

Volume 2

**CIVIC LEARNING  
IN  
TEACHER EDUCATION**

---

**International Perspectives  
on  
Education for Democracy  
in the  
Preparation of Teachers**

---

**Edited by  
*John J. Patrick,  
Gregory E. Hamot,  
and  
Robert S. Leming***

Volume 2

**CIVIC LEARNING  
IN  
TEACHER EDUCATION**

---

**International Perspectives  
on  
Education for Democracy  
in the  
Preparation of Teachers**

---

*Edited by*  
*John J. Patrick,*  
*Gregory E. Hamot,*  
*and*  
*Robert S. Leming*



The ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education  
and the Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse for International Civic Education  
in Association with Civitas:  
An International Civic Education Exchange Program

## Ordering Information

This publication is available from:

ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education

Indiana University

2805 East Tenth Street, Suite 120

Bloomington, Indiana, U.S.A. 47408-2698

Toll-free Telephone: (800) 266-3815

Telephone: (812) 855-3838

Fax: (812) 855-0455

Electronic Mail: <ericso@indiana.edu>

World Wide Web: <<http://ericso.indiana.edu>>

ISBN 0-941339-28-9

This publication was developed and published in 2003 at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education (ERIC/ChESS) and its Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse for International Civic Education at the Social Studies Development Center (SSDC) of Indiana University. This project has been funded at least in part with Federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education under contract number ED-99-CO-0016. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Support was also provided for the printing and distribution of this publication with a subgrant to the SSDC from the Center for Civic Education (CCE) through Civitas: An International Civic Education Exchange Program, which is administered by the CCE in Calabasas, California with funding from the U.S. Department of Education under the Education for Democracy Act approved by the United States Congress. The program is implemented worldwide in cooperation with the United States Department of State. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the Center for Civic Education or the U.S. Department of Education.

Civitas: An International Civic Education Exchange Program is a consortium of leading organizations in civic education in the United States and other nations. The Center for Civic Education, directed by Charles N. Quigley, coordinates and administers the Civitas program. The United States Department of Education supports the program, which has been conducted in cooperation with the United States Department of State and its affiliated offices throughout the world. Civitas enables civic educators from the United States of America and cooperating countries to learn from and help each other in improving civic education for democracy.



ERIC, Educational Resources Information Center,  
*is an information system within the U.S. Department of Education.*

# Contents

Preface	v
Contributors	vii
Introduction	1
1 Defining, Delivering, and Defending a Common Education for Citizenship in a Democracy <i>John J. Patrick</i>	5
2 Teaching for the Meaningful Practice of Democratic Citizenship: Learning from the IEA Civic Education Study in 28 Countries <i>Judith Torney-Purta and Wendy Klandl Richardson</i>	25
3 Using Research about Civic Education to Improve Courses in the Methods of Teaching Social Studies <i>Patricia G. Avery</i>	45
4 Civic and Economic Education: The Nexus <i>Margaret Stimmann Branson</i>	67
5 Using United States Supreme Court Cases to Promote Civic Learning in Social Studies Teacher Education <i>Thomas S. Vontz and Robert S. Leming</i>	75
6 The Deliberative Approach to Education for Democracy: Problems and Possibilities <i>Walter C. Parker</i>	99
7 Methods of Teaching Democracy to Teachers and Curriculum Developers: Examples from Post-Communist Europe <i>Gregory E. Hamot</i>	117
8 Civic Learning in Teacher Education through an American-Ukrainian Partnership <i>Alden Craddock</i>	139

9	Civic Learning in Teacher Education: An Example of Collaboration by Russians and Americans <i>Charles S. White</i>	157
10	Teacher Theorizing in Civic Education: An Analysis of Exemplary Teacher Thinking in the United States and Hungary <i>Jeffrey W. Cornett and Janos Setenyi</i>	177
11	Civic Learning in Teacher Education: The Hungarian Experience <i>Janos Setenyi</i>	205
12	Civic Learning in Teacher Education through an American-Indonesian Partnership <i>Margaret Sutton, Isnarmi Moeis, and Wendy Gaylord</i>	227 ✓
	Conclusion: Recommendations for Enhanced Civic Learning in Teacher Education <i>Gregory E. Hamot</i>	237
	Appendix: Participants in the 2002 R. Freeman Butts Institute on Civic Learning in Teacher Education	241

# Preface

The contents of this volume were derived from the second annual R. Freeman Butts Institute on Civic Learning in Teacher Education, which was sponsored by the Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California and conducted by the Social Studies Development Center of Indiana University, Bloomington. This international meeting occurred at the University Place Conference Center in Indianapolis, Indiana from May 17-21, 2002. Participants in this international meeting were professors and leaders in civic education from universities and curriculum centers in various parts of the United States and in eight other countries: Estonia, Hungary, Indonesia, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, and Ukraine.

