn

Advisor

Division of Educational Studies

Dr. Carole Hahn

Advisor

Dr. Vanessa Siddle-Walker

Committee Member

Dr. Lilia Coropceanu

Committee Member

2012

Education Civique: A Case Study of Third Year Collège Classes in Paris, France

By

Anna Shapiro

Dr. Carole Hahn

Advisor

Division of Educational Studies

An abstract of a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honor

Division of Educational Studies

2012

Abstract

Education Civique: A Case Study of Third Year Collège Classes in Paris, France

By Anna Shapiro

This case study provides insight into how civic education, both as a separate discipline and as a component of history education, is practiced and experienced by teachers and students in three culturally diverse French middle schools. As a historically valued discipline within the national education system, civic education is an important tool for political socialization and immigrant integration. This study uses three data sources -- interviews of three teachers, observation of 10 hours of class in third year history, civic education, and geography lessons, and an analysis of the three textbooks used in the school sites-- to explore how civic education is affected by student diversity in France. The findings show that although civic education continues to be highly valued as a discipline in diverse classrooms, teachers and students are challenged by the complexity and limitations on time posed by the curriculum. Furthermore, teachers report tensions between the curriculum and the cultural or religious knowledge that some immigrant children learn in their homes and communities. The findings from this study highlight the growing necessity of revising the civic education curriculum to act as a more effective tool for political socialization, and to improve the experiences that minority students and their teachers may have when learning the prescribed curriculum.

Education Civique: A Case Study of Third Year Collège Classes in Paris, France

By

Anna Shapiro

Dr. Carole Hahn

Advisor

Division of Educational Studies

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences

of Emory University in partial fulfillment

of the requirements of the degree of

Bachelor of Arts with Honor

Division of Educational Studies

2012

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Carole Hahn, for her guidance and support throughout this process and my committee members, Dr. Vanessa Siddle Walker and Dr. Lilia Coropceanu for their support.

I would also like to thank the three teachers in Paris who welcomed me into their classrooms and donated their limited time to my project. I would also like to thank Monique Benesvy and Virginia Guiradon who served as my mentors and contacted the school sites for me during my stay in Paris.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem.....	1
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature.....	6
History of Civic Education.....	8
Goals of Civic Education.....	13
History and Civic Education.....	15
Background of Immigration in France.....	17
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	22
Recruitment.....	22
School Sites.....	23
Classroom Observation.....	23
Teacher Interviews.....	24
Textbooks.....	25
Limitations.....	26
Chapter 4: Findings.....	28
How Teachers Experience and Practice Civic Education.....	30
How Students Experience Civic Education.....	46
How Teachers Experience Civic Education in Multicultural Classrooms.....	50
History, Geography, and Civic Education as Co-Disciplines.....	58
Emergent Themes.....	62
Summary.....	64
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	67
Implications.....	71
Conclusion.....	72
References.....	73
Appendix A: Values, Principles and Symbols in Civic Education.....	76
Appendix B: Observation Guide.....	78
Appendix C: Interview Guides.....	80
Interview Guide (English Version).....	80
Interview Guide (French Version).....	81
Appendix D: Sample Code Sheets	
Sample Interview and Observation Codes.....	83
Sample Textbook Codes.....	85

List of Tables

Table 1: Role of Education System.....	34
Table 2: Incorporation of Civic Education Goals.....	43
Table 3: Distribution of Entries by Concept Themes.....	46
Table 4: Themes of Diversity.....	58
Table 5: Distribution of Entries by Subject Matter.....	60
Table 6: Distribution of Entries by Method.....	61
Table 7: Distribution of Values by Method.....	62

Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem

Civic education is the educational preparation of students to carry out their role as a citizen in their country. Civic education is an important component of political socialization, and is either explicitly or implicitly included in the school systems of most democratic nations. Although civic education can be a separate discipline, or incorporated into related disciplines, the primary purpose of this form of education is to teach students the values, principles, institutions, rights, and responsibilities guaranteed to every citizen of a country and to instruct students how to use this knowledge to participate in democracy as citizens. Civic education also occurs informally through a multitude of avenues, including social groups and religious associations. Ideally, civic education provides students with a common foundation of nationalism and a shared knowledge of citizenship.

However, in diverse democracies that welcome large immigrant populations, civic education is complicated by differences in citizenship status and cultural and ethnic background among students. On the other hand, diversity in democracy is not necessarily an impediment to the goal of creating unity among citizens. According to Banks et al., (2001),

An important goal of the schools should be to forge a common nation and destiny from the tremendous ethnic, cultural, and language diversity. To forge a common destiny, educators must respect and build upon the cultural strengths and characteristics that students from diverse groups bring to school (p.5).

Although Banks' research is on the United States, the goal creating unity within diversity through civic education is also an important component of the national education program of

France. An increasingly diverse democracy, France places a significant emphasis on the importance of civic education for assimilating immigrant youth into mainstream French society.

The French National Ministry of Education, which regulates public and private education in France and the French territories, publishes the curriculum goals for primary and secondary education. These educational goals are divided into seven foundations for knowledge and capabilities that were introduced by the Law of Orientation passed in 2005. These seven categories are the master of the French language, practice in a foreign language, principles of mathematics and scientific and technological culture, humanist culture, social and civic competences, and autonomy and initiative. Together, these seven competences “constitute the ensemble of knowledge, abilities, values and attitudes necessary to achieve in your academics, your individual life, and your life as a citizen”¹ (Assemblée Nationale, 2005). Therefore, preparation for citizenship is at the foundation of the curriculum of collège, and considered an implicit goal of all disciplines.

Nevertheless, the history, geography, civics curriculum, most recently revised in 2008, is specifically designed for students to be able to understand humanist culture and develop social and civic competences in order to be informed and capable citizens of the French Republic (Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale, 2012). The curriculum for the third year in history, geography, and civic education focuses on French history from 1914 to the present, the organization of the modern world, and the modern political history. The three subjects work as a unit to achieve the ultimate goal of the program, which is to,

¹ Constitue l'ensemble des connaissances, compétences, valeurs et attitudes nécessaires pour réussir sa scolarité, sa vie d'individu et de futur citoyen.

Put into light the values and principles that found the Republic, and to show how these values and principles are realized in an ensemble of institutions and concrete procedures, how the Republic leads to a groups of rights and obligations for each citizen” (Ministre de l’éducation nationale, 2008).²

Although civic education is a prominent component of the curriculum in collège, only a small portion of the program is dedicated to addressing the diversity of ethnicities, religious identities, races, and nationalities among students in the public school system. This lack of emphasis on diversity is evident in the distribution of topics included in the civic education program for middle school. Of the roughly 200 topics included in the prescribed curriculum between the 6th and 3rd years of school (middle school), only 20 are related to the influence of diversity on French national culture. These topics related to diversity include how residents can attain citizenship, the importance of equality in front of the law, and a brief history of immigration to France. Furthermore, the majority of these 20 topics are covered during the fifth year (Ministre de l’éducation nationale, 2009).

The uneven distribution of topics can be attributed to the stated goal of the civic education curriculum to promote a uniform French identity within the student body (Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale, 2009). Rather than emphasizing the role that diverse social and religious communities play in the functioning of the French republic, the history, geography, civic education curriculum seeks to minimize that role. French citizenship is seen as a “contractual citizenship,” (Thénard-Duviver, 2008, p.27) that recognizes the national community of French citizens as the only legitimate community. French students are taught to understand and

² Mettre en lumière les valeurs et les principes qui fondent [la République] et de montrer comment ces valeurs et ces principes se réalisent dans un ensemble d’institutions et de procédures concrètes, comment la République entraîne un ensemble de droits et de devoirs pour chaque citoyen.

internalize the values and principles of the community that will allow them to be informed citizens as individual parts of the national whole. Unfortunately for some students, in particular those who identify with Islam, the emphasis on the individual does not correspond with the values they are taught in non-school settings.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine whether the French approach to civic education through the history-geography-civics curriculum is effective with students of non-French parentage. Can a civic education program that emphasizes national values and principles as the core of individual identity be applied to students who identify with community-based groups? The study seeks to address the following four research questions;

1. How are civic education guidelines from the National Ministry of Education experienced and practiced by teachers and students?
2. How do students of immigrant background experience and practice civic education differently from students of French background?
3. How do teachers experience and practice civic education guidelines in multicultural classrooms?
4. How successfully do the history and geography lessons transmit civic education principles, and in what ways do students and teachers experience the civic education principles differently when they are taught through history or geography?

The findings of this study could lead to a greater understanding of how education acts as a tool for political socialization in France. France has a long history of emphasizing the importance of civic education as a tool for democratization, and has incorporated civic education

into the national curriculum since 1881. As the population of France continues to diversify, the civic education curriculum may need to be revised to incorporate the value systems and principles of student's outside community relationships. Furthermore, as countries across Europe face continuing diversification of their population, this study could provide information about how successful France's integration approach to civic education has been at resolving tensions between minority groups and French society.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Although citizenship education in diverse democracies is a highly researched topic in other countries, I was unable to find empirical studies that examine the intersection between multiculturalism and citizenship education in France. Therefore, the following review of literature examines the role of civic education in France, the historical development of civic education and history education since the French Revolution of 1792, and the influence of immigration on education in France in the past 50 years.

Citizenship is a term used by almost every form of government to denote the role that community members play in the both government and society. In democratic societies like France, citizenship implies both rights and obligations. These rights, such as freedom of speech and protection of private property, are guaranteed to citizens of the country, but are contingent on each citizen performing his or her duties to the state, such as paying taxes or voting. Unlike nationality, citizenship requires a free and voluntary choice to assume these rights and obligations in order to participate as an individual in the collective project of building and maintaining a democratic society (Giolitto, 1993, p. 44).

Roche (2002, p. 18) defines the three dimensions of citizenship as, being a citizen of the national community, being a member of the political community, and being an informed member of society. A member of the national community is someone who shares a common culture with other members of the community. Schools act as a principle agent for teaching this common culture, particularly through disciplines like history, geography, literature, and French. A member of the political community should have the ability to articulate his or her opinions on the political scene, understand his rights, and understand how the institutions of government operate.

Finally, as a member of society, the citizen should be able to give a point of view and form a sound judgment on an issue (Roche, 2002, p. 19-20).

In general, the French conception of citizenship is closely aligned with the American conception of citizenship, both of which are founded on democratic principles. “Furthermore, like elsewhere in the world, one promotes the approaches to citizenship that base citizenship on the abilities of thought in a democracy that form the basis for peaceful resolution of conflicts” (Thénard-Duviver, 2008, p. 29).³ Citizenship of French people is not limited, however, to national citizenship. As the European Union continues to centralize, the concept of citizenship in the European Union has been reformulated to incorporate an overarching European citizenship. Europe is presented as a geopolitical entity with a common heritage, thus citizenship in Europe entails that citizens be members of the supranational community, the political community, and European society (Garcia & Leduc, 2004, p. 268). Schools in France are now charged with teaching students how to adopt a European identity without losing their core French identity (Mougniotte & Vial, 1992, p. 102-103).

The school is an agent for teaching students the rights and obligations of citizenship in the French Republic, primarily through the disciplines of history, geography, civics, French, and literature. Civic education is the principal discipline for this purpose. Civic education in France is most commonly defined as the plan of instruction used to render citizens capable of being valuable to the sovereign body of their nation (Thénard-Duviver, 2008, p. 197). The purpose of civic education, according to Vial and Mougniotte is,

³ En outre, comme ailleurs dans le monde, on voit mettre en avant des approches de la citoyenneté qui la fondent sur des compétences dans une démocratie pensée comme mode pacifique de résolution des conflits

To assure at the same time the freedom of people and of communities and the respect for differences between each other that tend to accentuate themselves but also preserve, not to say deepen, the cohesion of the social group and the perception of that which, however it may be, in unit the members, that is to say certain values” (Mougnotte & Vial, 1992, p. 97).⁴

Simply put, civic education theoretically prepares the citizen to live harmoniously in a pluralistic and diverse community, and facilitates the creation of unity among groups.

History of Civic Education

The origins of civic education in France can be traced back to before the Revolution of 1789. Under the royal regime, civic education was a form of social education in which students were taught to be loyal citizens of the kingdom. The Catholic Church was charged with devotion and moral education, with no emphasis on the political dimension of man that later developed in moral education (Mougnotte, 1991, p. 15). The Enlightenment thinkers like Diderot, Voltaire, and Rousseau, however, began to reformulate the purpose of education as the means for promoting the progression of humanity. They also believed that education was destined to form a “true national mindset,” as society progressed.

The writings of Enlightenment philosophers directly influenced the French Revolutionaries, who began to call for widespread education reform. The Talleyrand project of 1791 emphasized the obligations of citizenship rather than the rights granted by citizenship, and promoted the idea that education should induce an emotional stimulation that will induce a

⁴ Assurer à la fois la liberté des personnes et des communautés et le respect des différences qui tendant à s’accroître entre elles mais aussi préserver, voire approfondir, la cohésion du groupe social et la perception de ce qui, quoi qu’il en soit, unit les membres, c’est-à-dire de certaines valeurs

conviction of duties (Mougnotte, 1991, p. 19). The Condorcet project of 1792 that followed was an educational reform program presented to the National Assembly that, among other ideas, promoted the idea of instruction of civic character in order for the education system to increase the number of men capable of performing their civic duties.

Neither the Talleyrand nor the Condorcet plans were put into effect. Rather, they were followed by a series of decrees, including the Decree of Romme, Bouquier Decree, and the Danou Law, all of which proposed instating civic education into the curriculum of primary schools. The Lakanal Decree of 1794 specifically enumerated elements of civic and moral education that closely resemble the program used today, including the use of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizen, the Constitution, Republican morals, the geography and history of free peoples, and the French language (Mougnotte, 1991, p. 21-22). The accumulation of these attempts to incorporate civic education into the curriculum of national schools is commonly seen as the birth of civic education as a modern discipline.

On the eve of 1789, the idea emerged of a civic education given to all under the responsibility of the state: the citizen was characterized as a sharer of rights; in one part those which are possessed as a man and which precede natural rights and universal morals; in the other part, those which are necessitated by legislation, or the Constitution” (Mougnotte & Vial, 1992, p. 21).⁵

The 200 years following the Revolution have seen numerous governments, including five Republics, two Empires a brief restoration of the monarchy, and a government under occupied Nazi France. Civic education has remained an integral component of universal education, despite

⁵ A la veille de 1789, l'idée émergeait donc d'une éducation civique donnée à tous sous la responsabilité de l'Etat: le citoyen se caractérise comme détenteur de droits: d'une part ceux qu'il possède en tant qu'homme et qui précèdent du droit naturel et de la morale universelle: d'autre part, ceux qu'il doit à la législation, voire à la Constitution, de celui-ci

changing definitions and purposes. Under the First Empire of Napoleon Bonaparte, civic education had a strong religious orientation and primary schools were expected to teach the values of Catholicism. The purpose of civic education was to “form citizens attached to their religion, to their prince, to their country, and to their family” (Mougniotte, 1991, p. 27).⁶

During the July Monarchy and Second Empire, civic education was reoriented toward moral and religious education. The Law on Primary Instruction, signed by King Louis-Philippe and Minister of Public Instruction Francois Guizot, had reaffirmed citizenship education into the curriculum, but was soon replaced by the Falloux Law of 1850. The Falloux law, which followed the Revolution of 1848 and the establishment of the Second Empire, replaced civic education with religious instruction (Journal National de la République, 1833). As civic education was reoriented towards religion, France fell significantly behind the other western world powers like Prussia, Switzerland and Austria-Hungary, in providing education for citizenship (Mougniotte & Vial, 1992, p. 27-28).

