# DIVERSITY AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

*Global Perspectives*

James A. Banks, Editor

JOSSEY-BASS
A Wiley Imprint
www.josseybass.com

To the memory of

Lula Holt Banks

January 12, 1910–June 4, 2002

*My first and most important model of a committed*
*democrat and American citizen.*

# CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND ETHNIC ISSUES IN RUSSIA

*Isak D. Froumin*

In April 2001, more than 100 skinheads rushed into the market in Yasenevo. They were loudly shouting out Nazi slogans. In a few minutes they destroyed all of the small shops of people who are ethnically from Central Asia and Caucasus. That was a real pogrom. Police arrested about 70 skinheads and confiscated Nazi attributes and literature.

Two persons were killed and 23 were injured as a result of a pogrom in one of Moscow's markets in August 2001. About 300 young people in military-style uniform with symbols of the Russian Nationalist Party came to a market near a metro station and started to fight with people from Armenia or Azerbaijan, destroying their shops. They also beat people in the metro who looked like ethnic Azerbaijanian or Asians. Among the victims were Armenian, Indian, and Afghani citizens. The police arrested about 20 people.

This news reminded me of a meeting with one of my former students Gennady Borodin. After leaving school he had joined the Russian Army and served in Chechnya. I remembered him as one of the most joyful and friendly students I've ever met. He kept smiling in any situation. When his military service term ended, at the age of 21, he returned to his native town and visited his school where I was a principal at the time. This was in 1998. My first impression was shock: Gennady had lost his smile and his eyes were very sad. I knew that he had spent a year in Chechnya during the war with Chechen rebels and terrorists. I asked him about his

experience, and he told me to watch a video his friends had made in the army. A group of my colleagues gathered together to watch the video. It was full of the horrors of the war. A scene of the interrogation of a Chechen hostage by Russian officers was the most terrible. What was most disturbing to me were Gennady's comments on the video that we were watching. He kept calling Chechens "dirty animals," and he commented on the bloodiest actions in the video in an approving way.

After watching the video we had a cup of tea and talked face-to-face. Then I asked Gennady about what should be done to build friendship between Chechnya and the rest of Russia. His answer was laconic: to kill all Chechens. He developed the point further: to kill even those Chechens who live in other regions of Russia because they are completely different. Having noticed my reaction, he continued: If they want to live with us they have to change and behave as we do. Such views were not new to me, but I was surprised to notice the difference between Gennady's general mood in the past and at present. He had become another person.

This conversation came to my mind in October 2001 when I was giving a lecture to teachers and school directors from Chechnya at a seminar on civic education that was run by the Council of Europe. Twenty teachers had been trained during the Soviet period and definitely had a more or less positive attitude toward Russia and the idea of Chechnya being a part of Russia. However, they felt frustrated. They did not believe that Chechens could keep their ethnic identity under the Russian rule. A strong message from them was that the Russians would never tolerate the Chechens' different ways of organizing their community life, economic development, religious practice, and education.

After my conversation with Gennady, I had a chat with my colleagues at school. I consulted with them about a "vaccine" that we could give Gennady to help him cope with aggression and hatred. How can we develop the values of tolerance and recognition? And how can we develop an understanding of the roots of ethnic conflicts and different cultures? Any Russian educator—as well as the education system in general—faces these questions today.

In this chapter I will discuss how this problem is approached in civic and social studies education in Russia. Before moving to the discussion of specific curriculum and education policy, I will give a context for this policy by describing the state of affairs in ethnic relations in modern Russia and the general development of civic education.

For the analysis of educational policy and practice, we will use a framework similar to the framework used in the research on policies for education for democratic citizenship and management of diversity in

southeastern Europe that was conducted by the Council of Europe (Education for Democratic Citizenship, 2002). In this research two central questions were asked:

- What policies did a government develop?
- What measures have been adopted to implement policies that will make this rhetoric real?