The central theme of this meeting was education for democratic citizenship in the university-based education of prospective social studies teachers. We assume that improving education for democracy in programs of teacher preparation is a key to improving teaching and learning of democracy in elementary and secondary schools. If prospective teachers of the social studies are to be effective educators for democracy, then they must know what it is, how to do it, and why it is good.

The speakers at our five-day meeting variously proposed core content and pedagogical practices for the civic foundations of teacher education programs. Papers presented by these speakers have become the twelve chapters of this book.

Spirited discussions followed each formal presentation, and each day's program was concluded with intense focus-group discussions during which participants exchanged ideas about civic education in teacher education and offered recommendations about how to develop civics-centered teacher education courses and programs. A summary of recommendations and reactions of the participants is presented in the concluding part of this book.

We express gratitude to Gerardo Gonzalez, Dean of the Indiana University School of Education, for his strong endorsement of our work to renew and improve civic learning in the education of prospective social studies teachers. He officially opened this meeting of The Institute with an inspirational speech about the values of democracy and the importance of teaching them effectively to each generation of Americans. His remarks set the tone and terms for the successful meeting that ensued.

We appreciate the support of The Institute by Patrick Shoulders of Indiana University's Board of Trustees. He was the keynote speaker for the 2002 R. Freeman Butts Institute on Civic Learning in Teacher Education. Patrick Shoulders spoke eloquently and compellingly about the global resurgence of democracy and the importance of education for responsible citizenship

in maintaining and improving democratic institutions in the United States and abroad. We were honored by his presence at our meeting.

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions to The Institute by the Center for Civic Education and by the Social Studies Development Center of Indiana University. The Center for Civic Education provided funding to support The Institute, and the CCE cooperated with the Social Studies Development Center to plan, organize, and conduct the five-day program. In particular, we are grateful to Charles N. Quigley, Executive Director of the Center for Civic Education, for his support of The Institute. Without his help, The Institute could not have happened. And we express appreciation to Janet Hunter, Director of the Indiana Program for Law-Related Education at the Social Studies Development Center, for her work as a manager of The Institute.

We acknowledge the resources provided for the development and publication of this book by Civitas: An International Civic Education Exchange Program and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education at the Social Studies Development Center of Indiana University.

We emphatically acknowledge our debt to R. Freeman Butts, a distinguished scholar and advocate of education for citizenship in a democracy. He had a long and productive career as a professor in the foundations of education at Teachers College of Columbia University. After his retirement from Teachers College, he became the Hanna Distinguished Visiting Scholar of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. Among his many awards is an honorary doctoral degree in 1993 from the School of Education of Indiana University. Professor Butts' ideas on civic education—expressed in such notable publications as *The Revival of Civic Learning*, *The Morality of Democratic Citizenship*, and *The Civic Mission in Educational Reform*—have been catalysts of our work. Through his published works on civic education and his personal interactions with us, Professor Butts stimulated our conceptualization of The Institute and shaped the organization and execution of its meetings of prominent civic educators and teacher educators. We are proud that our annual meeting, the source of the chapters in this book, is titled the R. Freeman Butts Institute on Civic Learning in Teacher Education.

John J. Patrick, Gregory E. Hamot, and Robert S. Leming, 15 March 2003

# Contributors

*Patricia G. Avery* is a Professor in the College of Education and Human Development, The University of Minnesota.

*Margaret Stimmann Branson* is Associate Director of the Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California.

*Jeffrey W. Cornett* is Chair and Professor of the Department of Educational Research, Technology, and Leadership, The University of Central Florida, Orlando.

*Alden Craddock* is an Assistant Professor in the College of Education, Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio. He was Director of the Civic Education Program of the Mershon Center at The Ohio State University.

*Wendy Gaylord* is a doctoral student in the School of Education of Indiana University, Bloomington.

*Gregory E. Hamot* is an Associate Professor in the College of Education of The University of Iowa.

*Robert S. Leming* is Director of the *We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution* program at the Center for Civic Education in Calabasas, California.

*Isnarmi Moeis* is a Professor in Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia.

*Walter C. Parker* is a Professor in the College of Education and an Adjunct Professor of Political Science of The University of Washington.

*John J. Patrick* is a Professor in the School of Education of Indiana University, Bloomington, where he is also Director of the Social Studies Development Center and Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

*Wendy Klandl Richardson* is a member of the IEA Civic Education Study Research Team in the Department of Human Development in the College of Education of The University of Maryland, College Park.