The Minister for Public Instruction under the Third Republic, Jules Ferry, reestablished civic education as a central goal of public instruction with his widespread education reforms in the late 1880s. Ferry is credited with establishing free primary education protected by law, and with instituting *laïcité* in the National education system, a principle that continues to be highly valued and fiercely defended today. *Laïcité*, most commonly translated as secularization, is in fact a concept that is singularly French, and has no English equivalent. Unlike secularization, which requires that state institutions not be affiliated with any particular religion, *laïcité* requires the exclusion of the Church from public institutions as a means for creating unity and integration

⁶ Former des citoyens attachés à leur religion, à leur prince, à leur patrie, et à leur famille

among Frenchmen with diverse religious beliefs (Loeffel, 2009). Laïcité is protected because it guarantees that the citizen of the state is independent from all religions (Déloye, 1994, p. 87).

The February 1880 law on the Conseil Supérieur de l'Instruction Publique et aux Conseils Académiques sparked a series of political debates that lasted 14 months on the legitimacy of a political regime based on the rationalization of individuals (Roche, 2002, p. 22). Religious authorities were concerned that laïcité would quickly transform into state supported Atheism, but the principle of laïcité as religious neutrality was adopted by the government. Laïcité completely removed religious moral education from public instruction and replaced it with civic education. The State, for the first time in French history, replaced the Church as the singular and privileged place to foster a national conscience (Mougniotte, 1991, p. 31). Education initiates the values of citizenship to the future citizens of the Republic, whereas secular moral education assists in overtaking the particular political and religious options (Mougniotte, 1991, pp. 59-60).⁷

At the turn of the century the ardent supporters of civic education continued to strengthen the association between civic education and moral education, stating that “to teach the child that which is required to be known to play his role as a citizen, that is to complete his moral education (Déloye, 1994, p. 28).⁸ However, critics began to argue that civic and moral education was too complicated for children in primary school. Simultaneously, the socialist movement, with the increasing prominence of workers unions, spoke out against civic education, claiming that the values taught by the state promoted economic order, obedience to the law, and

⁷ “[L’Education] initie aux valeurs de citoyenneté le future citoyen de la République, tandis que l’éducation moral laïque aide à dépasser les options politiques et religieuses particulières”

⁸ “Enseigner à l’enfant ce qu’il doit savoir pour jouer son rôle de citoyen, c’est compléter son éducation morale”

submission to capitalism (Mougniotte, 1991, p. 173). Nevertheless, the civic education program put in place by Ferry endured through World War I and the Great Depression.

When the Germans occupied France in 1941 during World War II, the non-occupied zone established the Vichy Republic, which was closely aligned with the German Nazi Party. Under Vichy France, “moral and civic instruction” was replaced with “civic education.” This incarnation of civic education emphasized the concept of the citizen contributing to national identity, removed emphasis on civic obligation, and replaced all concepts of tolerance with Christian references (Desquesnes, 2011, p. 29-30). After the defeat of Germany, French democracy was reestablished under the Fourth Republic. The experience of the Vichy Regime had effectively reaffirmed the Republic’s ambitions for civic education (Desquesnes, 2011, p. 31).

Civic education under the Fourth Republic emphasized moral practice, an initiation to political and economic life and a focus on civic values (Desquesnes, 2011, p. 32). Civic education was also expanded into secondary education, and by 1948 the national program for secondary school included a bi-monthly hour of civic education (Desquesnes, 2011, p. 33). In 1958, Charles de Gaulle was elected president of the Fifth Republic, and civic education was incorporated into the history and geography curriculum. By the 1980s and 1990s, however, civic education was gradually removed from the history and geography program and reestablished as a separate discipline. In 1985, civic education was instituted as a discipline in primary and middle schools. High school civic education was instituted in 1999.

The past 20 years have seen a reemergence of contemporary civic education as a priority of National Education. In 1998, civic education was divided into three components: content, objectives, and pedagogical obligation. The content emphasizes knowledge of Republican

values. The objective is to promote the adherence of students to these values. Finally, civic education is pedagogically obligated to transmit and demonstrate these values to the future citizens of the Republic. Today's civic education program follows the 2005 law for the orientation and the program for the future of the school, which outlines the general dispositions of education as including "In addition to the transmission of knowledge, the nation puts the first mission of school as sharing with students the values of the Republic."⁹ In addition, the law included, "a humanist culture and science that permits the free exercise of citizenship" as one of the six domaines of éducation (Loi d'orientation, 2005).¹⁰

Goals of Civic Education

The values and principles of the Republic are at the base of civic education, and are intended to guide every facet of civic education. Among these values are equality, liberty, fraternity, laïcité, participation, sovereignty, civility and justice. The civic education program emphasizes the importance of not only understanding, but also internalizing these values to guard against political order and promote individual discipline (Déloye, 1994, p. 91). In general, the six permanent fundamental values in civic education are volition, laïcité, solidarity, and the rights of man, responsibility, and respect but there are many other values that are included in these large groupings.

The six domains of knowledge are the formation of good habits, diverse aspects of justice, administrative organization, political organization, principle social and familial obligations, and international life. As one of the functions of the state, education allows the state to "conserve cultural patrimony" (Giolitto, 1993, p. 41). The goals of civic education in French

⁹ Outre la transmission des connaissances, la Nation fixe comme mission première à l'école de faire partager aux élèves les valeurs de la République

¹⁰ Une culture humaniste et scientifique permettant le libre exercice de la citoyenneté

schools that work towards conserving this cultural patrimony are numerous and incorporate moral, judicial, social, and civic components to achieve this objective.

The moral component of civic education is not as strongly emphasized as it once was, but it is still seen as implicit in civic education (Roche, 2002, p. 12). Instead of being associated with religious morals, civic education promotes social morals needed for a society to function (Mougniotte & Vial, 1992, p. 80). “In other words, the republican moral is a social moral founded on a recognition of mutual obligations that link one another together as citizens” (Déloye, 1994, p. 100).¹¹ Successfully teaching civic morals requires that the citizen internalize civic conventions in order to satisfy his or her personal conscience. Therefore, moral education continues to be a component of civic education because it helps achieve the goal of instilling social and political norms that give citizens self-control and allow them to bring his passions and emotions to government (Déloye, 1994, p. 89).

The judicial component of civic education incorporates the four fundamental principles of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizen, a fundamental document of the French Republic. These four principles require that laws be an expression of the desires of the citizen, that laws are equal for all, that laws regulate man’s actions to ensure equal rights, and that the penalties fixed by law are evidently necessary (Appendix A) (Roche, 2002, p. 225). Civic education strongly emphasizes knowledge of national institutions and law making to promote citizen participation in government, and the exercise of citizens rights should these rights be threatened (Giolitto, 1993, p. 42). A primary objective of civic education is, therefore, not only the formation of free and engaged citizens, but also the promotion of citizenship actions (Giolitto, 1993, p. 47).

¹¹ “Autrement dit, la morale républicaine est une morale sociale fondée sur la reconnaissance de devoirs mutuels liant les uns aux autres citoyens »

History and Civic Education

History, geography and civic education courses have been strongly linked since the Third Republic, during which teachers of all three disciplines began collaborating to achieve shared goals. In its inception, this collaboration was intended to form, “citizen patriots,” and instill a, “citizenship of obedience,” in all students (Fontanabana & Thémines, 2005, p. 20). This tradition continues today, with history and geography being seen as two disciplines that aid in the communication of civic values.

History and civic education are linked by the shared values transmitted both through social history and contemporary civic education. These two subjects work together to instill the principles of the Republic that developed over time and are practiced today. Furthermore, a citizen must know the country’s historical past in order to conceptualize social realities of both the past and the present. “It is indispensable that the citizen should have the knowledge that allows him to understand the precise historic situations that bring [civic education terms] their meanings, and at the same time, [the event’s] characteristics, consequences and implications” (Rey & Staszewski, 2002, p. 202).¹² Therefore, a principle objective of history education is to form the citizen to both democratic political life, and democratic social life.

In order to give valuable input into the direction of society, a citizen must know his or her country’s history and fundamental values. History and civic courses simultaneously foster a desire for collective action in students, and aid this collective action (Rey & Staszewski, 2002, p. 198). History lessons allow students to explore the evolution of society in France and the outside world, with the objective of learning the ways in which society has succeeded and failed in

¹² “Il est indispensable que le citoyen ait les connaissances qui lui permettent de saisir les situations historiques précises auxquelles renvoient de tels termes et, du même coup, leur caractéristiques, conséquences, et implications.”

ensuring the Republic principles for which present day French government strives. “To learn history, in the profound sense of expression, is to understand the fundamental differences between societies of other times and those of today” (Rey & Staszewski, 2002, p. 244).¹³

History lessons also contribute to civic education because they require students to learn and understand the political history of France, which has been a complicated trade off between Republican and more authoritarian government since the Revolution. The tumultuous political history of France illuminates with benefits of protecting fundamental human rights and the repercussions of removing these rights. Unsurprisingly, the education of rights, even in civic education courses, is tied to history and the ideology of the Revolution (Desquesnes, 2011, p. 102). History also works as a form of civic education because students learn and understand the vices of government that work against a free democratic society, and the virtues of good government that can ensure democracy (Denis & Kahn, 2003, p. 137). Therefore, history contributes to the formation of political judgment for future citizens, so that they will be informed about the failures of the past before participating in government.

History and civic education not only work collaboratively to educate students about the social and political history of their country, but the two subjects also share several aims. For this reason, Vial and Mougnotte identify the pairing of history, geography and civics as an “indisputable trio,” because education for citizenship is the fundamental goal of all three disciplines. Although all three disciplines teach values, principles, and concepts that could be categorized as civic education, the most pervasive value across the three disciplines is patriotism. History teaches empathy and understanding of the “other,” which is necessary to foster

¹³ « Apprendre l’histoire, au sens profond de l’expression, c’est prendre conscience des différences fondamentales entre les sociétés d’autrefois et celles d’aujourd’hui »

patriotism. Furthermore, “the teaching of history encompasses the glorious obligation to love and understand the French people” (Denis & Kahn, 2003, p. 142).¹⁴

Overall, civic education, history and geography emphasize the importance of incorporating the values of the French Republic, like patriotism, into the social aspects of civic life. This entails accepting pluralism and diversity of ideas and beliefs, as necessary components of democratic society. There is, however, an inherent contradiction in the objectives of the social component of civic education, which simultaneously promotes universal values of the Republic and plurality of values. As Vial and Mougnotte summarize,

There is a double stain on the aims of civic education. Of one part, the aim makes the existence of [national] documents known and to draw attention to the importance that assumes their formation; on the other hand, the favor assimilation to the values on which [these documents] rest and which are considered universal, that is to say like they are self-imposed on all men and on all societies. ” (Mougnotte & Vial, 1992, p. 104).¹⁵

As French students become increasingly diverse, the tension between assimilation to French values and acceptance of plurality is increasingly felt, especially among students from immigrant background.

Background of Immigration in France

Immigration in France has become a prominent topic of debate on the national stage since the Second World War. Beginning in the 1940s, many immigrants arrived in France as a source

¹⁴ L’enseignement historique incombe le devoir glorieux de faire aimer et de faire comprendre la patrie”

¹⁵ C’est pourquoi une double tâche est à inscrire parmi les finalités de l’éducation civique; d’une part, faire connaître l’existence de ces documents et attirer l’attention sur l’importance que revêt leur formation; d’autre part, favoriser l’assimilation des valeurs sur lesquelles ils reposent et qui sont bien à considérer comme universelles, c’est-à-dire, comme s’imposant à tous les hommes, en toutes les sociétés

of labor, encouraged by the newly created National Office of Immigration (Dewitte, 2003).

Although immigrants came from all regions, large portions of the new arrivals were from French colonies in North African, known as the Maghreb. These immigrants were from marginalized socioeconomic and education statuses, reducing them to a peripheral position in French society. Beginning in the 1970s, France closed its doors to labor immigrants, but allowed immigration from the Maghreb to reunite families, leading to a large growth in the number of whole families of Maghreb descent living in France (Lorcerie, 2003, p. 82).

Continued waves of immigrants of Maghreb background created a substantial population in France with cultural and religious traditions significantly different from the French norm. As a Republic that espouses equality of all citizens, the French nation is now confronted with an ethnic minority population that many French citizens view as fundamentally oppositional to French values (Weil, 2005). In response, the French government has often taken an assimilation approach to integrating this population, wishing to instill French values in immigrants, rather than to incorporate cultural aspects of these populations into the fabric of French identity (Osler & Starkey, 2001).

The assimilation approach to integrating the immigrant population in France is evident across policy sectors. The most widely recognized example is the *laïcité* law, which establishes separation of church and state and guarantees freedom to practice any religion, but only in private spaces. The enforcement of the *laïcité* law was pushed into the spotlight in 1989, when three Maghreb girls arrived at school wearing veils and were then expelled when they refused to take them off (Killian, 2003). This incident, followed by another in 2005, indicated that the French government intends to use national policy to enforce integration of the immigrant population, rather than making concessions to the Muslim population to promote adaptation.

Most recently, a law passed on April 11, 2011 banned women from wearing the niqab, a full veil that covers the face, in all public spaces (Erlanger, 2011).

Although policies actively discourage the formation of distinct ethnic communities, the government does encourage immigrants to obtain citizenship. The guidelines for becoming a citizen include, among other things, “to be assimilated to the French community, notably by a sufficient knowledge of the French language” (Costa-Lascoux, 1989).¹⁶ The requirement that immigrants achieve assimilation to the French community is another example of how policy, in this case citizenship policy, uses an assimilation approach to immigrant integration.

Overall, however, there are competing viewpoints in the political arena about how to best address the “immigrant problem.” According to Francoise Lorcerie (2003), there are two major public interpretations of the “problem.” The first, neo-assimilation, supports the total assimilation of immigrants in French society, requiring that individuals shed their previous cultural, religious, or national identities to adopt the “French identity.” This viewpoint is most commonly seen as the prevailing position on immigration in France, but has lessened in extremism among the general public in recent years. Nevertheless, recent studies have shown a rise in Islamophobia, racism and intolerance among adults in the working class, indicating that a portion of the population is becoming more polarized on the subject of immigration (p. 88). Integrationists, on the other hand, support treating immigrants not as outsiders, but as components of a diverse national society (pp.81-98).

