

1 Introduction

1.1 Study background

Citizenship education¹ is interpreted broadly as education for young people, which prepares them for their role as citizens in a democratic society by helping them develop political literacy, critical thinking, attitudes and values, and active participation (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012, 2017; Eurydice, 2005; Kerr, 2002; UNESCO, 1998). The global interest in the topic of citizenship and citizenship education almost never stops. This is evidenced by government reports, graduate theses and dissertations, academic books and articles, curricula and policy statements, and publications by professional associations. Many factors, such as globalization and neoliberalism, an increase in human migration and the formation of transnational communities, an increase in diversity within the nation-states and the demands to limit assimilationist and exclusionary policies in the sign of a move toward multiculturalism, could explain this global upsurge in attention to citizenship and citizenship education. Citizens' abilities to interpret and react to political issues are a prerequisite for an effective and stable democratic system. However, in linguistically and culturally diverse contexts, most democratic, pluralistic societies today commonly confront challenges and difficulties in shaping and developing citizenship education that "accommodates difference while still promoting the bonds, virtues and practices needed to develop a strong democratic nation" (Molina-Girón, 2012, p. 2), and Germany is no exception.

Citizenship has been identified in three dimensions: as a legal member status, as a political principle of democracy and as an identity (Co-

¹Various terms like "citizenship education", "civic education", "political education" and "democratic education" have been used for referring to education for this aim. In this dissertation, I would like to use the term "citizenship education".

hen, 1999; Déloye, 2011; Leydet, 2017). As a legal member status, citizenship creates a juridical relation between an individual and a political community (usually a nation-state) and confers rights and obligations to these individuals. In a democratic society, individual members—citizens of the community—are “the source of all authority” and “the legitimate basis of all power” (Patrick, 1999, p. 15); without citizens, a state cannot exist. Citizenship is a collection of rights, such as voting or compulsory school attendance, and obligations, such as paying taxes or military service (Bauböck, 1994; Janoski, 1998; Leary, 1999; Marshall, 1950). Citizens are entitled to equal rights in public affairs and, at the same time, equally undertake certain obligations.

As a political principle of democracy, citizenship provides citizens with the basic conditions of self-rule. Citizens are considered as political agents who express common interests in the public sphere and participate in societal and institutional deliberation and decision-making in a direct or indirect (such as through choosing representatives and voting) form.

As an identity, citizenship is able to foster a sense of shared membership and belonging to the community and then produce “solidarity, civic virtue and engagement” (Cohen, 1999, p. 248). Being different from other social and cultural identities such as the identity of religion, ethnicity, race or gender, civic identity is the single identity that is equally granted to all citizens of the community. The common civic values, rights and obligations bound people together regardless of their places of birth, ethnic or religious background. In a democracy, people are united and motivated to participate in public affairs based on a shared civic identity rather than other forms of identity. As Patrick (1999) argued, “In societies with widespread diversity in religious, racial, and ethnic identities (e.g., the U.S.A., Canada, and Australia), common civic identity is the tie that holds citizens together in a single democratic political order” (p. 17).

Granting citizenship to individuals is commonly based on the principle of *jus soli* (birthright) or *jus sanguinis* (right of blood) in different countries. Under the principle of *jus soli*, citizenship is conferred by

the place where a person was born; and following the principle of *jus sanguinis*, people acquire citizenship through their parents or ancestors (Joppke, 2010; Patrick, 1999; Weil, 2001). Many countries practice a mix of *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis*, such as the United States, Canada, Israel, Greece, Ireland and recently Germany. Further, many countries allow foreigners to apply for citizenship through naturalization (Bertocchi & Strozzi, 2010; Gilbertson, 2006). In Germany, the nationality law was completely grounded on *jus sanguinis* before 2000. After 2000, people could also obtain German nationality by *jus soli*. According to the amended Nationality Act, children born in Germany to non-German parents acquire German citizenship at birth if at least one parent has resided in Germany for at least eight years and has a permanent residence permit. Besides, people who marry a German citizen can also obtain citizenship by applying for naturalization on condition that the couple has been married for at least two years and has lived in Germany for at least three years.