*Janos Setenyi* is Director of the Civitas Association, Hungary in Budapest.



*Margaret Sutton* is an Assistant Professor in the School of Education of Indiana University, Bloomington.

*Judith Torney-Purta* is a Professor of Human Development in the College of Education of The University of Maryland, College Park and Chair of the International Steering Committee for the IEA Civic Education Study.

*Thomas S. Vontz* is an Assistant Professor of Education at Rockhurst University in Kansas City.

*Charles S. White* is an Associate Professor in the School of Education of Boston University.

# Introduction

*John J. Patrick, Gregory E. Hamot, and Robert S. Leming*

The second annual R. Freeman Butts Institute on Civic Learning in Teacher Education, which met in Indianapolis from May 17-21, 2002, was the source of this book. Papers presented during the sessions of The Institute have become Chapters 1-12.

The Institute manifests the global surge of education for citizenship in a democracy. It began with the fall of communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe and the republics of the Soviet Union, which prompted an interest in constitutional democracy and civil liberty among people emerging from decades of despotism. The rise of democracy and liberty in Central and Eastern Europe influenced people across the globe. Thus, at the beginning of the twenty-first century nearly 65 percent of the world's population in 120 countries lived with governments that were more or less democratic; some were full-blown democracies, while others were building the conditions of democracy.

The global movement toward democracy and education for democratic citizenship has stimulated American civic educators to renew and improve their principles and practices of civic education. As Americans worked with civic educators in Central and Eastern Europe and other parts of the world to develop curricular frameworks and instructional materials, they examined various strategies by which to promote education for democracy. Prominent among the strategies was implementation of civic education for democracy in the pedagogical institutes and universities that educate prospective teachers. In pursuit of this strategy, our colleagues in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Russia, and Ukraine, among other countries, asked Americans for exemplary syllabi and programs for the education of prospective teachers. They expected to find numerous models of education for democracy in American colleges and universities, which they could adapt for use in their own teacher education programs.

Americans have responded with various examples of courses in social foundations of education and methods of teaching. They also cautioned colleagues abroad to think creatively, freshly, and independently about how to develop education for democracy in their pedagogical institutes and universities and in their elementary and secondary schools. Through these international experiences, Americans have been prompted to re-examine and re-think ideas and practices about civic education in the preparation of social studies teachers and in the development of curriculum and instruction for students in grades K-12.

International interactions revealed that civic educators throughout the world are very concerned about the place of civic education within teacher education and want to renew and reform it. Thus, we invited colleagues from America and abroad to meet with us for five-days (May 17-21, 2002) in Indianapolis to discuss civic education in the preparation of teachers. The discussions focused on such topics as the rationale for civic learning in teacher education, content at the core of civic education, conceptualization of civic education, research-based instructional strategies and methods for teaching about democracy and citizenship, national and international assessments of civic learning, and international examples of education for democratic citizenship in the education of social studies teachers.

This book, Volume 2 in the set on "Civic Learning in Teacher Education," includes 12 chapters by Americans and their colleagues abroad; some of the chapter authors are, or have been, working in Armenia, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Indonesia, Russia, and Ukraine.

Chapter 1 by John J. Patrick defines education for citizenship in a democracy in terms of four components: civic knowledge, cognitive civic skills, participatory civic skills, and civic dispositions. Patrick demonstrates how his four-component model can be used to develop and deliver a core curriculum for elementary and secondary schools and programs of university-based teacher education. He proposes six recommendations for the improvement of civic education in grades K-12 of schools and in programs of teacher preparation. Finally, Patrick defends or justifies his conception of civic education and its implications for curriculum and instruction.

In Chapter 2, Judith Torney-Purta and Wendy Klandl Richardson discuss the IEA Civic Education Study, which assessed the civic knowledge and skills of 14-year-old students in 28 countries. They derive recommendations from this recent research for the improvement of curriculum and instruction in elementary and secondary schools and in programs of teacher preparation. The authors emphasize the importance of civic knowledge in the form of conceptual comprehension for the development of democratic civic skills and dispositions.

Chapter 3 by Patricia G. Avery is a review of research about civic education and its implications for improving the preparation of social studies teachers. Like Torney-Purta and Richardson in Chapter 2, Avery emphasizes that deep understanding of concepts in the theory and practice of democracy is a foundation for developing the civic skills and dispositions of democratic citizenship.

In Chapter 4, Margaret Stimmann Branson connects the subjects of economics and civics. Branson presents a rationale for the relationship of economics and civics in education for democratic citizenship in grades K-12 and in the preparation of social studies teachers.