Many researchers have cited the re-Islamicization of the Muslim population, including Muslim youth, as an indicator that the emphasis on collective identity before religious and cultural identities has had adverse effects on achieving the goals of political socialization and

¹⁶ être assimilé à la communauté française, notamment par une connaissance suffisante de la langue française, le Code précisant

civic education. In fact, Muslim identity has become more important to Muslims living in France than it was in their homeland. According to DeJong and Glenn, (1996, p. 208), Islam provides a cultural marker and basis for identity that allows Muslim adults and youth to construct social communities in the French society from which they are overwhelmingly excluded.

Recent changes in policies on education reflect a mixture of assimilation and integration approaches to teaching immigrant youth. Since the 1880s, the national education system has functioned as a tool for political socialization, indicating that the school is viewed as the primary disseminator of French culture and values (DeJong & Glenn, 1996). Education acts as a fundamental integrator of immigrants because the curriculum requires that students confront the cleavages between values of citizenship legitimized by the Republic, and values legitimized by religious and cultural groups. The schools asks each student to make their connection to these groups secondary to their connection with the Republic in order to enter French society (Roche, 2002, p. 21-22).

The large number of immigrant youth in public schools led to the creation of Priority Zones for Education (ZEP) in 1981 in an attempt to address the growing achievement gap between students of different socioeconomic levels. Established by Alain Savary, a socialist minister of education, there were originally 400 zones that received additional funding and slightly improved student to teacher ratios (DeJong & Glenn, 1996, p. 102). Today there are 890 ZEPs in France, and 32% of Parisian schools have ZEP status. The ZEP program was specifically targeted to low-income students and is intended to reduce the impact of social inequalities on scholarly achievement (Peletier-Barbier, 2004, p. 95). Unsurprisingly, the students that perform most poorly, on average, in ZEP schools are immigrant youth, who face

cultural and linguistic barriers to achievement. The ZEPs, therefore, are seen as an education tool for integration of immigrant youth.

Although there is substantial research on the ethnic diversification of the population of France, the effect the new immigrant population has had on national policy, including education policy, and the effect of the new demographics on the school environment as a whole, there is still relatively little information on how effective the educational system is at integrating immigrant students. In addition, there is little research on how integral the education system is for promoting French values and citizenship of new immigrant populations. This information will be critical for France as it continues to search for ways to address tensions between immigrant groups and the broader French society.

Chapter 3: Methodology

In this study, I used qualitative case study methods to answer the research questions. Using three sources of data -- teacher interviews, classroom observation, and a textbook analysis -- I sought to explore the experiences of students and teachers during history, geography, and civic education lessons in three collèges in Paris, France. Although the centralization of the educational system and the pre-determined curriculum of the history-geography-civics program allows me to postulate that the educational experiences of the students and teachers I observed are typical of French students and teachers nationwide, this research is limited to a case study of three schools.

Recruitment

I gained access to the three school sites through Monique Benesvy, program director of EDUCO, the study abroad program in Paris, France for Emory University students. Although I planned to seek access to public schools with a diverse student body, and Madame Benesvy made contact with numerous schools, I was contacted by three schools that expressed interest in participating in the research project. Therefore, the three schools met my criteria: all three are secondary schools in diverse neighborhoods within the city limits of Paris; they represent a mix of public and private institutions; and all had personnel willing to participate. After initial contact was made, one teacher in each school who had expressed interest in the project to their school directors contacted me. Once in contact with each teacher, I worked with each individual to set up times for classroom observation and an interview.

School Sites

I purposefully selected three schools to participate in the study. The three schools differ from each other with regard to location, public or private status, make up of the student body, and textbook used. The first school is a large, combined middle and high school located on the border of the 9th and 10th arrondissements. The school was established in 1893 as a school for bourgeoisie girls, but is now a co-ed facility. Nonetheless, the collège is 40% boys, and 60% girls. According to the school website, the number of students attending the collège from the suburbs has significantly decreased in recent years, and the student body of the collège is more socioeconomically advantaged than that of the high school. As a neighborhood school, the socioeconomically diverse student body generally reflects the socioeconomic diversity of the surrounding neighborhood in the 9th and 10th arrondissements.

The second school is located in the 6th arrondissement at Saint-Germain-des-Près, a historic and wealthy neighborhood in the center of Paris. The school is a public school that draws a majority of its students from the neighborhood. Therefore, the student body generally reflects the high socioeconomic status of the neighborhood. The third school is located in the 11th arrondissement, a socio-economically and racially diverse neighborhood on the Eastern side of Paris, close to the former Bastille and La République. Unlike the other two schools, the school is a private institution, and does not draw the majority of its student body from the neighborhood. Furthermore, although the school is not singularly female, the collège classes are separated by gender. For this study, I observed a classroom of female students in the third school.

Classroom Observation

I observed between three and four hours of class time in each of the three school sites. Although I had proposed to conduct many more hours of observation in each school, I was unable to gain access to the classrooms for an extended period of time per the instructions of the school headmasters to each teacher. The classes I observed were for the subjects of civic education, history, and geography classes. I conducted a pilot observation session at in the first school in the 11th arrondissement, using the proposed observation guide. The seating chart observation method, however, proved to be ineffective. Although I was able to note which students raised their hands to the questions posed by the teacher, the rhythm of classroom discussion was such that students did not often raise their hands, but would call out answers to the questions posed.

Therefore, I revised my observation guide to reflect the more fluid nature of the classroom (Appendix B). During the civic education lessons, I noted how often the teacher used terminology and concepts included in the curriculum published by the national Ministry of Education. When possible, I noted direct quotations from the teachers. I also noted how often a student used these terms when asking or answering a question. During history and geography lessons, I also used the national curriculum for civic education as a base for observation, by noting when the teacher or student incorporated a component of the civic education program during the lesson. I took the observation notes in a mixture of French and English, depending on how quickly I was able to translate.

Teacher Interviews

I interviewed the teachers using a semi-structured interview guide to provide congruent data across the interviews. After conducting a mock pilot interview with Virginie Guiradon, a

professor at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, I revised the interview guide to incorporate questions about the link between the disciplines of history and civic education (Appendix C). The revision included the addition of three introduction questions to better understand the professors background and teaching experience, the culture of the school, and the teacher's relationships with students, administrators, and parents. The revision also included the addition of two questions related to the connection between the history and civic education curriculums. In the interviews, I explored how the teachers said the national curriculum successfully instills French values in the students, and asked the teachers to compare the teaching experiences of ethnic French and ethnic minority students. I conducted the interviews in French.

I recorded the interviews using a digital recorder, and subsequently transcribed them. I coded the field notes from my observations and the transcripts of the interviews using descriptive coding (Saldaña, 2009, p.70) in two cycles. First cycle codes categorized the data by topic. These topics were taken from the national ministry curriculum for the three disciplines (Ministère de l'éducation Nationale, 2009) and the data itself. During the second cycle, I added sub-topic codes and reorganized topics by theme (See Appendix D for sample codes). After the second cycle of coding, I analyzed the data for recurring themes throughout the interviews and observation sessions.

Textbooks

This study also uses a textbook analysis of the history, geography and civics textbooks used in each of the three schools for the third year. The three textbooks analyzed are textbooks used in third year classes published by Hatier, Hachette and Magnard in 2003. These three books were used in the school sites, and I analyzed the editions that were being used in the classroom. Of the three textbooks, only the Magnard textbook has a section devoted specifically to civic

education. Using the national curriculum guidelines, I coded each textbook for the civic education objectives outlined in the civic education curriculum revised in 2009.

Each time an objective was included in each textbook, the “mention” was coded by type (text, document or figure), subject matter (history, geography, or civic education), and topic (World War I, World War II etc). Each “mention” was then coded as “implicit” (the text does not explicitly use words or concepts from the curriculum outline, but implies a civic education concept), “negatively implicit” (the text uses a counter-example to imply a principle in the civic education curriculum”), or “explicit” (the text uses words or phrases directly from the curriculum).

The mentions were then coded using the 66 values, principles, or concepts of the curriculum as codes. These concepts make up the most recent curriculum published by the national ministry (Ministère de l’Education, 2009). The mentions were then analyzed by SPSS using means tests to count the number of mentions based on the multiple variables measured. The results from the textbook analysis were used to triangulate between the findings from the classroom observation and teacher interviews.

Limitations

As a case study that examines three schools and three teachers in Paris, France, the findings from this study cannot be generalized. Although I had originally proposed to interview between 10 and 15 teachers, I was unable to recruit teachers outside of the classrooms I observed. Therefore, I only interviewed three teachers. Furthermore, I was unable to observe for longer than three or four classroom sessions based on the instructions given to the teacher by the headmasters of each school. Therefore, I was able to observe 10 hours of classroom instruction, between three and four hours in each school. Due to the reduced amount of data I was able to

collect using the two originally proposed methods, I chose to revise the research methodology to include the textbook analysis outlined above.

Further, the amount of data collected was limited by time constraints. The national curriculum has grouped the three disciplines of history, civic education, and geography into one meta-discipline, meaning that students learn one of these disciplines at a time, in a rotating order that is decided by the teacher. For this reason, I was not able to choose which courses I observed based on discipline or topic. Therefore, the classroom observations cover various topics from all three disciplines. Nevertheless, the congruency of findings between the classroom observations from all three disciplines and various subject matters provide insight into the interconnected nature of the three disciplines, and the ways in which civic education permeates all three disciplines. Despite the limitations, the findings from this study provide insight into how political socialization, in the form of civic education in history, geography, and civic education, is practiced by teachers, and experienced by students of both French and non-French origin.

Chapter 4: Findings

I used three sources of data for this study, teacher interviews, classroom observation, and textbook analysis, to answer the following research questions:

1. How are civic education guidelines from the National Ministry of Education experienced and practiced by teachers and students?
2. How do students of immigrant background experience and practice civic education differently from students of French background?
3. How do teachers experience and practice civic education guidelines in multicultural classrooms?
4. In what ways do history and geography lessons incorporate the principles and concepts of the civic education curriculum?

The following findings reflect the thoughts and reflections of three history, geography and civic education professors in the third year of middle school, the experiences of teachers and students in classrooms, and the role that textbooks play in transmitting civic education.

To preserve their anonymity the teachers and schools are referred to using pseudonyms. Madame Dupont is a young female professor at Collège Martin. Monsieur Moreau is a middle-aged male professor at Collège François. Monsieur Leroy is a young male professor at Lycée et Collège Jean-Paul. All three teachers taught at schools before their current positions, and all three have experiences teaching in suburban, low-income, and low-performing schools. They speak to their experiences in both situations throughout the interviews.

In addition to the interviews of three teachers at different schools in Paris, the study also includes classroom observation of two or three of each teacher's classes. The classes observed were

history classes, geography classes, and civic education classes. All classes had between 20 and 30 students. The makeup of the student body was similar in all three classrooms. The majority of the students were white, but there were a few students of Arab, African, Asian and Middle Eastern descent in each class. Three of the observed classes were entirely female, and the other five were co-ed.

Of the eight observed classes, they all covered different units within the third year curriculum. The third year curriculum is focused on modern history and geography. The historical and geographical subjects covered during this year begin at 1914 and end in current events. The complementary civic education curriculum is focused on current laws, rights, and obligations of citizens in the Fifth Republic and as members of the European Union.

The three civic education courses that were observed covered Republican values, Republican principles, Republican symbols, and the acquisition of citizenship in both the European Union and in France. The geography course covered the organization of the modern world. Specifically, it focused on the differences between developed, developing and third world countries. Of the four history courses, two of them focused on the USSR, one focused on the Russian Revolution and the other focused on the USSR under Lenin and Stalin. One history course looked at the period between 1920 and 1930 in France, attending to the Front Populaire in particular. The last history course was on the rise of Nazi Germany and the beginnings of anti-Semitism in the totalitarian state. Despite the diversity of subjects covered, all eight courses were similarly conducted, and all of the courses included themes and principles that are designated as civic education.

In addition to conducting teacher interviews and classroom observations, I analyzed the textbooks used in the three schools. Using the civic education program published by the Ministry

in 2009, the textbooks were coded for civic education concepts. These textbooks are “3e Histoire et Géographie” published by Hatier in 2003, “3e Histoire, Géographie, et Education Civique” published by Magnard in 2003, and “3e Histoire et Géographie,” published by Hachette Education in 2003. The concepts that the textbooks were coded for are categorized into three large categories, The Republic and Citizenship (A1), Democratic Life (A2), and Defense and Peace (A3), which were taken directly from the national curriculum.

Of the three books, two only included history and geography sections, and one included history, geography, and civic education sections. The book with chapters on civic education is longer than the other two books with only history lessons and geography lessons by 70 pages. The books with civic education lessons also had double the number of civic education concepts than the other two books. For this reason, I conducted two analyses, one including only those instances that occurred in either history or geography lessons, and one that included all records. The textbooks were also coded by subject matter and method of transmission.

How Teachers Experience and Practice Civic Education

Madame Dupont, Monsieur Leroy and Monsieur Moreau identified several key influences on their experiences as teachers for history and civic education lessons. Structurally, all three teachers identified various components of the school system and their individual schools that influence their teaching experience and the experiences of students in civic education. In addition to structural influences, all three professors also spoke to the influence of the student body at their individual schools and the influence that relationships between various actors in the school can have on teaching civic education.

Structural influences. All three teachers spoke about the influence that centralization of the school system, the program published by the ministry, the ministry-approved textbooks used in the classroom, and the Brevet, a national standardized test that students take after the third year, have on their experiences as civic education and history teachers. Some of these ideas were repeated during the classroom observation as well.

Centralization. Although the centralization of the school system in France was alluded to in all three interviews, Madame Dupont spoke directly about the influence of centralization on the school system. She sees the centralization of the school system as a direct reflection of the French value of indivisibility. Although she personally supports centralization, and values the principle that all children in France learn the same material, she was open about the contradictions that centralization creates within the school system. When speaking about the complexity of the history and civic education curriculum in the third year, she attributed this to the fact that for many students, the third year is their last year of education. For this reason, students must learn history up to modern times by the end of the third year. Although she supports this approach to history education, she blames the centralization of education on forcing high-school bound students to condense their history education into three years of middle school. Madame Dupont was conflicted about the benefits that come from all children learning the same material at the same time, and the reality that not all students will be in school for the same number of years. During the classroom observation, the three teachers mentioned the difference between centralized instruction (requiring all teachers to use the same teaching methods) and centralized education (requiring all teachers to teach the same information). The teachers reminded their students that although education is centralized, instruction is not, so each student may have a different school experience.