Special emphasis will be given to textbook analysis. Textbooks on social studies and history will be analyzed. We will also consider the development and implementation of regional policy (large multiethnic cities, ethnic regions, and Chechnya).

## Ethnic Relations in Russia

### Ethnic Diversity in Russia and the Soviet Legacy of Building a United Nation

Recent cases of ethnic conflicts in Russia mentioned above should not be considered as something exceptional. They reflect the state of affairs in the relationships between ethnic groups and in ethnic identity development. Many recent sociological studies show growing intolerance, aggression, and distrust between different ethnic groups (Malakhov, 2001; Zdravomyslov, 1999).

The Russian Federation has significant ethnic diversity. Twenty-eight million people belong to more than 100 different ethnic groups. One hundred twenty million identify themselves as Russians. Some ethnic groups are bigger than 50,000 people, some are less than 1,000 (Zdravomyslov, 1999). Russia is a federation of regions. Some of these regions are ethnic republics. It makes the situation in ethnic relations very diverse.

One can say that chauvinism is not very influential in Russia. For example, an all-Russian study of 1995 shows that 81% of citizens agree with the statement "There are no good and bad ethnic groups." Only 7.7% disagree with this statement (Zdravomyslov, 1999, p. 45). However, in everyday life people often behave aggressively toward the representatives of other ethnic groups. Russian citizens often use discriminating names for different ethnic groups. Some ethnic Russians think that Ukrainians, Yakuts, and other ethnic groups are stupid or lazy. The same study (Zdravomyslov, 1999) shows that 100% of Russian citizens of different ethnic backgrounds have a sympathetic attitude toward their own ethnic group. At the same time more than 25% of Russian citizens have antipathy toward ethnic groups such as Poles, Gypsies, and African Americans.

So in reality a significant majority of people in modern Russia behave contrary to the statement "There are no good and bad ethnic groups."

The situation of ethnic tensions cannot be understood outside the historical context. Russia was a multinational empire until the socialist revolution in 1917. Russification was a state policy during the empire time. After the revolution the ethnic policy was based on the ideology of internationalism. The Marxist idea was that class relations are primary when compared to ethnic tensions. Following this principle the Soviet state imposed a repressive political correctness and administrative control on interethnic relations. It promoted formal respect of other cultures and friendship between people of different cultures. The Soviet government and the Communist Party were trying to resolve and to prevent conflicts by affirmative actions, a very complex system of ethnic groups represented in different spheres of public life.

Leonid Brezhnev—in a 1972 speech at the Communist Party meeting devoted to the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Union—made a profound statement: "We are the witnesses of the emergence of a new historical type of nation, the Soviet nation." That statement reflected a perception of the success of the "melting pot" policy. However, this perception was superficial. There were many conflicts in everyday life, and (which is more important) there was a strong wish for an ethnic renaissance and independence among all ethnic groups, including Russians.

### Democratic Transition Opens a Complexity of Ethnic Relations

The "blind" ethnic policy of the Soviet authorities led to a great explosion. Democracy, glasnost, and openness were followed by ethnic conflicts. The former empire moved away very quickly from a "new type of nation" to disintegration and conflicts.

Russia inherited the legacy of ethnic tensions from the Soviet Union as a potential threat to the stability of a newly emerged Russian state. A number of conflicts showed that different ethnic groups (including Russians) were not ready for a dialogue. The democratic movement and ethnocentric movement came together. However, that ethnic renaissance was intended to bring benefits only to the major ethnic groups, for example the Georgians in Georgia and the Tatars in Tatarstan. At the same time ethnic minorities in those republics faced difficulties in the implementation of their rights. Russians and other minorities in those ethnic republics were not considered subjects of democratic liberation. The most terrible example of ethnic conflicts in post-Soviet Russia is the conflict in the Chechen Republic that resulted in a full-scale war. This war spread

beyond the borders of Chechnya, killed thousands of people, and developed feelings of hatred and intolerance.