## *Introduction*

Thomas S. Vontz and Robert S. Leming in Chapter 5 advocate the use of landmark Supreme Court cases as a staple of civic learning in the K-12 curriculum and in programs of teacher education. They present criteria by which to select cases for the curriculum, and they discuss various methods for teaching Supreme Court cases.

Chapter 6 by Walter C. Parker examines deliberative discussions in education for democracy. Parker conceptualizes deliberation, connects it to the theory and practice of education for democracy, and prescribes how to do it in K-12 classrooms and the inservice education of teachers.

Gregory E. Hamot in Chapter 7 uses his experiences in international curriculum projects in Armenia, Bulgaria, and the Czech Republic to propose a set of guidelines for teaching democracy to teachers and curriculum developers. Constant consideration of the socio-political context in each country forms the foundation of his guiding principles.

In Chapter 8, Alden Craddock describes the historical context for civic education in Ukraine. He also discusses a partnership between Ukrainians and Americans to develop programs in democracy for the education of teachers and students in elementary and secondary schools.

Charles S. White in Chapter 9 discusses the first year in the implementation of a civics-centered program of teacher preparation in Russian universities. This program involves partnerships between institutions of higher education in the Samara region of Russia and faculty of Boston University and Russell Sage College in Troy, New York.

In Chapter 10, Jeffrey W. Cornett and Janos Setenyi present the methods and findings of an ongoing qualitative research project on education for democratic citizenship in Hungary.

Chapter 11 by Janos Setenyi provides a case study of the challenges and achievements of education for democracy in a post-communist country, Hungary.

In Chapter 12, Margaret Sutton, Isnarmi Moeis, and Wendy Gaylord describe a partnership between faculty of Indiana University and Negeri Padang University in Indonesia. The objective of this partnership is to develop a civics-based program of teacher preparation that can be used in Indonesian universities.

Following Chapter 12, Gregory E. Hamot offers a conclusion that highlights recommendations and reactions in response to ideas and examples presented in the twelve chapters of this book. Participants in our meeting of May 17-21, 2002 deliberated daily in focus groups about the contents of papers presented to the plenary sessions. They recorded their reactions to the papers, and they offered recommendations for improvement of civic education in university-based programs of social studies teacher education.

We hope that the contents of this book, derived from the 2002 meeting in Indianapolis, will stimulate thought and deliberation among civic educators and teacher educators about how to improve the preparation of prospective social studies teachers. If so, our primary objective in organizing and conducting the May 2002 meeting and producing this book will be achieved.

# 12

---

## Civic Learning in Teacher Education through an American-Indonesian Partnership

*Margaret Sutton, Isnarmi Moeis, and Wendy Gaylord*

Indonesia has the fourth largest population in the world and as an archipelagic nation with thousands of islands stretching from Singapore to Australia, it presents great challenges in the form of its diversity of ethnic groups, cultures, languages, religions, and geographical location. Under the control of President Suharto for 31 years until 1998, the country is experiencing a period of reform and uncertainty as a result of the Asian economic crisis coupled with political instability after the resignation of Suharto. The recent acts of violence by small extremist groups further challenge Indonesia's state and citizens to move forward with democratic reforms.

Since the major political changes that took place in 1998, the nation has been undergoing a democratizing process in all aspects of public life, known in Indonesia as "Reformasi." Significant among these is the reform of the centralized 1994 K-12 curriculum in all subject areas. New curriculum was piloted in the 2001-2002 school year. Prior to 2001, all K-12 curriculum was formulated at the central Ministry of National Education (MONE) and provided a detailed scope and sequence of lesson plans. By contrast, the new curriculum is characterized by national standards to be elaborated by local educators. Thus, the standards movement in Indonesia promises higher levels of teacher autonomy and local curricular control than what has historically existed. Not only is the content changing to encompass democratic ideals, but the form itself is intended to be one dimension of the democratization of Indonesian education. This is the context in which the civic education curriculum is being reformed.

Nationwide diffusion of the new K-12 curriculum can be expected to take place over the next few years. However, the introduction of the new

curriculum has yet to be accompanied by wide-scale changes in teacher education. In all curricular reforms, such a mismatch between teacher education and new curriculum raises significant questions. In the case of the democratization of civic education, these questions grow in importance. At stake is not only the mastery of cognitive civic knowledge, or what Patrick (1999, 45) calls "intellectual capital for the engaged citizen," but also the learning of new participatory civic skills and dispositions, or "the social capital" for engaged citizenship (Patrick 1999, 50) that supports effective citizenship in a democracy.