Curriculum. All three professors referred directly to the program published by the ministry of education that they are required to follow. This program includes history, geography, and civic education as one subject. Both Monsieur Leroy and Madame Dupont spoke to the content of the program, both of in terms of what it does well and in what ways it is not an adequate tool. Monsieur Leroy believes that the program is essentially a useful tool because it gives parameters for teachers to stay within, but allows a level of freedom for teachers to take liberties with how they teach the material. Madame Dupont echoed this sentiment, and reiterated that she supports the unity that the program provides for the education system. However, both Monsieur Leroy and Madame Dupont identified the program as inadequately designed. For both, the “mise en œuvre” is not successful.

Textbooks. Two of the three professors spoke to the role that textbooks play in civic education. Both Monsieur Leroy and Monsieur Moreau said that the textbooks are not well done, too simple, and too easy. For this reason, Monsieur Moreau does not use a civic education textbook in his classrooms when possible.

« C’est aussi le fait que les livres, les manuels qu’on utilise en éducation civique en général, ne sont pas très bien. Ils sont très difficiles à utiliser, »¹⁷ (Monsieur Moreau, December 2, 2011).

Monsieur Moreau is also not supportive of the textbooks because of what the books leave out. He gives the example of how the fifth year textbooks do not include pictures or descriptions of the nude sculptures used in Ancient Greece because they might offend religious students. To Monsieur Moreau, these textbooks work against the goals of civic education because they hide pieces of history, and therefore distort the truth.

¹⁷ It is also the fact that the books, the manual that one uses in civic education are, in general, not very good. They are very difficult to use.

The Brévet. Two teachers mentioned the Brévet, which is the final test that determines if students will either receive a Brévet diploma or continue to high school, as a significant influence on how they teach history and civic education. The Brévet is a national standardized test composed of multiple choice and essay questions that all students in France take at the end of their third year. Monsieur Leroy lamented that students do not always truly learn the material in history and civic education, but rather just memorize the facts needed for the test. Both Monsieur Leroy and Madame Dupont spoke to being constrained in their ability to take more liberties with civic education and history because they must prepare their students for the test during a limited period of time. The teachers also highlighted the importance of the Brevet during classroom sessions. In one class, the professor discussed the importance of the Brévet and the implications of the Brévet scores on a student's future.

The student body. All three teachers spoke to the characteristic of their student bodies, which influence their teaching experience. For Madame Dupont, she values the heterogeneity of the student body, which is comprised of students on both ends of the socioeconomic spectrum. However, all students choose to go to College Martin because it is a private school. Madame Dupont believes that the element of choice makes for a generally pleasant student body and positive relationships between professors and parents. Monsieur Moreau also speaks to the element of choice present in his school, but views it differently. Although College Francois is a public school, many students live outside the district, cheating the system by renting addresses in the neighborhood. These students change the student body, making it more diverse. For Monsieur Leroy, he attributes the diversity of the student body at Lycée Jean-Paul to the diversity of the neighborhood from which it draws students. For all three teachers, the diversity

of their student bodies is appreciated, but also provides certain challenges, which they speak to in depth later in the interviews.

Pedagogical techniques. During the interviews, the teachers mentioned the importance of using documents to illustrate a topic, and frequently used historical examples and comparisons to illustrate their point on a given subject. These two techniques, comparison and use of documents, were also used across the classes to demonstrate the concepts or ideas being taught. The following table shows the distribution between the history or geography classes and the civic education classes for these themes.

Table 1: Role of Education System.

	History and Geography	Civic Education
Centralization		1
Use of textbook	1	3
Importance of Brévet	3	1
Comparison	16	8
Documents	5	

The history and geography lessons incorporated a similar use of comparison as did the civic education lessons (2.6 times per class during civic education and 3.2 times per class during history or geography). This triangulates with the idea expressed during the interviews that the teachers try to make their courses more concrete for students by providing examples. For instance, when discussing the diversity of citizenship acquisition rules within the EU, the teacher compared the rules in France to the rules in Germany. The history and geography lessons also included use of documents, which the civic education classes did not. One professor used primary documents both to ground the history lesson and to include a complimentary lesson on how to read a document for point of view and bias. This substantiates the claim that history is

more easily bolstered by documents than civic education. The mention of centralization, textbooks, and the Brévet also mirrors themes found in the interviews.

Relationships between actors in the school. Beyond the influence that the national ministry of education and the student bodies of each school exert on these teachers' practices, all three teachers spoke to the different relationships they have with actors both inside and outside the school. In addition one teacher spoke to the relationship he has with the program, other teachers, and students. The following relationships color how all three teachers experience teaching history and civic education.

Teacher to administrator. All three teachers experience positive relationships between the faculty and administrative staff at their schools. According to Monsieur Moreau, the director is personally invested in the success of Jacques Francois's students, which fosters a positive relationship between himself and the teachers. Monsieur Moreau does admit that the administration is not adequately involved in disciplinary affairs, but overall, sees the administration as supportive. Monsieur Leroy echoes Monsieur Moreau's position on the administration. He experienced positive relationships between the teachers and administration at both his current school, and the previous "difficult" school. He said he believes that positive relations between the two are not all that common, and that many schools suffer tensions between the faculty and administration. Madame Dupont also reports a good working relationship, but adds that the administration has high expectations for the staff at her school.

Teacher to student. Similarly, all three teachers reported that they experience positive relationships between themselves and the students at their current schools. Madame Dupont generalizes that, in general, students have positive relationships with all of their teachers, that students can confide in their teachers, and that in general these relationships are trusting.

Monsieur Leroy also generalizes that students have positive relationships with their teachers. However, he adds that it can be very difficult to engage the students in work. Monsieur Moreau, on the other hand, says that the relationships depend on the teachers themselves. The students have good relationships with the hard-line teachers and the modern, relaxed teachers, but can be very troublesome for the teachers who are not as engaged in the teaching profession. All three teachers also report positive relationships between themselves and the students they taught in “difficult” schools, but add that it was difficult to engage those students in learning.

Teacher to parent. Monsieur Moreau and Madame Dupont spoke to the relationships they have with the parents of the students they teach. When discussing the different types of teachers previously, Monsieur Moreau differentiated not only between how students react to these teachers, and also how the parents engage with the teachers.

« Et en fait avec les parents, ils supportent les profs à l’ancien, adorent les modernes, et détestent les professeurs qui n’ont plus envie de travailler et qui ennuient les élèves »

(Monsieur Moreau, December 6, 2011)¹⁸

Madame Dupont also discussed her relationships with the parents of the students. On the one hand, she finds that the parents are usually on her side, and support her work with their children. On the other hand, when teaching students who may hold values or beliefs that do not align with her lessons, she said she had found herself in indirect confrontation with families.

Transmission of civic education values. Seen through the lens of their experiences in the school and the greater school system, I now look at whom the teachers identify as principal actors in the transmission of civic education values. All three teachers spoke about their role in the transmission of values, the role of the family, the role of the civic education curriculum, the

¹⁸ In fact, with the parents, they support the professor of the old style, adore the modern ones, and detest the professors with no desire to teach and who bore the students.

role of history lessons, the role of the school as a social unit, and the role of outside actors such as social groups, civic associations, and government.

The role of the professor. All three professors recognized their personal obligation to transmit civic education values, both as educators and as individuals. Monsieur Moreau feels a personal obligation to transmit civic education values, and does not disagree with his role in transmitting the “universal” values like liberty and equality. However, when charged with transmitting “Franco-Francaise” values, those values that are uniquely French, he is uncomfortable with the imposition.

« Et en même temps, je n'ai pas le droit de les transmettre [les valeurs]. Quand elles sont des valeurs universelles, je sais que j'ai le droit de les transmettre. Quand elles sont des valeurs franco-françaises, je le fais parce que j'aime bien ces valeurs-là, mais au fond je me dis « je ne devrais pas. » Je devrais les présenter en disant <bon>. Je vous les présente mais si l'on était raisonnable, on renoncerait peut être » (Monsieur Moreau, December 6, 2011)¹⁹

Monsieur Leroy does not share this uncomfortable relationship with his role as a transmitter of French values. He said he believes the curriculum allows him to take the liberties needed to transmit these values in a way that is adapted to the classroom. Madame Dupont also feels a personal responsibility to transmit these values, and believes that she transmits personal ideologies with them. In fact, she says she is often surprised at what personal values she transmits while teaching.

¹⁹ And the same time, I do not have the right to transmit [the French values]. When they are universal values, I know that I have the right to transmit them. When they are French values, I do it because I like those values, but at my core I say to myself “I should not.” I should present them and say “good.” I present them to you but if you are reasonable, you can renounce them.

Both Monsieur Moreau and Madame Dupont explained that as teachers, they are complicit in what they see as a form of civic indoctrination. Madame Dupont gave several personal examples of instances when she felt uncomfortable with her role as a value transmitter. When teaching about the totalitarianism of China, she found that her Chinese students were upset with what they were hearing about their home country. Madame Dupont recognized her Chinese students could easily misunderstand her lesson on Communist China as a direct judgment on the Chinese government. She found herself in a position in which several students believed she was implying that France is a “better” country than their own.

« J'ai le droit de te dire que ton pays ça va pas et que le mien c'est mieux ? Je n'ai pas le droit de dire ça. » (Madame Dupont, November 21 2011)²⁰

However, she acknowledges that the state requires her to teach these concepts to her students, even if they may not personally agree with her. She must help them to reconcile fact with their perception of an implied judgment based on that fact.

« Et pourtant, mon travail est quand même comment dire à l'enfant, son pays n'est pas une démocratie, j'ai pas dit que la Chine est mauvais, mais j'ai dit autant que ton pays n'est pas une démocratie. » (Madame Dupont, November 21 2011)²¹

Monsieur Moreau believes he is obligated to teach citizenship, but also sees it as an imposition of French values on students from other countries. He is quick to emphasize that only those “Franco-Française” values, in particular laïcité, are impositions, not the “universal” values of the republic like liberty and equality.

²⁰ I have the right to say to you that your country is not good and that mine is better? I don't have the right to say that.

²¹ And yet, my work is how to say to a child, your country is not a democracy. I did not say that China is bad, but I did say that it is not a democracy.

Finally, all three teachers spoke to how successful they feel as transmitters of values. Monsieur Moreau reiterated how he personally believes in the values, and that he hasn't done his job if he does not relay his personal adhesion to them to his students. To encourage them to internalize the values, he reported that he tries to treat the students as equals in his classroom, giving them the same respect and courtesy he expects from them. One of the ways he does this, which I also observed when in his classroom, is by sitting in a student desk when he teaches, so that he is on the same level as his students. Madame Dupont also believes that internalization of values is the ultimate goal for professors, but expresses her uncertainty that she can successfully instill in her students the desire to vote, the idea that democracy is fragile, and the personal volition to defend democracy whenever necessary.

The role of the family. All three professors spoke briefly about the role that the family plays in teaching children the values of civic education. Monsieur Leroy included the family as one of the multiple actors in the transmission of civic education. Madame Dupont, however, afforded the family a more significant role. First, she identified the family as the primary source of civic values related to hygiene and decorum. She spoke negatively about the recent inclusion of these "values" in primary school curriculum. She also said that she has seen firsthand that the immigrant families of children only teach the values and principles of their home country. In this way, these students are receiving important civic education lessons from their homes, but these lessons may or may not be in line with the lessons these children receive from home. Monsieur Moreau also mentioned the role that families play in value transmission, but indicated his concern that families do a sufficient job teaching children what they are forbidden to do, but do not encourage creativity, exploration, dreams and expectation for the future as they should.

The role of society. Monsieur Moreau identifies society as the principle transmitter of values because he believes that students must “live” the values to truly internalize them. With regard to the immigrant students, he further emphasizes the importance of living in the world and experiencing democracy. He believes that students from non-democratic countries will only truly internalize a value for democracy when they experience it’s benefits first-hand. Monsieur Leroy agrees with this statement, and says that students encounter opportunities to experience citizenship in everyday life. Madame Dupont gives another interpretation, and says that it is important for students to understand that they may not always operate within democratic spheres and that they must accept non-democratic experiences. She gives the example of the business world as an environment that is not democratic. For this reason, she believes that schools should not be democratic either, and does not believe students should play a role in real decision-making that would effect the school operations or structuring.

The role of history education. All three teachers speak highly of the ability of history courses to transmit French values. Monsieur Moreau attributes this to the fact that history provides a bridge between theoretical values and actual demonstrations of these values. He also indicates that history is successful in providing examples of regimes that are counter to Republican ideology. Monsieur Leroy also believes that history is an important component of civic education, but says that civics is transmitted differently through this medium because all information is seen from a historical perspective. Madame Dupont sees history as a medium for making civic education more concrete than it would be as a stand-alone discipline. She elaborates by saying that history also connects civic education to current events.

The role of civic education. Interestingly, none of the three professors spoke very strongly about the role that civic education itself plays in the transmission of values. Madame

Dupont said that the course tries to transmit values, but that it is not designed in a way that facilitates transmission. Monsieur Leroy also spoke about the difference between intention and actuality. According to him, the curriculum does not require students to truly reflect on the values they are taught, making it less successful. He reported that he fears that students are required to memorize the list of values for the test, but are not given the opportunity to explore what these values mean in the classroom. Monsieur Moreau flatly stated that he does not believe that the curriculum is the best way to transmit values.

Civic Values. Although the teachers do not all agree on who is the principle transmitter of civic values, all three identified similar principles, values, ideologies, and concepts that are taught as part of a student's overall civic education. These were liberty, equality, fraternity, diversity, the role of voting, civic participation, laïcité, the Revolution, the Constitution, the principle of indivisibility, the ability to comprehend the modern world, internalization of democratic principles, and a responsibility to the state. Of these ideas, however, all three professors specifically emphasized equality and fraternity and laïcité.

Equality. Madame Dupont identified equality as a central value in France, but admits that equality is more theoretical than realizable. Monsieur Leroy echoed this statement, adding that the principle of state socialism is designed to achieve equality. He sees the social services like social security, healthcare, and free education as necessary for reducing inequalities within society. However, he also admits that the State has not achieved equality through these measures yet. Monsieur Moreau adds that equality is a truly universal value that all nations should strive for, but which is not easily attained.

Laïcité. Both Monsieur Moreau and Monsieur Leroy emphasized the importance of laïcité to the French republic. Monsieur Moreau believes that laïcité is a truly French concept,

and therefore central to the functioning of the state. Monsieur Leroy agrees that laïcité is an important French value, but also believes that it has caused tensions within French society. He emphasizes the importance of teaching students about laïcité to ameliorate these tensions. Madame Dupont did not specifically mention laïcité, but she did mention the importance of the principle of the Republic, one of which is laïcité.

Fraternity. Of all of the principles, values, and concepts that the three teachers mentioned, fraternity was the one value that teachers spoke negatively about. Both Madame Dupont and Monsieur Moreau expressed dislike for the value of fraternity, saying that the value “annoys” them. Madame Dupont dislikes fraternity because,

« La signification de la notion de fraternité ne me semble pas assez bien comprise. Elle me semble mal comprise et mal sue par les Français mêmes. » (Madame Dupont, November 21, 2011)²²

According to Madame Dupont, fraternity is currently only taught as the right to receive from your fellow citizens, and does not clearly emphasize the obligation to give in return. Monsieur Moreau adds that fraternity implies that “all men are brothers,” which he does not agree with. To him, the value of fraternity is an imposition.