There were many factors that contributed to the growth of ethnic tensions in the beginning of the transition period. For example, in 1991 the Russian parliament adopted a law on "rehabilitation of oppressed ethnic groups." This law was driven by good idealistic wishes. It was intended to give formerly oppressed groups such as Crimea Tatars, for example, the rights to go back to their historic motherland. That law was a catalyst of ethnic conflicts because it did not take into account the new situations that emerged decades after Stalin's repression.

Another potential source of ethnic conflicts is the growing number of migrants. Ethnic Russians and representatives of other ethnic groups moved to Russia from other former Soviet republics in the beginning of the 1990s. More than 3 million people came to Russia from those republics between 1993 and 1999 (Gukalenko, 2000). Some researchers also explain the growth of nationalism and separatism in the early 1990s by the manipulative actions of ethnic elites who wanted to have more power and independence from Moscow (Zdravomyslov, 1999). All these examples can explain why the current situation in ethnic relationships in Russia is very complicated. They also confirm the statement that the "ethnic factor has become critical for Russian social life" (Tishkov, 1997, p. 3).

The above hostile events damaged the status of ethnic relationships. The consequences of ethnic conflicts on public consciousness is demonstrated in a 1999 study of attitudes between ethnic Osetins and Ingushes. After the conflict between these ethnic groups, more than 95% of the representatives of these ethnic groups expressed antipathy toward another ethnic group (Zdravomyslov, 1999). Sociological surveys also show that ethnic identification has been growing since 1993. In 1995 more than 50% of the representatives of different ethnic groups supported the idea that ethnic groups can separate from the Russian Federation together with their historical territories (Nazarov, 1998). The results of recent sociological surveys are summarized in the following statement: "Increasing ethnic diversity and feelings of ethnic solidarity as well as widespread everyday racism and xenophobia are two components of ethnization of mass consciousness" (Gusenkova, 1998, p. 199).

There are three main types of macro contexts for ethnic relationships in Russia:

○ Ethnic minority groups in big cities

○ Ethnic regions where a particular ethnic group is a majority

○ Ethnic regions where a particular ethnic group is a minority

Below we consider recent changes within these contexts. Big cities in Soviet Russia have always been places with multiethnic populations. In all these cities ethnic Russians are a major ethnic group. A long history of common life led to establishing some balance without any ethnic segregation. However, as a result of recent immigration into some of the big cities, whole districts became places with homogeneous ethnic populations. This situation is a source of growing aggression from the local population to the "aliens." This leads to repression and restrictions in relation to immigrants, and, as a chain reaction, to their further isolation and alienation.

There are seven ethnic regions where major ethnic groups represent 50% or more of the regional population: Dagestan, Ingushiya, Kalmykiya, Tatarstan, Tyuva, Chechnya, and Chuvashiya. In the early 1990s many of these regions adopted their own laws. Often those laws were inconsistent with the federal laws. Some of these new laws in those regions directly referred to ethnic relations and promoted exclusive rights for the "major" ethnic group. In some of those regions a religious and ethnic renaissance came together. As a result religious and ethnic radicals often supported each other.

Six ethnic regions have less than 25% of the ethnic group they are named after. The rights of these groups for cultural development and self-governance are very limited. It has been observed that for modern Russia ethnic minority groups are difficult to define. They can be a minority in one place and a majority in others (Kloprogge, 2000). Ethnic groups in these regions do not have open conflicts. However, there is no clear policy in promoting an interethnic dialogue and cultural understanding.