The status of citizenship could be inherited through parents or by birthright. However, as Gould et al. (2011) pointed out, the knowledge concerned with citizenship, such as how government works and the rights and obligations of citizens, is not handed down through the gene pool, but rather through education; an educated citizenry is essential for a well-organized government and for maintaining democracy because only individuals who have that knowledge and intelligence can understand the concept and ideal of democracy and effectively participate in public affairs. In consideration of these views, the concept of citizenship education should aim to mold the youth into responsible and active citizens who are aware of their rights, who work for a society with a shared responsibility and who understand and respect democratic ideals. Citizenship education is the tool through which individuals can become citizens who are, in Gould et al.'s terms, "equipped with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to participate in the life of their nation" (Gould et al., 2011, p. 15), and the widespread insufficiencies of democracy could be improved.

Undoubtedly, developing responsible and active citizens is part of the aim of education in any democratic society. In many countries, the knowledge dissemination and the civic mission of schools have been put at the heart of public education by constitutions. Dewey (1916) also stressed the civic purposes of education in the democratic process of a country and believed that education should aim at preparing young people to be full and active participants in all aspects of democratic life. Because of the connection with the greatest number of citizens in the “laboratories of democracy”, schools are considered to be the most effective carrier and main channel of achieving the educational goal and impacting more citizens in a more sustained way than nearly any other social institution (Dewey, 1938; Parker, 1996). As educational venues where most people spend long periods of life, schools lay a solid talent foundation for economic growth and social development and provide access to reducing poverty and inequality. Moreover, schools provide an important context for the learning and exercise of democratic citizenship, as well as reflecting concerns that matter to society and that involve different dimensions of citizenship education, such as human rights education, media literacy, education for gender equality, intercultural education, education for defense and security, financial education and law education. It is this undertaking of civic mission that regards schools as the “guardians of democracy” (Gould et al., 2011, p. 6).

Inevitably, globalization is interacting and creating an impact on schools in terms of the understanding and teaching of citizenship. Within the context of globalization, citizenship is experiencing unprecedented and severe challenges. The territorial borders are becoming increasingly blurred, and the functions of states are being weakened. With an increasing number of countries recognizing and permitting multiple citizenship, millions of people are considered as citizens of more than one country; meanwhile, more people do not have citizenship of any country because of wars, or racial, ethnic, religious or linguistic reasons. In the words of Castles and Davidson (2000), cultural heterogeneity is increasing, and the bundling of citizenship and nation-

ality is weakening, which threatens the importance and significance of nation-states in building democracy. This is especially because the large number and diverse origins of international migrants have produced a significant impact on the traditional conceptions of citizenship within nation-state borders and presented cultural diversity. According to the data released by the United Nations in 2019, 272 million people lived outside their country of birth or their country of citizenship, a figure that has increased 23 percent compared to 2010 and continues to rise; more than half of all international migrants were living in Europe (82 million) or Northern America (59 million); the largest number of migrants (51 million) resided in the United States of America, and Germany and Saudi Arabia hosted the second and third largest numbers of migrants worldwide (13 million each) (United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, 2019). In Germany, the results of the 2019 census show that 26 percent of the national population has a migration background. Among them, two-thirds have personal migration experience while the remaining one-third is the second- or third-generation descendants of immigrants; slightly more than half of the people with a migration background have acquired German citizenship; more than 27 percent are children and adolescents under 20 years old (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2020). Transnational mobility and migration of population must be followed by cross-cultural communication and spreading. The demographic changes are gradually affecting the German ethnic, cultural and religious diversity as well as the variety of lifestyles. While enjoying the benefits of productive growth, German society is now facing unprecedented challenges of interethnic interaction and coexistence brought by large numbers of immigrants. These changes are also influencing and impacting citizenship education. Osler (2012) pointed out that immigration poses two types of issues for citizenship education: one concerns the response to an increasing diversity of cultures in schools. Due to diverse migration patterns, students in schools are in different citizenship status: some students are stateless, some are asylum seekers and some are migrants but still seeking citizenship rights. The rich diversity of status and cultural

backgrounds inevitably leads to a tension between local residents and newcomers which threatens education equality; the other focuses on the general impact of education and the special influence of citizenship education on both the formation and extension of students' diverse social and political identities and the improvement of students' public participation. It is thus clear that the more direct and frequent clashes of heterogeneous cultures have made tasks of citizenship education more complex. In response to the issues, Osler (2012) argued that schools have taken on the important mission of encouraging and helping young people be active participants in civic and public life, whether they are existing population or newcomers; and on this basis, schools must play an active role in promoting the integration of immigrants and truly equal citizenship.