“ Les hommes sont frères? Non... on doit respecter un homme, des choses qui sont très différentes dans nos voisins, mais ça, la fraternité, le fait de la propager, je le sens comme un devoir culpabilisateur” (Monsieur Moreau, December 6, 2011)²³

The classroom observations support the findings from the interviews on the subject of which civic education disciplines are most highly valued by the teachers. Therefore, the

²² The meaning of the notion of Fraternity doesn't seem well enough understood. It is poorly understood and known by the French

²³ Men are brothers? No... one should respect man, and the things that are very different in your neighbors. But that, fraternity, the obligation to teach that, I feel like is a guilty obligation.

importance that each teacher places in specific values is reflected in their actions as teachers in the classroom. Table 2 shows the distribution of how often a component of the civic education curriculum was discussed in the observed lessons.

Table 2: Incorporation of Civic Education Goals

	History or Geography Lesson	Civic Education Lesson
Values	3	5
Principles	3	2
Republican symbols		9
Foundation of French citizenship	1	3
Common language		3
French nationality		3
Citizenship in the EU		3
Link between political rights and nationality		1
Civil rights	2	
Economic rights	3	
Social rights		3
Right to vote	2	1
Current debates on voting		2
Political parties	3	
Political participation	1	1
Syndicates	1	
Public opinion	1	1
Role of the media	11	
French engagements in Europe		1
France and international military action		1
Treaty of Maastricht	1	
Laïcité	2	4
The EU	1	7
Rights vs. obligations		2
The constitution		1
The Republic		3
State supported services		5
TOTAL	29	61

These 27 components, more than a third of the total number of components of the curriculum, were addressed during only eight courses over the course of two months. This indicates that civic education is prominent in the implemented curriculum, even when the course itself is focused on history or geography. Nevertheless, there were three civic education courses and five history courses. Unsurprisingly, the three civic education courses together included more topics from the civic education curriculum than did the five history courses observed. The lesson on Republican symbols, for example, required the students to identify and explain all three symbols, and included a rousing rendition of the national anthem.

However, the number of times a topic from the civic education guidelines was included in a history course was not negligible, which indicates that history courses often include civic education goals. For example, when teaching about the rise of the Socialist party, *The Front Populaire*, the professor included a discussion of the importance of economic and social rights to France, some of which were adopted during this period in history. As all three professors indicated, the history classes provide opportunities for inclusion of civic education, which they take when possible.

The textbook analysis, on the other hand, contradicted the findings from the interviews and classroom observation. The findings demonstrate that the number of mentions of civic education concepts in the three textbooks is relatively equal among the three major thematic groups presented in the intended curriculum. However, these findings do not reflect the emphasis in the implemented curriculum as reflected in the observation and interview data, which showed that teachers and lessons emphasize the concepts in the Republic and Citizenship thematic group more than the values in the Democratic Life and Defense and Peace thematic groups. Furthermore, these findings do not reflect the distribution recommended in the intended

curriculum, which instructs teachers to spend 30% of the courses on Republic and Citizenship concepts, 50% on Democratic Life concepts, and 20% on Defense and Peace concepts. This indicates that the implemented curriculum diverges from the intended curriculum as revealed in the published material from both the ministry of education and the textbook publishers in this area.

Although there is consistency in the intended curriculum and the published textbooks that are approved by the Ministry of Education, there is far less consistency in the implemented curriculum. An analysis of the similarity of the textbooks is included later in the section. This indicates that the teachers' emphasis on personal interpretation and adaptation of course material to fit the classes they teach would be a differentiating factor among the classes. Although the students may be reading the same material and covering the same civic education concepts, their professors may not be transmitting them in the same manner.

Table 3: Distribution of Entries by Concept Themes

		Themes in Curriculum Guide		
		Republic and Citizenship	Democratic Life	Defense and Peace
1	Sum	183	94	84
	Total	362	362	362
	% of Total Sum	26.4%	29.2%	31.3%
2	Sum	276	112	95
	Total	484	484	484
	% of Total Sum	39.8%	34.8%	35.4%
3	Sum	235	116	89
	Total	442	442	442
	% of Total Sum	33.9%	36.0%	33.2%
Total	Sum	694	322	268
	Total	1288	1288	1288
	% of Total Sum	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

How Students Experience Civic Education

All three professors focused on how they perceive their students, both French and non-French responding to and experiencing civic education as a discipline. All three spoke to the different factors that influence how their students react to what they learn in school. The teachers identified the background of the students as a deciding factor for how they experience the curriculum. The professor noted that students also experience the curriculum differently if they personally feel a clash between what they are learning in school and what they experience in the

world. Finally, they said that students show how they experience the curriculum through demonstrating acquired skills or tools related to civic education.

Student background. The neighborhoods students live in, their family background, socioeconomic level, national origin, and religious background all influence how students react to the curriculum. Although all three teachers mentioned neighborhoods and socioeconomic level, all three also identified the students' familial situation as the greatest determinate of performance. Monsieur Leroy noticed that the children from broken homes, or who have parents who do not work, are more likely to be late to school, disheveled and disoriented in school. Madame Dupont identified the children in wealthy homes with disengaged parents as the least adjusted and most unhappy. Monsieur Moreau stated that the children with parents in the low paying jobs were the most likely to be low-performing, but attributed this to the fact that these students may not have parents who engage in intellectual pursuits. Overall, all three teachers said family dynamics, more so than income and neighborhood, is a deciding factor for a student's success.

All three teachers also discussed the influence of origin and religion on student performance in civic education. Monsieur Moreau said that the poorest performing students are often of Arab or Algerian descent, and attributed this to the fact that these students are more likely to have confusion related to their national identity. Monsieur Leroy disagreed with the idea that a child's origin is a factor in his or her achievement, but did admit that students who are from Arab countries have more trouble finding jobs after school because they do not have French names. He also identified immigrant students who have not yet mastered the French language as having particular difficulties. Both Monsieur Leroy and Monsieur Moreau mentioned Jewish or Muslim religion as another influencing factor, but only for those students who are practicing.

Clashing with the curriculum. According to all three teachers, students of both French and non-French background find their experiences and values clashing with the curriculum. Monsieur Moreau said he believes that when students see the contradiction between the values they are being taught and what their schools and teachers practice, it is harmful to civic education as a discipline. He also mentions that students whose political beliefs clash with Republicanism are more likely to be quiet than to speak their mind. Monsieur Leroy also notes that the contradiction between what students learn and what they see others practicing is harmful, but he identifies society itself as the origin of most of these contradictions.

« Par contre le problème depuis quelques années, on a l'impression que l'image qui aurait été donnée par les gens qui ont le pouvoir, c'est parfois du tout une bonne image. C'est-à-dire que parfois on a l'impression que les valeurs, qui sont pour tout le monde, ne sont pas toujours pour les gens qui ont le pouvoir. » (Monsieur Leroy, December 2011)²⁴

Madame Dupont also acknowledges that students are likely to see a discrepancy between what they are learning and what they see, but she supports this incongruence. She explains that students should expect to operate in a democratic society all the time.

However, Madame Dupont is sensitive to the struggle that children from different backgrounds may have. Similar to the example of Chinese students discussed earlier, she says that Turkish students face a contradiction between what the school tells them and what their parents tell them about the Armenian genocide. Although Turkey does not recognize the Armenian genocide during WWI as genocide, the Turkish children in French schools are taught

²⁴ On the other hand since several years ago, one has the impression that the image that has been given by the people who have power, it's sometimes not a good image at all. That is to say that sometimes one has the impression that the values, which are for everybody, are not always for the people who have power.

that France legally recognizes the genocide. Therefore, the students are caught in a contradiction between what their parents tells them is true and what their school tells them is true. She explains that this contradiction is compounded by the fact that the students are taught that the Civil Code, which has been in place since Napoleon, demands that children respect their parents. Therefore, children are simultaneously being told to respect their nation and to respect their parents, even when the two diverge.

All three teachers also point out particular clashes that children from immigrant homes face with the curriculum. Monsieur Moreau says that living in France but having an ethnic name gives children two identities that may be difficult to reconcile.

« Et puis ce sont des élèves qui sont souvent d'origine des pays arabes. Ils viennent des pays arabes. Ça, ils sont des élèves qui ne savent pas s'ils sont arabes ou français. Et ça, ça ne nous aide pas. Ils n'en ont pas d'idée. Ils sont nés en France, mais ils s'appellent Mohammed » (Monsieur Moreau, December 2011)²⁵

Monsieur Leroy also discusses the impact a double national identity has on students. He says that he has observed that students from non-French backgrounds feel excluded, and blame this exclusion on their origins. Madame Dupont adds that she worries about the effect a multi-national identity has on children. « [Si l'élève dit] moi, dans mon pays... ça signifie que tu es, en fait, en deux, parfois tu te soucies que de ton pays, ce qui est dommage. »²⁶ Unlike Monsieur Leroy and Monsieur Moreau, she attributes the danger of being “torn between two cultures” in school specifically to history and civic education.

²⁵ And then there are the children who are from Arab origins... They are the students who don't know if they are Arab or French. And [having a Muslim name] doesn't help. They have no idea. They were born in France but are named Mohammed.

²⁶ When a student says “me, in my country,” that means that, in fact; you are in two, often concerned only about your country. And that's a shame.

How Teachers Experience Civic Education in Multicultural Classrooms

When discussing the challenges that teachers and students face during the civic education curriculum, several themes emerged. First, the teachers discussed the personal relationship that teachers have with the civic education curriculum. With regard to the school system the teachers noted three challenges; the importance of available time, class size and organization, and ability to engage in debate. The curriculum also poses challenges because it can be too abstract, not adequately emphasized as equal to history and geography in importance, not relatable, too shallow, overly complicated and too emotionally heavy. Furthermore, the teachers identified characteristics of the students that complicate civic education instruction. These are maturity, personal volition, engagement, and internalization of concepts.

Personal internalization. All three teachers expressed that they personally are in agreement with French values and principles. They all support and believe in the values of liberty and equality, and the principle of laïcité. As Monsieur Moreau says, he is fundamentally “laïque” as an individual, and believes that there is no room for religion in public life. Furthermore, when giving the definition of citizenship, both Monsieur Moreau and Madame Dupont included their personal conception of citizenship. For Monsieur Moreau,

« Et vous voyez, la citoyenneté pour moi, on est d'accord pour être dans une République démocratique, et on a envie être dans le sens de la démocratie de la république, de la responsabilité publique...on sait qu'il faut supporter les opinions différentes des autres, des croyances, les différences des modes de vie... quelques choses comme ça. »

(Monsieur Moreau, December 6, 2011)²⁷

²⁷ Citizenship is being in agreement with the democratic republic, and that one has the desire to be in the sense of the democracy of the republic, public responsibility... that one knows to support the different opinions of others, the beliefs and the different ways of life.

Madame Dupont clarified that her personal definition of citizenship is congruent with the concept of citizenship that she teaches.

« Pour moi, c'est la même chose en fait, la signification de citoyenneté en tout cas en ce que je veut transmettre... c'est que tu as la possibilité de voter, et voter n'est pas n'importe quoi donc, comprend que tu dois savoir des choses pour pas voter pour n'importe qui. C'est une responsabilité très importante, que tu es un acteur de ton pays. »

(Madame Dupont, November 21, 2011)²⁸

Throughout the eight classes, there were 11 instances during which the professor demonstrated that he or she personally holds the same opinion or belief that she is teaching. The professors demonstrated this by making a strong statement of agreement or giving an example from his or her life. Nine of these 11 instances occurred during the civic education lesson, and two occurred during a history or geography lesson.

For example, during a civic education course, a teacher willingly expressed her opinion that requiring that potential citizens not have a criminal record is a good requirement, because it will keep “bad people” from joining the national community. This could indicate that teachers feel freer to express opinions during a civic education course, or that teachers are more likely to have an opportunity to express opinions related to civic education than to history. This also reflects the idea that emerged during the interviews, that civic education is more about debate and expression of opinion than history or geography.

²⁸ For me, it's the same thing in fact. The meaning of citizenship in all cases, in what I want to transmit, it's that you have the possibility to vote, and to vote isn't just a whatever. So understand that you must know things to not vote for just whoever. It's a very important responsibility that you are an actor in your country.

Personal difficulties. Nevertheless, all three teachers mention that teaching civic education in multicultural classrooms can be personally challenging. For Monsieur Moreau, he questions the necessity of the discipline, because he believes that education itself is a form of civic education.

« L'éducation exige qu'elle soit civique ou pas. Parce qu'en fait, si c'est véritablement une éducation, elle est civique. » (Monsieur Moreau, December 6, 2011)²⁹

Monsieur Leroy attributes the difficulties he encounters to his ability to make his students excited about civic education. For Madame Dupont, she also struggles to engage her students, and is afraid she might turn them off of civic education if it is too boring.

The three teachers, in general, repeated the same sentiments about civic education, the school system, the influence of student characteristics, the challenges to history and civic education posed by various factors, their personal experiences within the disciplines, and what they perceive to be the experiences of the students within the disciplines. Nevertheless, the three did diverge on the issues of which actors play the strongest role in value transmission, the biggest impediment to civic education as a discipline, and how successful the program is at achieving its goals. These themes were also complemented by the classroom observation.

Available time. Although class size, social-economic class, organization, and the ability to engage in debate were mentioned by all three teachers as important barriers to successful civic education in the classroom, the lack of time for civic education was the most common recurring theme. Monsieur Leroy worried that most professors reduce the number of hours they spend on civic education in favor of more time dedicated to history and geography. Madame Dupont repeated this fear, and attributed the unequal distribution of time to the need to adequately

²⁹ Education demands what is civic or not. Because in fact, if it is truly an education, it is civic.

prepare the students for the Brévet, which focused more on history than civic education. Overall, Madame Dupont mentioned lack of time as an impediment to civic education eight times throughout the interview. Overall, the three teachers worried that they could not spend the time needed to adequately transmit the civic education knowledge proposed by the curriculum.

Abstract nature of the curriculum. All three professors emphasized the abstract nature of the curriculum as the most serious impediment to transmitting civic education values successfully. Monsieur Moreau specifically mentioned that the study of institutions, presidents, ministers, the Senate, and the National Assembly could be too abstract for students at that stage of education. Madame Dupont mentioned that the curriculum is too abstract eight times throughout the interview. She does not believe that the curriculum allows students to see how political principles and civic values are related to their lives. Monsieur Leroy attributed the abstract nature of the course to the vague nature of the published program. Unlike the other two teachers, however, he supported the idea that using specific examples within civic education can help to ground the discipline.