So one can conclude that modern Russia can be characterized by growing ethnic tensions and a lack of critical public discussion of these tensions and a government strategy in this field. The conflicts were driven by ethnic prejudices and stereotypes, and the conflicts increased these stereotypes. Radical nationalist movements emerged in all ethnic regions and in big Russian cities. These movements strongly influenced youths, who became the first victims of these changes. Some ethnic groups were trying to invent such forms of ethnic identification to stress their differences. Writes Malakhov (2001), "The rebellion against totalitarian unity made under the slogan of diversity led to a variety of small despotism" (p. 25). The political discourse of the federal government is moving toward pluralistic views. However, a real multicultural policy of recognition is still considered as something very difficult and unrealistic.

## Education Policy and Ethnic Relations

### The Theme of Ethnic Diversity in Soviet Education

In 1918 one of the founders of the Soviet education system—the first minister of education of the Soviet period—Anatoly Lunacharsky (1976) wrote:

> We insist on international, human education. We have to educate a person, who would not be alienated from any human being. This person should consider any person from any nation as a brother, this person should love any piece of the earth equally. . . . This is why we specialists should consider the principle of internationalism and unity of mankind as the foundation for teaching history. (p. 443)

Such statements describe Soviet education policy as assimilationist. This policy was rooted not only in the Marxist notion of class relations as a primary factor of public life. There was one very powerful cognitive framework that influenced education policy in the area of ethnic relations. Russian education theory was focused on the pedagogy of collectivism, and it almost ignored individual differences including culture, ethnicity, and gender. The whole climate of the Soviet society was against the growth of individual identity, which, according to Taylor (1992), is the main root of a discourse of recognition.

Schools were considered a main tool for creating a new type of people—Soviet people. The Communist Party imposed compulsory learning of the Russian language as a way to achieve unity. Many schools where the language of instruction was that of an ethnic group were closed. Uniform culture based on Russian culture was imposed on all students. The idea of multiple perspectives was not recognized in such areas as humanities, arts, and social studies. At the same time the whole curriculum of the Soviet school was aimed at promoting specific Soviet class-based internationalism and friendship among all people regardless of their ethnicity. In history and literature classes especially students were indoctrinated with the idea of a harmonious common life of people of different ethnic backgrounds under "the sun of the Communist Party."

Besides traditional school disciplines there was a unique part of the Soviet school curriculum called *vospitanie*. This word is translated often as *political* or *moral education*. However these words do not transmit the whole meaning of the *vospitanie* phenomenon. It was a part of curriculum and extracurricular activities devoted to the transmission of basic values of communist ideology into all spheres—from family life to

international relations. This phenomenon will be discussed in more detail in a later part of this chapter.

### Ethnic Diversity and Education in Modern Russia

The renaissance of ethnic education was announced as one of the features of the democratic education reform in Russia after *perestroyka* and the collapse of the Soviet Union. It meant many positive things, including opening gates for discussing controversial topics in history and promoting ethnic cultures. At the same time it opened gates to aggressive nationalism and separatism.

One of the most important features of the Russian democratic education reform of the early 1990s was the emphasis on ethnic education in ethnic regions. A former minister of education stated: "In Komi region the number of ethnic schools opened in 1991–1992 was more than the number of schools closed in the previous 20 years. In 1998, 46 languages were studied in Russian schools, in 1992—77 languages" (Dneprov, 1998). The Russian law on education adopted in 1993 was considered one of the most progressive in the world. The law provided the right for each person to be educated in his or her native language and to study his or her native culture. The law requires all ethnic regions to have a special part of the core curriculum that is called the ethno-regional component. The implementation of this law posed serious practical difficulties.

The implementation of the law led to creating ethnocentric curricula for different types of ethnic groups and in some cases to the creation of "ethnic boxes" that would limit the development of students. However, the educational community did not pay enough attention and did not analyze this policy. One of the reasons for that was that the policy created an illusion that the problem was being solved. Separation appeared to be the easiest and most effective way to avoid ethnic conflicts. Very few educators suggested other solutions that required the development of a discourse of recognition and multiculturalism in all kinds of schools (Dmitryiev, 1999; Syrodeeva, 2001).