Clearly, teachers play a critical role in fostering this new learning. However, in Indonesia as elsewhere, the education of teachers in new forms of intellectual and social capital for engaged citizenship is not taking place with the same speed and depth as the curricular reforms that they are meant to implement. The primary purpose of the project described in this chapter is to make some inroads into the process of supporting the changed needs of Indonesia's teacher educators to enhance the democratic knowledge and skills of the national teaching force. The project, "Partnership in Civic and Multicultural Teacher Education between Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia and the School of Education at Indiana University," is an institutional linkage project supported by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State. It supports collaboration between the School of Education at Indiana University Bloomington (IUB) and the department of Civic Education at the State University of Padang (UNP). Now in its third year, this project exposes faculty of UNP to knowledge and methods of democratic civic education in order to contribute to the process underway at UNP in support of reformed civic education. At the same time, it exposes IUB faculty and students to these processes, thus widening their knowledge of the complex processes and struggles underlying the democratization of civic education in post-authoritarian societies.

This paper will analyze the current status of teacher education in civic education in Indonesia. We begin with background on Indonesian civic education and recent changes to it. This is followed by a discussion of teacher education for civic education, which leads us to identify specific issues of concern. Finally, we will discuss international cooperative efforts underway to support the democratization of Indonesian teacher education in civic education.

### **Overview of Indonesian Civic Education**

Civic education as a school subject has been in the curriculum since the national education system began in the 1950s. The Indonesian education system includes many more subjects, up to 12 or more, than in the U.S., and they are therefore taught over a longer period of time in small amounts.

Civic education is compulsory for all students for all 12 years of school and for one year at the tertiary level. The content has changed over the years, but the aim has always been nation-building through the development of loyal citizens, and the aim of national history has always been to create patriots. Particularly in the 1980s, the focus became strongly anti-communist and portrayed the military as saviors in the curriculum. Until recently, the curriculum has been centralized, with one national K-12 curriculum that has been revised in 1975, 1984, 1994, and 2002.

The content of the civic education can be found in two main courses in primary and middle school in the 1970s and 1980s:

- 1) PMP/PPKN or Pancasila Moral Education or Pancasila and Citizenship Education, presenting the philosophical basis of the nation and the moral principles that all Indonesian citizens should live by. The content of this course is a normative set of values that are presented for the students to make them good citizens. In 1999 the course was revised by eliminating some of the lessons.
- 2) PSPB, the History of the National Struggle, a history course encouraging patriotism through a focus on the heroes and events of the struggle for independence. This is a very interesting course as it looks at 300 years of national history as a continuous struggle of the state against enemies—first, externally, the Dutch colonizers, and then, internally, the communists and regional separatists (van Klinken 2002). This course was discontinued in 1999 in the aftermath of Suharto's resignation.

Other K-9 courses with a heavy civic education content include Social Studies (IPS) and National History.

At the senior secondary level streaming takes place, with students going into vocational/technical or general academic schools. Within the academic schools there are math/science, humanities and social science streams. However, all students take a common core of Indonesian language, religion, Pancasila/PMP, and history.

Changes in the 2002 curriculum include decentralization of the authority for curriculum content to the district (i.e., below the province level). The national curriculum now comprises standards, similar to the national framework or state standards in the United States of America, that are to be elaborated locally to suit the diverse conditions and regions of the country.

Issues with these changes include the amount of autonomy teachers will have, the availability of textbooks (will the textbook companies determine the content in a *de facto* manner?), testing, and support for teachers from the Ministry of National Education. Changes in the content of civic education include the elimination of some clearly ideological lessons, such as those considered to be promoting militaristic and unthinking actions. For example, the topics of *ketaatan* (obedience) and *rela berkorban* (willingness to sacrifice)



have already been eliminated in the 1999 revisions. Other changes in the new curriculum are the inclusion of topics related to human rights and democracy and development of the skills for participation in democracy.

A critical issue for the new curriculum is the changing state of the Indonesian political, social, and economic context. The Constitution is in the process of being amended, the court system is widely discredited, and the Asian economic crisis has caused many people to grasp for any financial gains they can find through legal and extralegal channels. With a suddenly free press after 1998, these changes are not going unnoticed.

Power is in the hands of the rich and the military continues to have great influence despite the election of a non-military president. Regional autonomy is both exacerbating and ameliorating some of the problems as local officials struggle to establish their authority. The change from brutal denial of the possibility of conflict and disagreement in society for the sake of national unity to acceptance and learning to deal with it is a difficult process that is now underway. Moreover, acts of violence by small extremist groups, including the bombing of churches on Christmas Eve 2001 and the recent bombings in Bali and Manado, both communities of religious minorities, are testing the climate of religious tolerance that has characterized the Indonesian nation and culture.