Maturity of students. Maturity of the students was commonly mentioned as a challenge for 3rd year civic education. All three teachers said that their students are too young at age 14 to truly understand the subjects taught in civic education classes. Monsieur Moreau said that at 14, one is not capable of understanding the complexity of the modern world, but that this is also a critical time for children to develop a critical mind. Therefore, the curriculum may be too advanced for some of the more immature students, but also encourages the natural development of critical thinking that occurs at this age. Madame Dupont was less optimistic about the ability for her students to develop the capacities intended by the curriculum. For her students, she

believes they are too young to learn all of the complex information they are supposed to and develop the capacities of critical thinking and reflection.

Internalization. The three teachers identified another important characteristic of the students as the students' abilities to internalize what they learn and carry it out into the world. Monsieur Moreau demonstrates this by telling a story of how he asked the students a question and was reprimanding them for not knowing the answer. As it turned out, the class had not covered the material yet, but none of the students spoke up. This indicated to Monsieur Moreau that the students have not internalized the values of the Republic, but rather the authoritarian nature of school. According to Monsieur Moreau, the most important thing civic education can do is to teach students to love liberty. This incident indicated to Monsieur Moreau that the students have not achieved that internalization yet.

The internalization of French values takes courage and acceptance of the messiness of the democratic system, in its "disorder and imperfection." Unfortunately, Monsieur Moreau explains that this internalization does not happen completely. He tells the story of students protesting the right-wing politician Jean-Marie Le Pen and his party, Le Front National to demonstrate this idea.

« On a eu ce qui s'est passé en 2002 le 21 avril 2002. C'est-à-dire le moment où Jean-Marie Le Pen s'est retrouvé qualifié pour le deuxième tour de l'élection présidentielle. Ou là, il y a eu immédiatement une immense manifestation de la jeunesse pour protester. Et ça, ça voulait dire deux choses. La première est que ces élèves savaient ce que c'était le fascisme, le nazisme etc. Ils savaient, donc, ce qu'ils ont appris. La deuxième chose c'est que quand même ils ont oublié qu'une élection, ça se respecte. Et que, avant de commencer mani... on dit « bah ! » il y a eu le suffrage universel. Et en plus on était entre les deux tours. C'est-à-dire le premier on a voulu mais encore il y a encore le second cercle... Il me semble que s'ils ont vraiment, vraiment bien assimilé des règles de droit, et de respect du droit et du suffrage universel, ils n'auraient pas manifesté. Mais néanmoins

en même temps le fait qu'ils ont manifesté, ça prouve qu'ils ont la conscience du danger. Et donc que les professeurs d'histoire, dans l'ensemble, avaient à peu près fait leur travail. » (Monsieur Moreau, December 6, 2011)³⁰

Madame Dupont also echoed the idea that in order for students to completely internalize civic education principles, they must truly change their spirit. She believes it is not adequate to be able to recite the things you have learned in class, but that you must “truly know them in your soul.” Monsieur Leroy added that when students have not fully internalized these values, it becomes most apparent when they enter society. Those students who are not completely in agreement with the values when they leave school are more likely to have trouble integrating into society.

Classroom observation showed that students demonstrated that they are internalizing concepts during history, geography, and civic education courses. This was observed when students raised their hands to ask critical questions related to the material, ask the teachers questions about the material after class, expressed shock at examples contrary to civic education or expressed approval at examples that support civic education. Overall, I observed demonstrations of internalization 14 times during civic education classes and 15 times during history or geography lessons. For example, when discussing the implementation of racist policies in Nazi Germany, the students were shocked that the German people had allowed this to happen.

³⁰ We had what happened in 2002. The 21st of April 2002. That is to say the moment when Jean-Marie le Pen was found to have qualified for the second round of the presidential election. Where there was a huge demonstration of the youth to protest this. And that says two things. The first is that these students knew that there was Fascism and Nazism in the past. They knew, so they had learned. The second thing is that at the same time they forgot that one respects an election. And that, before beginning to protest... one says “bah! There was universal suffrage.” And furthermore one was between two rounds. That is to say that in the first one, he was wanted but there was another one... It seems to me that if they had truly, really truly assimilated to the rules of rights and the respect of the right to universal suffrage, they would not have protested. But nevertheless, at the same time, the fact that they protested, that proved that they are conscientious of danger. And so the history teachers, as a unit, had almost done their work.

They asked multiple questions about why no one fought back and why people agreed with this level of racism. This indicates that the majority of the class has internalized the idea that racism is bad and equality under the law is ideal. This also demonstrates that students have internalized the right to express discontent at government actions.

Contrary to what was expressed during the interviews, the students demonstrated engagement in the curriculum more frequently during the civic education courses than during the history courses. This could, however, be due to the level of discussion permitted during the civic education courses and not a function of how engaged the students were in the material. Nevertheless, students expressed internalization of principles throughout the eight classes. This indicates the teachers were correct in assuming that students are, in general, highly engaged in the history and civic education lessons in these three schools.

Diversity. In both history and civic education, the teachers identified diversity of the student body as a challenge and an opportunity for transmitting civic education values through the two curricula. The diversity of students was identified as an encouragement to diversify teaching styles. Monsieur Leroy mentioned twice that he had to adapt the curriculum to fit the children sitting in front of him each year. Madame Dupont lamented that she is not able to adapt the curriculum as much as she would like because of the national parameters. For example, she explained that she feels like she needs to change the examples used in the textbook to explain civic education principles because she teaches an all-female class, and many examples in the curriculum guide and in the textbooks are related to sports, which would be received better by males.

Monsieur Leroy and Madame Dupont also mentioned that diverse classes create an inequity among students in terms of what knowledge they bring into the classroom from other

sources. Monsieur Leroy used the example of a classroom in St. Denis, which is a suburb of Paris only five kilometers from the cities. Some of these students have never been outside of St. Denis, and have never seen Paris. Therefore, not all students have shared the same experiences, even experiences as common as traveling into the city center. Madame Dupont also discussed how some of her students know the national anthem by heart before class, so she does not have to spend time on it in class. Others, however, have never learned the history of the Marseillaise, and need a two-hour lesson to catch up.

Finally, all three spoke to the effect student diversity has on classroom dynamics in history and civic education courses. Monsieur Moreau speaks positively of the number of Jewish students in his class because he believes it reduces the likelihood that students will be anti-Semitic. On the other hand, he expresses concern that the Arab students in his class, who are all low performing and badly behaved, set a bad example for Arabs. With regard to these Arab students, he says that diversity in a classroom is bad if students do not attempt to represent their sub-group appropriately. Madame Dupont echoes this sentiment in a less severe manner. She worries that now that the student body is more culturally diverse, she is obligated to teach courses on all different cultures, some of which are not relevant to her particular students. Monsieur Leroy only mentions diversity as an influencing factor for how he evaluates students, setting the bar lower for less advanced students.

Themes related to diversity also emerged during the classroom observations. Teachers' and students' questions related to the diversity of the nation, dual identity, French culture, and racism and discrimination were the most common

Table 4: Themes of Diversity

	History or Geography	Civic Education
Diversity	1	4
Dual Identity		3
Question of French Culture		4
Racism and Discrimination	5	1

Although the majority of questions related to diversity occurred during the three civic education classes, the history and geography classes focused heavily on questions related to racism and discrimination. The majority of this focus came from the units on Nazi Germany, during which they discussed the implication of racism on both those who were discriminated against and those who discriminated against people. Although these themes were not highly prevalent during the observation, they echo the themes related to diversity that emerged during the interviews.

History, Geography, and Civic Education as Co-Disciplines

The teachers also spoke to the challenges and opportunities they experience in history lessons. With regard to the curriculum itself, three ideas emerged: that the program is emotionally heavy, internally focused, and traditional. The discipline of history, in contrast to civic education, was discussed as being more concrete, easy to relate to, conducive to illustration by example, lending to discussion, related to current events, and substantiated by documentation. In general, all three professors agreed that the history curriculum is more easily absorbed by students, and provides a good medium for transmitting civic values when applicable.

The civic education, history, and geography curriculums are published together as a unit, and the teachers interviewed all agreed that not only do these disciplines go together, but that

they complement each other. This observation was substantiated by the classroom observations, during which I identified 17 instances where the professor referred to a lesson from one of the other two disciplines to build a bridge between what the students were learning.

The textbook analysis clearly demonstrates the extent to which the civic education and history curricula are linked. The books are compared to show how similar textbooks are across the three schools. First the books were compared for the number of counts for each concept in only the history and geography chapters. Of the 66 concepts that are included in the civic education curriculum, 16 were never observed in the textbooks. Comparatively the books did not emphasize the exact concepts an equal number of times, but on average each book had the same number of records. This indicates that the books are relatively equal with regard to how often they include civic education principles during history and geography chapters. The books were then compared for the number of counts for each concept in the history, geography and civic education chapters. Unlike the previous analysis, only five concepts of the 66 were not recorded. This reveals that the book with the civic education chapters mentions 11 concepts that are excluded from history or geography lessons. Nevertheless, the chapters on civic education emphasized the same types of principles in the same general distribution as the history and geography chapters. This suggests that in the textbooks that include separate civic education chapters, these chapters bolster the history and geography chapters with regard to what civic education concepts are taught.

Analysis by book. The following analysis looks only at history and geography books, because the first two books do not include a civic education section. The findings from a comparison of counts by subject matter, and method of transmission; implicit transmission, explicit transmission, or negatively implicit transmission (using a counter example) reveal that in

all the three books, over 80% of the civic education concepts are mentioned during history lessons. During the interviews and classroom observation, teachers focused on the complimentary role that history plays for civic education, whereas geography was not mentioned. These findings explain that phenomenon.

Table 5: Distribution of Entries by Subject Matter

Book		History	Geography	Total
1	Count % in Book	291 80.4%	71 19.6%	362 100.0%
2	Count % in Book	387 80.0%	97 20.0%	484 100.0%
3	Count % in Book	355 80.3%	87 19.7%	442 100.0%
Total		1033 80.2%	255 19.8%	1288 100.0%

Number of counts by method. The findings reveal that all three textbooks have the same percentages of implicit, explicit, and negatively implicit mentions of the civic education principles. These findings show that the books use the same tactics to transmit civic education values through history and geography curriculum. This indicates that the students across the three schools are receiving the same types of messages from their textbooks for the civic education concepts.

Table 6: Distribution of Entries by Method

Book		Implicit	Explicit	Negative Implicit	Total
1	Count % in book	52 14.4%	198 54.7%	112 30.9%	362 100.0%
2	Count % in book	101 21.2%	284 59.7%	91 19.1%	476 100.0%
3	Count % in book	87 19.7%	251 56.8%	104 23.5%	442 100.0%
Total	Count % in book	240 18.8%	733 57.3%	307 24.0%	1280 100.0%

Analysis by method. The following analysis looks at the method distribution by value categories. This analysis uses the records for all chapters, including civic education chapter, and therefore includes over 400 records not used in the previous analyses.

Value groups. The table shows that the explicit mentions are the overwhelming majority within the three thematic groups. Within the Democratic Life and Republic and Citizenship categories, the percentage of negative implicit mentions was higher than the percentage of implicit mentions. However, for Defense and Peace, the percentage of negative implicit mentions is negligible, whereas the percentage of implicit mentions stays comparative to the other two categories. Therefore, the change occurs between explicit mentions and negative implicit mentions in the Defense and Peace theme. This indicates that while the textbooks use the same methods of transmission throughout the book, they do not use the same methods to transmit the concepts across the thematic groups.

The table shows that the explicit mentions are the overwhelming majority within the three thematic groups. Within the Democratic Life and Republic and Citizenship categories, the percentage of negative implicit mentions was higher than the percentage of implicit mentions. However, for Defense and Peace, the percentage of negative implicit mentions is negligible,

whereas the percentage of implicit mentions stays comparative to the other two categories. Therefore, the change occurs between explicit mentions and negative implicit mentions in the Defense and Peace theme. This indicates that while the textbooks use the same methods of transmission throughout the book, they do not use the same methods to transmit the concepts across the thematic groups.

Table 7: Distribution of Values by Method

Method		Democratic Life	Defense and Peace	Republic and Citizenship
Implicit	Sum	83	55	107
	N	247	247	247
	% of Total Sum	18.4%	16.3%	12.2%
Explicit	Sum	240	281	594
	N	1117	1117	1117
	% of Total Sum	53.1%	83.1%	67.7%
Negative Implicit	Sum	129	2	177
	N	308	308	308
	% of Total Sum	28.5%	.6%	20.2%
Total	Sum	452	338	878
	N	1672	1672	1672
	% of Total Sum	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Emergent Themes

In addition to the findings that address the four research questions, four new themes emerged from the data.

Civic education in the classroom. The teachers expressed the idea that civic education in the classroom is not as important to the formation of future citizens in France as their familial and societal experiences. They substantiated this claim using personal examples from their interactions with students. Although civic education is a discipline in the school system, the teachers said that children find the curriculum too abstract. The teachers said that students receive their primary civic education from their actions in society. All three expressed the belief that students only become citizens after leaving school. Furthermore, all three teachers expressed doubt that their actions as professors and the concepts that they teach are successfully internalized by their students. Nevertheless, all three indicated that they consider themselves a component of a child's civic education, just not the most important.

Role of multiculturalism. All three teachers denied that being a child of immigrant parents has a significant impact on students, attributing inequality of performance to family instability, poverty, and lack of support. Nevertheless, all three teachers gave examples of students who are from non-French families that struggle directly with the content of the program. This indicates that although teachers are aware that their immigrant students are struggling with school, they are reticent to place blame on the education system itself. The teachers appeared to be conflicted on the subject of how race, culture, or religion influences the experiences their students have in the classroom. All three teachers occasionally contradicted themselves, at times emphasizing the importance of nationalized and standardized curriculum, and at other times recognizing a need to adapt the curriculum to their students.

Teaching civic education by using counter-examples. The three teachers, eight classroom sessions, and three textbooks all revealed that an important method of civic education is teaching by using an example of the concept's opposite. The teachers stressed the importance

of using history or geography lessons to give counter-examples: dictatorship to show a counter-example to democracy; the Holocaust to show a counter-example of non-discrimination; or the inequality of wealth around the world to show a counter-example to the social service role of the state. When using these examples, teachers reminded students that these examples are in contrast to the values of the French Republic, but did not refer to positive examples to reinforce the contrast. During classroom sessions, the students reacted positively to this method, and demonstrated that they understood the comparisons used. The textbooks also demonstrated that a significant portion of civic education concepts is conveyed through implicit mentions using counter-examples.

Difference between intended and implemented curriculum. The divergence of the textbooks and curriculum guidelines with the teacher interviews and student observation indicates a difference between intended and implemented curriculum. The teachers recognize the importance of following the intended curriculum, but simultaneously adapt the curriculum in slight ways to fit to their classroom. Furthermore, the personal emphasis that the three teachers placed on particular values was apparent when observing their classrooms. Contrarily, their lessons did not reflect the distribution of emphasis that the intended curriculum suggests for each category of civic education concepts.