In fact, facing with the growing threats to basic values such as equality, freedom, democracy and human rights triggered by migration, many European countries have attached great importance to the advancement of citizenship education and made relevant policy adjustments in recent years (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2012, 2017; Eurydice, 2005). In Germany, being consistent with the immigrant integration policies in education, schools are becoming more and more concerned about migration-related issues and representing them from multiple perspectives in citizenship education. In addition, schools are attempting to foster diversity and establish a more inclusive vision of citizenship for the multicultural country (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, 2015; Bendel, 2014).

Along with the establishment of the European Union, multilevel citizenship has gradually emerged (Maas, 2013, 2017; Painter, 2002, Yuval-Davis, 1999). Thus, in the current multicultural background, citizenship education should promote not only national identity but also regional identity and global identity; it should focus on the particularity and difference of their own country, as well as the universality and commonality. Citizenship education emphasizes particularity and difference internally, which could be distinguished from other nation-states and form a sense of commonality and belonging within the border.

1.2 Objectives of the study

At the same time, citizenship education emphasizes universality and commonality externally, which makes citizens form a more inclusive view of citizenship in order to adapt to a broader civil society and public spheres and achieve sustainable development. It is also the basic direction of the development of German citizenship education. Especially, as a core member of the EU, Germany takes great responsibility for European integration, which emphasizes the important function and significance of education for both European citizenship and global citizenship.

1.2 Objectives of the study

The purpose of this study is to explore how citizenship education is implemented in German schools and how issues of migration, which is one of the biggest challenges for citizenship education in the age of globalization, have been dealt with by civics courses in German schools. Hereby, I seek to identify and analyze whether, and to what extent, civics textbooks have responded to national, transnational and global challenges to migration issues in Germany.

1.3 Research questions

The following three guiding questions are explored in this study:

1. How does citizenship education in Germany develop from a historical point of view? And how is it situated in the present German school structure?
2. How is migration presented in the civics textbooks?
3. How is the education for European citizenship and global citizenship embodied in German citizenship education?

1 Introduction

1.4 Significance of the study

One significance of the study is to contribute to a more vivid and comprehensive understanding of citizenship. Especially through the documentary analysis of images of migrants, the situation of migrants (including refugees and asylum seekers) and the difficulties of their integration into host communities are presented. This may provide readers with valuable insights into the understanding of cultural diversity in education and put forward an inclusive way of thinking about citizenship in a multiethnic society.

This study is also expected to have a significance that may provide inspiration for textbook authors and policy-makers. It is also intended to provoke thought about citizenship education curriculum reform and instructional practices among citizenship education specialists.

1.5 Methodology

In order to meet the objectives and answer the research questions mentioned above, this study employs a qualitative approach. Based on referring to and analyzing abundant literature on history, government reports, public policies and school curriculum, this study reviews the historical development of German citizenship education from the era of the German Empire to the reunification of Germany, presents the current general implementation status of citizenship education in German schools and illuminates concepts of European citizenship and global citizenship.

Besides, for the purpose of investigating the teaching on migration issues in school citizenship education, a small-scale case study on civics textbooks has been designed in this research. Hereby, the documentary method is employed to analyze pictures in civics textbooks so as to interpret how migration issues are conveyed.

1.5.1 The documentary method

The documentary method originated from Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge and was developed as a qualitative research approach by Ralf Bohnsack in the 1980s. In the 1920s, Mannheim presented the documentary method as a particular approach to observation in social science with his draft of the "documentary method of interpretation", which still has a profound significance now, especially in the field of epistemology (Bohnsack, 2014). In the 1950s and 1960s, recognizing the importance of the documentary method as a method to both social-scientific and daily-life procedures, Harold Garfinkel brought the documentary method back into social-scientific discourse. Both Mannheim and Garfinkel realized the importance of the documentary method in the context of discourse concerning the epistemological substantiation of the social sciences. However, neither of them regarded it as a method for practical empirical research (Bohnsack, 2014). In the 1980s, affirming the value of the documentary method in empirical research, Bohnsack developed it both as a methodology for qualitative research and as a method for practical empirical inquiry. Its use was rapidly extended from the interpretation of texts that are from talks of group discussion to the interpretation of field notes from participant observation, as well as the interpretation of pictures and videos. Now the documentary method is used in a wide range of research fields, such as education in schools, media reception analysis, social work, migration and life-long education (Bohnsack, 2014).