In the post-1998 period of reform teachers have been accused of lying to students; they have requested evacuation from places such as East Timor (now an independent nation) and Papua (or Irian Jaya) because the national history did not include their own histories, and a critical reaction to the content of the history and civic education courses has given rise to public debate. Suddenly, multiculturalism is important. Unlike the past, when race, religion, and ethnicity were taboo subjects, they are not critical issues. Indonesian teachers, particularly teachers of civics, want and need support to develop their own competence to facilitate discussions of potentially divisive social issues such as these.

### **Teacher Education for Civic Education**

In Indonesia, teacher education has been conducted by Teacher Training Institutes or IKIPs, of which there were 27 in the early 1990s, spread throughout the provinces, and holding the status of other four-year colleges and universities. With Reformasi have come changes in the university system, including the transformation of some IKIPs from an exclusive focus on teacher education to a mandate to offer college level studies in other areas, or in other words, to become universities. This change responds to social demands for wider access to higher education. For the IKIP Padang, like others such as the IKIPs in Bandung and Jakarta, the expansion of authority to teach subjects other than education has led to a renaming of

the institution itself. Thus, the IKIP Padang is now named Universitas Negeri Padang (UNP) or Padang State University. In addition to the faculty of education, UNP now encompasses faculties of language, literature and art; social sciences; math and natural sciences; technology; and sports. Within this structure, teacher preparation in civic education takes place in the department of civic education of the Faculty of Social Sciences. All teacher education students are required to take a basic course in civic education. In addition, a teacher preparing to specialize in civic education at UNP will receive courses from three divisions of the university: the general studies division, the division of education sciences, and the department of civic education, within the division of social sciences. Approximately 70 percent of courses are in the student's specialty, such as civic education, with 30 percent drawn from other fields.

Teacher educators in Indonesia are currently operating under interim guidelines from the MONE, while teachers in the schools are teaching from the 1999 revision of the 1994 curriculum. For in-service civics teachers, this encompasses directives to eliminate the most ideologically biased lessons in the old civic education curriculum. Teacher educators, in reaction to this revision, have adapted aspects of their programs. All of the interim changes are technical in nature. Changes have taken place in such courses as micro-teaching, evaluation, and lesson planning. In 2001, a new directive to teacher educators foreshadowed the changes to come. PK 232/2001 emphasizes competency-based education. It also stipulates that 60 percent of the content of teacher education programs will be developed by the universities, a radical departure from historical practice. All subjects are to be developed under the core standards that are issued by MONE. The new core standard is Decree No. 232-2001 by MONE. The basis on which faculty at UNP and elsewhere will develop new curricula in civic education is the new K-12 Curriculum for Civic Education, which, as noted above, is still in the process of being finalized.

Further directives will be issued by MONE once the new curriculum has been finalized. At present, the possible character of these directives is murky. One major unknown is how much focus will be placed on pedagogy, a crucial factor in changing civic education for democratic citizenship. In addition, it is likely that teacher education institutions will be in a reactive position. That is, having little or no input into the design of the curriculum, teacher educators will be required to develop appropriate material to prepare teachers for teaching it.

To anticipate the development of the new K-12 curriculum, there has been a workshop for developing new curriculum at the UNP Civic Education Department. It focused on changing the subject matter of UNP civic education courses to meet the needs of the new curriculum, particularly in regard to

the development of a competency-based curriculum for the Civic Education teacher education department rather than on theory.

### **Critical Issues in Teacher Education for Civic Education**

As the discussions above have indicated, this is a period of transformation for civic education in Indonesia, in form, content, goals, and methods, with a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the specifics of these changes. All teachers and teacher educators are faced with the reality of moving towards a new definition of curriculum. As in the United States, a systemic change to standards-based curriculum will call on teachers to approach subjects differently and therefore for teacher education to change in content and method. The mechanisms for curriculum development under this new approach are as yet unclear. Who will develop textbooks and lessons? What input will teachers and educators have in the process? And, like all Indonesians, teachers and teacher educators are grappling on a daily basis with the meaning of democracy and how to promote it in Indonesian society and culture.

For civics teachers, the changes and challenges are acute. For forty years, civics teachers in Indonesia have been charged with conveying fixed ideological messages, including some that clearly conflicted with social reality, such as that economic justice is a foundation of Indonesian society. In the new era of Reformasi, civics teachers are now being asked to promote critical thinking, democratic values and skills, and some level of multicultural awareness. Civics teachers and civics teacher educators alike are grappling with both the “what” and the “how” of the new civic education. On the side of intellectual capital, democratization demands new course content in the preparation of the nation’s teachers of civics. It will be necessary for teacher educators to develop course content focused on fundamental concepts of democracy and their application in different contexts. At the same time, teachers and teacher educators in the field of civics realize that teacher methods must change in order to effectively convey this content and even more so, to promote skills of democratic deliberation and dispositions towards engagement in political life.