Summary

Overall, the findings are comparable across the three data sources. Using the interviews as a basis for the findings on teacher experience and student experience from the point of view of the instructor, the classroom observations and textbook analysis reinforce the themes found in the interviews. Together, by triangulating data, the findings from all three sources answer the

study research questions and are presented below. In addition to these findings, four themes also emerged from the data.

The first research question, “How are civic education guidelines from the National Ministry of Education experienced and practiced by teachers and students?” was addressed both through the teacher interviews and the classroom observations. For teachers, the teachers reported a personal adherence to the goals of civic education. The definitions of citizenship and their perceptions of the role that teachers play in the transmission of civic education values indicates that teachers have a personal investment in teaching civic education because they feel personally responsible to educate students for citizenship. All three teachers identified personally as French citizens, and believe in the responsibilities and rights that derive from citizenship. The classroom observations substantiated the teachers’ personal relationship to the civic education curriculum because the professors did not hesitate to share their personal views on the subject matter. Nevertheless, the teachers reported that the curriculum is too abstract, too complex, and not given enough time by the ministry of education.

For the students, the question of how they experience and practice the civic education guidelines was observed both from the perspective of the teachers, and by observing the students in their classrooms. The classroom observations indicated that the students in these classrooms were engaged in the material. Students asked critical questions and actively participated in classroom activities. The teachers, however, gave a more complicated view of student experience. All three teachers expressed doubt that students truly integrate their classroom activities and scholastic knowledge with their actions and beliefs outside the classroom. Without interviewing the students themselves, it is not possible to draw any conclusions about how the students experience the civic education guidelines outside the classroom. Inside, however, both

the teacher interviews and classroom observations indicate that students are engaged with the material.

Only the teacher interviews addressed the second research question, “How do students of immigrant background experience and practice civic education differently from students of French background?” The teachers were able to give insight to this question from their point of view. The teachers expressed concern that students from difficult family backgrounds are more likely to struggle in school, but were hesitant to connect this directly with a student’s immigrant background. On the other hand, all three teachers gave examples of times when a student from non-French origins struggled with the curriculum because of his or her background. The teachers also emphasized the contradiction between theory and practice in civic education with regard to immigrant youth. Therefore, one can assume that immigrant students experience and practice civic education differently when they are confronted with a conflict between their home culture and French culture in school. Without direct engagement with immigrant students, however, no conclusions about how these conflicts influence their ability to integrate civic education into their daily lives can be made.

Both the teacher interviews and the classroom observations addressed the third research question, “How do teachers experience and practice civic education guidelines in multicultural classrooms?” During the interviews, the teachers expressed the necessity to adapt their teaching styles to the diversity of the classroom before them. This classroom adaptation was demonstrated in several classroom sessions. For example, one teacher gave particular emphasis to the unit on multi-nationalism and dual citizenship in Europe because one of her students is not a French citizen. In another class session, the students were particularly curious about how the Nazis had

classified people by race. Due to the number of non-white students in the class, the teacher spent additional time debunking the Nazi race theory for the students.

The final research question, “In what ways do history and geography lessons incorporate the principles and concepts of the civic education curriculum?” was revealed in all three data sources. The teachers expressed that they are primarily history teachers who teach civic education, and therefore use history to demonstrate civic education principles when applicable. This multi-disciplinary approach was demonstrated in all of the classroom sessions, when teachers either used historical references in a civic education lesson, or reminded students of a civic education concept during a history lesson. The textbook analysis reinforced these findings as well, because of the frequency of civic education concepts being included within history and geography lessons. As an ensemble, the three data sources support the conclusion that civic education is treated as a part of history. Both teachers and textbooks focus primarily on history, but substantially incorporate ideas of citizenship and other civic education concepts into history lessons.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The findings from this study give insight into the experiences of three middle school history and civic education teachers in Paris, France by addressing the following research questions. 1) How are civic education guidelines from the National Ministry of Education experienced and practiced by teachers and students? 2) How do students of immigrant background experience and practice civic education differently from students of French background? 3) How do teachers experience and practice civic education guidelines in multicultural classrooms. 4) How successfully do the history and geography lessons transmit

civic education principles, and in what ways do students and teachers experience the civic education principles differently when they are taught through history or geography?

In general, my findings support previous research on the influence that diversity from immigration has had on the development and practice of civic education. In exploring the experiences of teachers and what these teachers perceive are the experiences of their students, the findings affirm the strong connection between the history and civic education curriculums that has been in place for hundreds of years. On the other hand, this study shows that there are challenges to teaching the prescribed curriculum in multicultural classrooms that come from a contradiction between the outlined goals of the curriculum and the realities of the students in the classroom. Furthermore, the findings show that these teachers feel a personal tension between what they believe civic education should achieve and what they see students from minority cultural backgrounds experience.

The findings from this study support the notion that civic education is a historically significant and currently valued discipline in secondary education. The emphasis on civic education in the history, geography, and civic education curriculum dates back to the Revolutionary period, but has evolved over the past 250 years (Mouginotte, 1991). Nevertheless, combining history, geography, and civic education into one subject, which occurred recently, was highly supported by all three teachers, the classroom observations, and the textbooks, supporting Desquesnes (2011) assertion that the education of rights in civic education courses is tied to the history and ideology of the Revolution.

Surprisingly, however, all three teachers believe that history lessons are the most effective method of transmitting civic education values, contradicting the national emphasis on

civic education as a separate discipline. Nevertheless, the inclusion of civic education in the meta-discipline of history, geography, and civic education reflects that the national ministry intends for teachers to bridge the three disciplines to teach students the social knowledge they need to be citizens of the Republic (National Ministry of Education, 2009). In summary, the ministry, while acknowledging that civic education and history are complementary disciplines, maintains that civic education should be a separate discipline. The teachers and the textbooks show, however, that a vast majority of civic education principles are being taught through the history curriculum. This observation is compounded by the opinion expressed by all three teachers that civic education as a separate discipline is subordinate to history in importance.

The teachers echoed the importance of civic education as a component of k-12 education, but contested the idea that civic education should include moral lessons in addition to political and social concepts. This departure from moral education as a component of civic education reflects national policy changes in curriculum during the past 50 years (Roche, 2002). On the other hand, one of the teachers worries that moral education is reemerging in the curriculum in the form of social instruction. According to her, teachers are being forced into the role of parent by being required to teach basic hygiene and behavior rules to children in early grades. Although none of the teachers explicitly blamed the necessity of adding these lessons back into the curriculum on cultural diversity, one can infer that the cause is a larger number of students who are learning different cultural mores related to behavior and physical care than those taught by French parents.

The findings from this study also suggest that the national emphasis on *laïcité* is particularly emphasized in the classroom. In particular, the presence of Islamic students who may bring religious identity into the classroom, particularly by wearing a headscarf to class, has

been a topic of intense debate in recent years (Killian, 2003). By declaring that *laïcité* is an integral principle of civic education, the teachers support the secularization of school and religion mandated by the 1905 law. They also support the idea that increasing religious diversity in the classroom threatens the implementation of *laïcité*, echoing the national law that requires *laïcité* to be obeyed in the classroom. On the other hand, the assertion that Christmas trees could be present in a school building because they are not overtly religious whereas Islamic symbols should be banned in schools according to the principle of *laïcité* indicates that there is an unequal implementation of the law that follows religious and cultural lines. The teachers interviewed in this study did place Christian symbols and Islamic symbols as equals under the law, indicating that there is a growing tension between cultural groups in the classroom. Although civic education currently emphasizes the importance of *laïcité* as a national principle, the realities of the classroom and an apparent unequal application of the law indicates that civic education will continue to evolve.

On the other hand, the findings in the study support Lorcerie's (2002) analysis of the current political atmosphere in France on the subject of how to best absorb immigrant populations. Although both assimilation and integration theories are popular, these teachers all appear to straddle the two approaches. On one hand, the teachers' personal opinions reflected in the interviews and classroom activities support DeJong and Glenn's (1996) concept that the school is the primary disseminator of French culture and values. The teachers in this study agreed that there is a core set of French values, principles, and symbols that should be internalized by all students. This belief is closely aligned with an assimilation approach to immigrant inclusion into the national curriculum. On the other hand, these teachers recognize that internalization of this predetermined French culture is not always successful, especially with

non-French students. This realization supports a concession towards an integrationist approach to immigrant inclusion. By recognizing that forcing immigrant students to assimilate to French culture through civic education and history lessons is not always successful, the experiences of these teachers support the current political move towards integration of immigrant groups rather than assimilation.

Implications

The findings from this case study, while not generalizable, indicate that at least some teachers and students experience civic education differently in diverse classrooms. The finding that civic education as a disseminator of French culture is not as successful with students of non-French origin implies that revisions to the civic education curriculum will be necessary to better incorporate diverse cultures and ethnicities into French culture. Although Ladson-Billings (1995) presented the concept of ‘culturally relevant pedagogy’ in relation to American curriculum, this case study reveals that her concept is relevant in France as well. The findings from the study suggest the need for research on the application of culturally relevant pedagogy to the national French curriculum. On the other hand, the teachers also identified several challenges they face when teaching civic education that are unrelated to cultural barriers. This indicates that future studies should explore the effects of maturity, allocated time, and abstract concepts in the curriculum on successful civic education.

By exposing the tensions and contradictions that these teachers are experiencing when teaching the civic education curriculum to diverse classrooms, the findings from this study provide a basis for the design of future studies on French civic education. Although this study was conducted in schools located in upper-middle class neighborhoods in Paris, the findings

could be used to design a broader study on how civic education is experienced and taught by teachers in classrooms with majority minority populations. Although the teachers interviewed and observed in this case study teach in predominately white classrooms, the contradictions and tensions they experience suggest that teachers in majority minority classrooms face similar tensions on a larger scale. More broadly, an exploration of how civic education could be revised to better accommodate cultural and religious diversity would lead to better understanding of how to integrate immigrant populations. Furthermore, because education is a significant tool for political socialization in France, future studies could be conducted that examine the efficacy of the civic education in instilling French political and social values in immigrant students.

Conclusion

The boom of immigrant populations from diverse cultural backgrounds has placed a strain on the established curriculum. Students are facing increasing contradictions between the cultural and religious knowledge they learn at home and in their communities and the cultural knowledge they are expected to learn at school. On the other hand, civic education is an important component of political socialization in France and continues to be valued by teachers and the national ministry of education. An examination of how the contradictions between French culture and non-majority cultures could be explicitly reconciled in the school system could improve both the experiences of the students and teachers in France. More broadly, this curriculum change could improve the incorporation of immigrant populations into a newly diverse French nation.

References

- Banks, A., Cookson, P., Gay, G., Hawley, W., Irvine, J., Nieto, S., Schofield., & Stephan, W. (2001) *Diversity within unity : Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society*. Seattle, WA : University of Washington.
- Bouvet, C., & Lambin, J-M. (éd). (2003). *3^e histoire géographie : le monde d'aujourd'hui*. Paris, France : Hachette Education.
- Casta, M., Daboval, N., & Guizard, P., (eds). (2003). *3^e Histoire géographie éducation civique*. Paris, France : Magnard.
- Centre National de Documentation Pédagogique (2004). *Enseigner au collège, histoire-géographie-éducation civique ; programme et accompagnement*. Paris, France : CNDP
- Costa-Lascoux, J. (1989) *De l'immigre au citoyen*. La Documentation Française :
Notes et Etudes Documentaires N° 4886
- Déloye, Y. (1994). *Ecole et citoyenneté ; l'individualisme républicain de Jules Ferry à Vichy : Controverses*. Paris, France : Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.
- Denis, D., & Kahn, P. (Eds). (2003). *L'école républicaine et la question des savoirs*. Paris, France : CNRS éditions.
- Desquesnes, J. (2011). *De l'élève au citoyen : les enjeux du parcours civique*. Caen, France : CRSP de Basse-Normandie.
- Dewitte, P. (2003). *Le point sur...deux siècles d'immigration en France*. La Documentation Française, Paris.
- Direction générale de l'enseignement scolaire. (2009). *Histoire-géographie-éducation civique : classes de sixième, cinquième, quatrième, troisième*, Paris, France : Ministère de l'Education Nationale.
- Erlanger, S. (13 Apr. 2011) "France Enforces Ban on Full-Face Veils in Public." *The New York Times*. Web.

- Fontanabona, J., & Thémines, J-F. (2005). *Innovation et histoire-géographie dans l'enseignement secondaire ; Analyses didactiques*. Paris, France : Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique.
- Garcia, P., & Leduc, J. (2004). *L'enseignement de l'histoire en France ; de l'Ancien Régime à nos Jours*. Paris, France : Armand Colin.
- Glenn, C., & de Jong, E. (1996). *Educating immigrant children: Schools and language minorities in twelve nations* New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Journal Officiel de la République Française (1833) *Loi sur l'instruction primaire, 28 juin 1833*.
- Journal Officiel de la République Française (1880) *Loi du 27 Février 1880 relative au conseil supérieur de l'instruction publique et aux conseils académiques*. Paris, France.
- Journal Officiel de la République Française (1886). *Loi du 30 Octobre 1886 sur l'organisation de l'enseignement primaire*. Paris, France.
- Journal Officiel de la République Française. (1867). *Loi Duruy du 10 Avril 1867*. Paris, France.
- Journal Officiel de la République Française. (2005). *Loi d'Orientation 2005*. Paris, France.
- Killian, C. (2003). "The other side of the veil: north African women in France respond to the headscarf affair." *Gender and Society*: 17.4
- Loeffel, L. (2009). *Ecole, morale, laïque et citoyenneté aujourd'hui*. Villeneuve d'Ascq, France : Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
- Loeffel, L. (2009). *Enseigner la démocratie : Nouveaux enjeux, nouveaux défis*. Paris, France : Armand Colin.
- Lorcerie, F. (2003). *L'école et le défi ethnique : Education et Intégration*. Paris, France : Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique.

- Ministère de l'éducation Nationale. (2008). *Programme de l'enseignement d'histoire-géographie-éducation civique ; class de troisième*. Paris, France
- Mougniotte, A. (1991). *Les Débuts de l'instruction civique en France*. Lyon, France : Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
- Mougniotte, A. & Vial, J. (1992) *D'hier à demain ; l'éducation civique et sociale*. Toulouse, France : Editions Eres.
- Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2011). Citizenship education and national identities in France and England: Inclusive or exclusive? *Oxford Review of Education*, 27 287-303
- Peltier-Barbier, M-L. (éd). (2004). *Dur pour les élèves, dur pour les enseignants, dur d'enseigner en ZEP*. Grenoble, France : La Pensée Sauvage Editions.
- Rey, B. & Staszewski, M. (2004). *Enseigner l'histoire aux adolescents : Démarches socioconstructivistes*. Bruxelles, Belge : De Boeck.
- Roche, G et al. (2002) *L'éducation civique aujourd'hui : Dictionnaire encyclopédique*. Paris, Issy-les-Moulineaux : ESF éditeur.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manuel for qualitative researchers*. London, England : Sage Publications.
- Thénard-Duvider, F. (éd). (2008). *L'enseignement des questions socialement vives en histoire et géographie*. Paris, France : ADAPT éditions.
- Weil, P. (2005). *La République et sa Diversité: Immigration, intégration, discriminations*. La République des Idées du Seuil.