1.5.2 Picture interpretation in the documentary method

Bohnsack (2008) argued that pictures and images could "provide orientation for our everyday practice on the quite elementary level of understanding, learning, socialization and human development" (pp. 3–4). People can perceive nonverbal communication and behaviors through the other's gestures, postures or facial expressions in their mind. They store these behaviors in memory through the medium of images and imitate them. These images concern all signs or systems of

meaning and are largely established on the basis of iconic knowledge, or rather image-based understanding that is embedded in tacit knowledge, in “atheoretical” knowledge, as it is called by Mannheim.

Since the transition from Iconography to Iconology in the arts (Panofsky, 1955), interpretation has turned from the sphere of explicit knowledge to that of tacit or atheoretical knowledge, or rather from the question “what cultural or social phenomena are all about” to the question “how they are produced”, influenced by Mannheim’s documentary method of interpretation (Bohnsack, 2008). In Luhmann’s words, it is the transition from observation to observing the observations (Luhmann, 1990). Our focus shifts to our reconstruction of the reconstruction by others. The singular message of the pictorial signs is determined on the pre-iconographical or denotative level. Bohnsack (2008) stated that “when decoding these messages, we must pass through the next higher level of iconographical or connotative code, which somehow obtrudes upon our minds and which Roland Barthes has called the ‘obvious meaning’” (p. 9).

In the iconological stance of analysis, the characteristic meaning, “which documents itself” (Panofsky, 1932, p. 115), is also called “habitus” by Panofsky, a concept which is adopted by Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1972/1977). Bohnsack (2008) stated that one of Panofsky’s most extraordinary achievements is to have worked out the concept of habitus or the documentary meaning by ways of homologies (meaning structural identities) between quite different media or quite different genres of art from the same epoch (from literature to painting, and architecture to music). He also stated that “the iconic meaning, which is Max IMDAHL’s term for this deeper semantic structure, has—according to IMDAHL—its peculiarity in a “complexity of meaning which is characterized by transcontrariness” (Bohnsack, 2008, p. 11). Thus, the iconic meaning, or the documentary meaning, is the unknown point that needs to be made known through interpretation.

As stated by Bohnsack (2008), from the perspective of Mannheim’s sociology of knowledge, there are two forms or layers of knowledge that constitute a structure of duality in our daily life, namely, communicative

knowledge and conjunctive knowledge. The former concerns generalized and stereotyped institutionalized knowledge and role relations in society, while the latter concerns common atheoretical knowledge, and experiences and habitus which guide our practical action. Based on Imdahl's study, Bohnsack (2008) suggested that the compositional analysis of the image could be organized into three dimensions, namely, the planimetric structure, the scenic choreography and the perspective projection, and the methodological devices of picture interpretation should be:

to treat the text as well as the picture as a self-referential system, to differentiate between explicit and implicit (atheoretical) knowledge, to change the analytic stance from the question *What* to the question *How*, to reconstruct the formal structures of texts as well as pictures in order to integrate single elements into the over-all context, and—last but not least—to use comparative analysis. (p. 16)

These methodological devices endeavor to interpret the image of migration presented in textbooks using the documentary method. As stated above, the quality and capacity of pictures or images can provide orientation for our actions and our everyday practice. In the context of treating the picture as a self-referential system, it is necessary to differentiate the conjunctive knowledge and the communicative knowledge from the picture. In the framework of the documentary method, social culture is the collective phenomenon like milieu; the same “conjunctive of experience”, which is a concept in relation to the habitus or tacit knowledge, affects the representing picture producers' image of migration, represented by their photos or caricatures. Thus, the analysis of the image of migration in textbooks is actually the analysis of the picture producers' reflexivity which reveals the mutual relation between the elements of a picture and the underlying pattern of meaning (Bohnsack, 2008).