### **International Cooperation**

Indonesia’s efforts to democratize civic education are eliciting interest and support from international agencies. Out-of-school civic education efforts are being supported in the form of voter education, media training, and support for legal reforms by the Asia Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and government aid agencies from the United States of America, Australia, Japan, and the Netherlands.

In schools, the Asia Foundation and the Ford Foundation have supported the Jakarta State Institute of Islamic Studies in its program to develop a one-semester civic education program to promote democratic values (*Chronicle of High Education* 2001) for tertiary level Islamic Institute students, intended to replace the Kewiraan (Military Studies) course that promoted military values and patriotism.

Currently the only internationally supported national effort in public schools is one being undertaken by the MONE in collaboration with the international program of the Center for Civic Education (CCE), funded by USAID, to introduce local adaptations of programs such as *Project Citizen* and *Foundations of Democracy* into middle and elementary schools. Piloted over the past two years, the Indonesian version of *Project Citizen* has been incorporated into the new curriculum as a required extra-curricular component. The elementary level *Foundations of Democracy* was being adapted to fit into the new curriculum framework in late 2002.

For international collaboration in support of democratic civic education to be most effective, it is critical for international actors to understand the wider context of civic education reform, and particularly, the current situation of Indonesia's teachers and the nature of the new demands being made upon them. As this paper has suggested, today's Indonesian teaching force is as yet unprepared for the challenge of supporting democracy through civic education. Like their compatriots, Indonesia's teachers grew up in a context of political repression that stifled critical discussion. Both inservice and preservice teachers in Indonesia need multiple opportunities to explore the meaning of democracy in their own lives, their communities, and their nation. No matter how much curricular content changes in civic education, and the changes may be less than the continuities, Indonesia's civic educators need time and support to collectively rethink the fundamental purposes of civic education. Otherwise, deeply ingrained habits and cultural practices like rote learning of principles are likely to kick in.

And, as noted above, it is not only civic educators but all Indonesian teachers and teacher educators who need such opportunities to reflect critically on the meanings of democracy and its implications for teaching and learning. To take teacher educators first, our analysis shows how important it is that not only those who instruct in the field of civic education, but indeed all teacher educators, must be provided opportunities to deepen their own understandings of democracy in relation to education. As in all subject fields, students aspiring to become teachers of civic education take only a small proportion of their classes in the department of civic education. If it is only through these courses that preservice teachers are encouraged to think about democracy and to implement teaching practices supportive of the development of democratic dispositions, then those lessons are likely

to be swamped by the "standard" messages simply to cover the curriculum and manage the classroom. Thus, we urge international actors in the reform of Indonesian civic education to engage with *all* teacher educators, regardless of their subject specialty.

This engagement includes, in the first place, providing opportunities for critical reflection on the meaning of democracy in society and in education. As we have argued above, it must also go beyond concepts and curricular content to encompass pedagogy. Teaching habits are notoriously resistant to change, but change they must if the Indonesian education system is to make its fullest possible contribution to the realization of democracy in Indonesian society. As leaders in civic education have noted, classroom practices are at least as important in the fostering of democratic dispositions as is the content being covered. Moreover, in the context of change and revitalization currently encompassing education in Indonesia, the time is ripe for wide-scale exposure of teacher educators to innovative teaching techniques. Indonesian teacher educators who specialize in civic education need the support of their colleagues throughout teacher education in modeling democratic and critical pedagogical techniques.

All efforts to adapt external models of civic education to Indonesia must be attentive to the unique history and cultures of Indonesia. Because the authoritarian rule of decades past stifled discussion of conflict and controversy, new techniques may need to be developed for raising and discussing controversial subjects such as multiculturalism. Multiculturalism itself is an example of what is uniquely Indonesian. Foreign-derived models of race and ethnic relations do not readily transfer to Indonesia. What is needed instead is the promotion of local efforts to understand and come to terms with the ethnic diversity of Indonesian society.