Appendix A: Values, Principles, and Symbols in Civic Education

Three Core Values:

A value is a concept that determines the correct, moral, or appropriate mindset that one should have when addresses a particular issues. Values are not, by definition universal, and are relative both in terms of their meanings and their senses (Leleux & Rocourt, 2010, 81). Although France accepts the plurality of values and ethical norms, republican values are seen as the structuring values for all citizens when taking with civic actions. These republican values suppose a social consensus on common values, but students and parents may not universally hold Republican. The following values are defined according to French tradition.

Equality: Equality is one of the three values highlighted in the national motto “liberty, equality, fraternity.” Equality as a value is related to equality of rights. In civic education, equality is taught as a value, but is often contradicted by the reality of low-income students (Desquesnes, 2011, 50).

Liberty: Liberty is a value that guarantees that each citizen is allowed to live as individual, which adopting the norms of the group as their own. According to Déloye (1994, 99), to be a citizen in a Republic means accepted the restrictions the social state imposes on individual liberty to insure communal liberty

Fraternité: Fraternity creates the feeling of a singular and indivisible nation, in which there is solidarity of the national community and communalization of social life (Déloye, 1994, p.109). Fraternity works with all other values to promote the republican ideal of peace in the country and peace in the world (Mougniotte and Vial, 1992, 100).

Four Core Principles:

The principles of the Republic are intimately linked to the values, but refer to the four requirements for a functioning Republic. The four principles outlined below contain multiple sub-principles and concepts.

Civicism (social responsibility): Civicism is the aspiration for the ideals and values of being a good citizenship. Civicism includes respect for accepted rules, a benevolent relation to other people, courtesy and solidarity (Roche, 2002, p.39). According to Roche, it is the indispensable virtue of democracy. Civicism also includes the desire and capacity to interest one’s self in active participation (Mougniotte and Vial, 1992, p.81). The internalization of civicism develops understanding (tolerance and generosity), common attachment to social order, and a feeling of communal responsibility of a diverse society (Déloye, 1994, p.106).

Common culture (indivisibility): Common culture is essential to building a national community because it fosters a strong feeling of belonging to a group as a citizen (Déloye, 1994, p.109). The cultural community creates a feeling of patrimony because it integrates citizens on the ground of common values. Solidarity and cooperation are commonly included in the umbrella of this value (Mougniotte and Vial, 1992, pp.87-92). Citizens must use and share a

common culture, understand how to use Republican institutions, how to mobilize to support their interests, how to talk about their rights and how to know their rights (Dubet, 2004).

Democracy: Democracy is an umbrella concept that is treated as a value because democracy refers to democratic society, rather than a purely democratic political state (France is a Republic, not a Democracy) (Garcia and Leduc, 2004, p.52). The fundamental criterion of democracy are equality, liberty, fraternity, participation, social mobility, transparency, and conflict according to G. Democracy is fundamentally tied to civic education because citizens are responsible for perpetuating the democracy that produces citizens.

Laïcité: Laïcité is commonly translated as “secular” or “neutral,” but there is no equivalent concept in American English. Established with the Loi du 9 décembre 1905 relative à la séparation des Églises et de l'État, the law guarantees freedom of religious affiliation. The law for laïcité was born from a long social history in the 19th century of the Republic struggling to confine the church to the private sphere (DeJong and Glenn, 1996, p. 209). The law also guarantees that the State will not recognize, fund, or provide the salaries for any religious group and prohibits the overt display of religious symbols in State and public spaces (Journal National de la République Française, 1905).

Five National Symbols

The following six symbols represent various values and principles of the French Republic. All citizens are expected to recognize and understand the significance of these symbols.

Marianne: Marianne is the French symbol of liberty. She takes the form of woman representing liberty, reason and Justice

La Divise: The French national “motto” is “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.” The devise originated during the French Revolution, and summarizes the three core values of the Republic.

The rooster: The Rooster is a symbol of French heritage and history. The rooster was the symbol of Gaulle, and is intended to evoke a sentiment of national pride.

La Marseillaise: The Marseillaise is the French national anthem. Originally a war chant during the Revolution, the song represents freedom and democracy.

The three color flag: The flag is a national symbol of the country.

Appendix B: Observation Guide

Using this chart I noted when a term is mentioned, if it was mentioned by the teacher or the student, and in what capacity this term was mentioned: For example, if a student references jus soli while answering a question about how French citizenship is granted, I marked, « Nationalité, citoyenneté française et citoyenneté européenne » and the student box, and wrote “answer-jus soli.” In the teacher box I would write “question- how is citizenship granted.”

	Professeur	Etudiants
Les valeurs, les principes et les symboles de la République		
Les fondements de la citoyenneté et de la nationalité		
L'importance de la langue nationale		
Nationalité, citoyenneté française et citoyenneté européenne		
Diversité		
Le lien entre les droits politiques et la nationalité		
La nature des droits civils, économiques et sociaux accordés à tous les habitants installés sur le territoire national		
L'existence de droits relevant de la citoyenneté européenne		
Le droit de vote		
La vie politique		
les institutions de la Ve République		

La décentralisation		
Les partis politiques		
Le citoyen et les différentes formes de participation démocratique		
La vie sociale		
Les syndicats, les élections professionnelles		
Les groupements d'intérêts.		
L'opinion publique et les médias		
La diversité et le rôle des médias		
Les sondages d'opinion		
La recherche de la paix, la sécurité collective		
La coopération internationale		
La Défense et l'action internationale de la France		

Appendix C: Interview Guides

Interview Guide (English Version)

Good afternoon/evening, my name is Anna Shapiro. I am interested to learn more about citizenship education in French middle schools. Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today about your experiences as a teacher of history, geography and citizenship.

1. How long you have been teaching in general, and how long you have been teaching at this school?
 - a. How would you describe the student body at this school?
 - i. **Prompt:** Socioeconomic level? Ethnic composition? Religious background? Family background?
 - b. How would you describe the relationship between teachers and administration at this school?
 - i. **Prompt:** Open dialogue? Cooperation?
 - c. How would you describe the relationship between teachers and students at this school?

2. Have you taught at other schools prior to teaching here?
 - i. How many?
 - ii. Where?
 - iii. For how long?
 - iv. How did the social fabric of those schools compare to your current school?
 - v. Did you teach history-geography-civics at your previous schools as well?

3. As a teacher in the history, geography, civics program, what does “citizenship” mean to you?
 - a. The national program (2009) states the goal of citizenship education in college as “to understand the contemporary world and act as a free and responsible person, to be present and active in the within the city, to compel knowledge of the world in it’s diversity and evolution.” Do you agree with this definition of citizenship?
 - i. If not, how would you redefine citizenship?

4. The national curriculum also identifies many of the values and principles of the French state that are taught through the civic education curriculum. How would you define French values?
 - a. Could you list some of these values?
 - b. Why would you classify these as French values?

5. How would you assess the curriculum goals set forth by the Ministry of Education for teaching students the values and skill sets needed to be responsible citizens?
 - a. Do you believe that the history, geography, civics program in the third year is an effective way to teach these values to students?
 - i. **If no:** How do you think adolescents should learn about citizenship?

- b. Do you think that students value French values more highly after the 3rd year than when they enter?
6. History and civic education are in the same curriculum created by the ministry of education. Are you in agreement with this pairing?
 - a. Why?
7. Do you find that you teach concepts of civic education during history lessons?
 - a. Could you give me some examples?
8. Do you find that student achieve differently in lessons on citizenship that are anchored in history lessons than the lessons on citizenship taught from the civic education curriculum?
 - a. If yes: Why do you think this is true?
 - b. If no: Do you think that students are aware that they are learning civic education lessons during their history lessons?
9. In what ways do you think that history lessons that contain concepts of citizenship teach these concepts of citizenship and democracy differently?
 - a. More successful?
 - b. Less successful?
10. In what ways do you think your students act as citizens now and what actions do you think they'll take in the future?
 - a. In what ways do students demonstrate that they understand or internalize French values?
11. In what ways might it be similar or different to prepare students from different family backgrounds to be citizens through the history-geography-civic curriculum?
 - a. Are there particular challenges?
 - b. Are there particular opportunities?
12. Have you observed that students of diverse family backgrounds achieve differently on assessments in the history-geography-civics program?
 - a. In what ways do they achieve differently?
 - b. What factors do you think contribute to this difference in achievement?
 - c. **Prompt:** *In what ways do you think your students receive messages about citizenship from their families? Cultural groups? Might these messages be similar to or different from what the school is teaching about citizenship?*
13. How do you think the citizenship education could be redesigned to better accommodate students from different family backgrounds?

Interview Guide (French Version)

Bonjour/Bonsoir. Je m'appelle Anna Shapiro. Je m'intéresse à apprendre plus sur l'éducation civique au collège en France. Merci de me parler aujourd'hui de vos expériences comme un enseignant/euse d'histoire, géographie et citoyenneté.

1. Combien d'années est-ce que vous avez enseigné en général, et combien d'années est-ce que vous avez enseigné en cette école ?
 - a. Comment décririez-vous le corps étudiant à cette école?
 - i. Niveau socioéconomique ? Composition ethnique ? Milieux religieux ? Milieux familiaux ?
 - b. Comment décririez-vous les relations entre les professeurs et l'administration ici?
 - i. Négociation ouverte? La coopération ?
 - c. Comment décririez-vous les relations entre les professeurs et les étudiants ici?
2. Avez-vous enseigné dans des autres écoles avant cette école?
 - a. Combien/Où?
 - b. Pendant combien de temps ?
 - c. Comment compareriez-vous les mœurs de là-bas aux mœurs d'ici?
 - d. Enseignez-vous l'histoire, la géographie et la citoyenneté aux écoles précédentes aussi ?
3. Comme un professeur d'histoire, de la géographie et de la citoyenneté, qu'est-ce que c'est la signification de « citoyenneté » selon vous ?
 - a. Le programme du ministère d'éducation spécifie que le but de l'éducation civique en collège est « de comprendre le monde contemporain et agir sur lui en personne libre et responsable, être présent et actif au sein de la cité, exiger la connaissance du monde dans la diversité et son évolution. » Est-ce que vous êtes d'accord avec cette définition de l'éducation civique ?
 - i. Si non, selon vous, qu'est-ce que c'est le but de l'éducation civique ?
4. Le programme national aussi identifie les valeurs et les principes de l'état français qui sont enseignés par le programme de la citoyenneté. Comment est-ce que vous définiriez les valeurs françaises ?
 - a. Pouvez-vous faire une liste de quelques valeurs ?
 - b. Pourquoi les avez-vous classifiées comme ça ?
5. Comment évaluez-vous les objectifs présentés par le ministère d'éducation pour enseigner aux étudiants les valeurs et connaissances nécessaires d'être des citoyens responsables ?
 - a. Croyez-vous que le programme d'histoire, géographie, et civique dans la troisième année est une façon effective pour enseigner ces valeurs, principes et connaissances aux étudiants ?
 - i. Si non, comment peuvent les étudiants apprendre ce qu'est la citoyenneté ?
 - b. Pensez-vous que les étudiants valorisent les valeurs françaises plus après la troisième année qu'au début ?

6. L'histoire et l'éducation civique sont dans le même programme créé par le ministère d'éducation. Etes-vous d'accord avec ce groupement?
 - a. Pourquoi ?
7. Trouvez-vous que vous enseignez des concepts de la citoyenneté pendant les cours d'histoire ?
 - a. Pouvez-vous me donner des exemples ?
8. Trouvez-vous que les étudiants réagissent différemment aux cours de la citoyenneté qui sont ancrés dans les cours d'histoire que les cours enseignés pendant le programme civique ?
 - a. Si oui, pourquoi pensez-vous que c'est comme ça ?
 - b. Si non, Pensez-vous que les étudiants sont conscients que les cours de la citoyenneté sont ancrés dans les cours d'histoire ?
9. Selon vous, dans quelles manières les cours d'histoire qui contiennent des concepts de la citoyenneté enseignent les concepts de la citoyenneté et démocratie différemment ?
 - a. Plus réussies ?
 - b. Moins réussies ?
10. Comment pensez-vous que vos étudiants agissent comme les citoyens maintenant, et quelles mesures pensez-vous qu'ils prendront dans l'avenir ?
 - a. Comment démontrent-ils qu'ils comprennent ou internalisent les valeurs françaises qui sont enseignées ?
11. Dans quelles façons peut-il être similaire ou différent à préparer les élèves des milieux différents d'être un citoyen ?
 - a. Est-ce qu'il y a des challenges particuliers ?
 - b. Est-ce qu'il ya des opportunités particulières ?
12. Avez-vous observé que les élèves des milieux pas français réussissent mieux dans les contrôles du programme Histoire Géographie Civique?
 - a. Dans quelles façons ?
 - b. Quels éléments, selon vous, contribuent à cette différence de réussite?
 - c. Dans quelles façons pensez-vous que vos élèves reçoivent les messages sur la citoyenneté de leurs familles ? Groupes culturels ? Peuvent-ils être similaires ou différents de ce qu'on apprend à l'école ?
13. Dans quelle manière peut l'éducation civique être modifiée pour s'adapter mieux aux élèves pas français ?

Appendix D: Sample Code Sheets

Sample Interview and Observation Codes:

Value Transmission (V): The perceived role in transmitting civic education values

Role of the professor (V.1)

Role of the family (V.2)

Role of civics program (V.3)

Role of history program (V.4)

Role of society (V.5)

Problems with civic education (P): Perceived difficulties with the curriculum

Time (P.1)

Maturity of students (P.2)

Depth of material (P.3)

Complicated (P.4)

“Heaviness” (P.5)

Program is “boring” (P.6)

Ability to relate (P.7)

Room for Debate (P.8)

Personal desire to learn (P.9)

Abstractness of program (P.10)

“Current-ness” of program (P.11)

Class size and Organization (P.12)

Internalizing the Material (P.13)

Sub-material of History (P.14)

Sample Textbook Codes

Area 1: The Republic and Citizenship

Values of the Republic

Principles of the Republic

Symbols of the Republic

Foundations of citizenship and nationality

Importance of the National Language

Area 2: Democratic Life

Political life

Institutions of the fifth republic

Decentralization

European parliament

Political parties

Political participation

Area 3: Defense and Peace

National defense

International action of France

Mission of national defense in the contemporary European context

Missions of national defense in the contemporary world context

Current risks to national defense

Notion of global defense

French engagements in Europe