The IU-UNP program has begun to address, on a modest scale, some of the needs for reform of teacher education in conjunction with the democratization of civic education. To date, four Indonesian scholars have come to Indiana University for periods from four to ten weeks. Three of the scholars, including one of the authors, come from the Universitas Negeri Padang, and one from MONE. Their projects have included a research proposal for incorporating multiculturalism in civic education (Soemantrie 2001); an overview of civic education approaches in the U.S. (Ananda 2001); an analysis of democratic and critical pedagogy in civic education (Moeis 2001); and an analysis of the potential for conflict resolution approaches to be employed in Indonesian schools (Khadir 2001). These individual projects will be collected, along with other materials, into a handbook for teacher educators concerned with the democratization of education. At the same time, the project has supported workshops for UNP faculty to expose them to the ideas and approaches gleaned by the visiting scholars.

In the summer of 2002, the IU-UNP project supported a two-day workshop for teachers and teacher educators on active pedagogy for promoting skills of democratic deliberation and a one-day international seminar on multiculturalism and democracy in Indonesian education. Both events elicited widespread and enthusiastic participation. They also made clear the efforts that Indonesian teachers and teacher educators are making to come to terms with the democratization of civic education. Participants called for the creation of mechanisms to provide students with more choice over the content of their own education, for more and wider employment of active pedagogies, for experientially based education in the workings of democratic and civil society institutions, and for more emphasis on understanding diverse perspectives on social and political issues.

These activities are already beginning to influence practice in civic education classrooms in West Sumatra (Gaylord 2002). As importantly, the project is being carried forward in a newly democratizing university environment. The most significant indicator of this change, in terms of the project, was the decision this year to place full authority over the project in the hands of the Department of Civic Education, a radical departure from past practices at Indonesian universities, in which all projects are controlled by central administration. In addition, although finances and teaching responsibilities necessarily limit the number of faculty who can directly participate as Visiting Scholars, participation by UNP in this project has drawn this provincial institution into more direct contact with the reforms that are taking place at the level of the central government. This is a direct contribution to the process of widening participation in educational policy making and implementation.

The project has been indirectly hampered by extremist actions in other parts of the nation that have resulted in State Department travel advisories and travel bans at different points in the project, precluding the active participation of many Indiana University faculty as visiting scholars at UNP. Nevertheless, the basic momentum for change and wide-scale participation continues to benefit through the external linkage. For the remainder of the project, emphasis will be placed on engendering university-wide dialogue on democracy and education.

What remains to be seen is whether the critical issues facing Indonesia's democratizing efforts can be overcome by education. Teachers need to be prepared to undertake new tasks that they have never been asked to do before when they were prepared to be loyal civil servants in the service of the state. These include syllabus development from a national framework, management of classrooms for democracy and equity, professional development to promote autonomous, collaborative teaching and learning, and so on. For teachers to effectively address the conflicts in society with its increasingly

ethnic and economic challenges, new skills and knowledge are required. In particular the unique character of Indonesia's diversity and the social conflicts that are very different from those in the U.S. require careful attention by teachers and students alike. International collaborations, in the end, contribute the most when they prescribe the least, serving instead to provide ideas, models, and comparative cases for study by those who ultimately must make the real decisions about what is taught under the rubric of civic education, and how it is taught – Indonesia's teachers and teacher educators.

## References

- Ananda, Azwar. *The Education of Social Studies Teachers at the School of Education, Indiana University, With Possible Application at The State University of Padang*. Unpublished Research Report, 2001.
- Chronicle of High Education*. "Indonesia Tries Civic Education to Promote Democratic Values." PA41. 7/13/2001.
- Ministry of National Education. Decree No. 232. Jakarta, Indonesia, 2001.
- Gaylord, Wendy. Personal Communication. October 14, 2002.
- Khadir, Afriva. *School Peer-Mediation Program in the United States: Its Potencies and Implementation Possibilities as an Instrument in Conflict Resolution and Civic Education in Indonesia*. Unpublished Research Report, 2001.
- Moeis, Isnarmi. *Democratic Education: Concepts, Approaches, and Possible Application in Indonesian Context*. Unpublished Research Report, 2001.
- Patrick, John. "Education for Constructive Engagement of Citizens in Democratic Civil Society and Government." In *Principles and Practices of Education for Democratic Citizenship*, Charles F. Bahmueller and John J. Patrick, eds. Bloomington, IN: The ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 1999, 41-60.
- Soemantrie, Hermana. *A Critical Analysis of Multiculturalism in Indonesia and Its Impact Upon Elementary and Secondary Schools Citizenship Content and Teaching*. Unpublished Research Report, 2001.
- Universitass Negeri Padang. *Buku Pedoman Akademik Universtiass Negeri Padang*. Padang: UNP, 2001.
- Van Klinken, Gerry. "The Battle for History after Suharto: Beyond Sacred Dates, Great Men, and Legal Milestones." *Critical Asian Studies* 33 (September 2001): 323-350.