Multicultural education (in its ethnic aspect) as a part of a research agenda in education is emerging. However, there is a lack of support for research and development in multicultural education theory. Theoretical discourse of multicultural education in Russia already reflects important features of multicultural education such as the value of social justice, education equity, and student-centered learning. However, widespread underlying assumptions about the value of assimilation and negative attitudes toward difference and diversity make this discourse quite unique. Often

it reminds us of the old Soviet-style discourse of communist internationalism. The emerging theory of school transformation does not refer to multicultural education. It ignores such concepts as the "multicultural school environment" (Banks, 1981). Different factors of multicultural education are considered separately.

Recent outcomes of such policy are worrying. Extensive study (Sobkin, 1996) suggests that 18% of students are ready to fight for their religion and that 13.3% think that the interests of the ethnic majority should be in the center of state politics. The most disturbing is the fact that 51% of the students are sure that the state can use its military forces to resolve ethnic conflicts, if other possibilities proved to be ineffective. The attitude of students in relation to immigration issues is also very rigid—40.2% of students think that the state should introduce constraints for the so-called "economic immigrants" of non-Russian ethnicit (Sobkin, 1996).

## Civic Education in Modern Russia

### Civic Education in Transition Time

We have already referred to the notion of *vospitanie* (political or moral education). It performed the role of civic (citizenship) education for Soviet society. *Vospitanie* had quite a complex structure. It included cross-subject themes, extracurricular activities, special lessons on moral education, and an enabling school environment. The Communist Party heavily controlled Soviet civic education. Its curriculum was centrally developed and was uniform, disregarding local or regional conditions. The whole system of *vospitanie* had the clear intention to educate citizens of socialist society as "Communist Party soldiers." Ideas of tolerance, humanism, and critical citizenship were considered anticommunist and were subject to oppression and direct counterpropaganda.

The history and social studies curriculum as a main part of *vospitanie* was approved at a very high political level. There was only one history textbook approved for use in all Soviet schools. Every teacher was supposed to teach the skills and attitudes necessary for the good Soviet citizen.

Democratization of the educational system in Russia was related to *perestroyka* and *glasnost* in the late 1980s. The first signs of the decay of the totalitarian ideology and the relaxation of the administrative control in schooling awoke hopes and enthusiasm among thousands of educators. Freedom opened unprecedented opportunities for implementing their original ideas and realization of their individual values. At that time, in the late 1980s, the ideas were not exactly pedagogically analyzed and were

mostly formulated as popular *perestroyka* slogans about democracy and respect for individual and human rights (Eklof & Dneprov, 1993). As one cannot make immediate changes in curricula and textbooks, "liberated" practicing teachers and principals concentrated on the search for new teaching methods and new types of relationships with students and parents. They abandoned Soviet-style *vospitanie*.

The schools that took an active part in that movement were called innovative schools. They became the main driving force for democratic educational reform. In analyzing educational reform in Russia and comparing it with the international experience, one can conclude that it was very special, and the phenomenon of innovative schools was rather unique (Chapman, Froumin, & Aspin, 1995; Kerr, 1994). It can explain why innovative experience in civic education is so much ahead of official policy in this field.

In 1988 the Ministry of Education of the USSR made a decision to revise the entire social studies and history curriculum to achieve what was then called the "humanization" and "democratization" of education (Dneprov, 1995). The main new course for high school was to be an inter-disciplinary social studies course for the last four grades of secondary school called "Mankind and Society." This course continued the Soviet tradition of teaching about values, now called "universal human values" instead of "class values." The ambitious goals of that course were not accomplished on a full scale because the authors of those textbooks could not overcome the legacy of Soviet textbooks with their "final answers" and indoctrination.

Since that time much has been done. As regions, localities, and schools have some choice of what to teach, and the central Ministry has no funds to investigate what is actually going on in schools, it is impossible to know how many schoolchildren actually take these courses at present. It is likely that most schools have some course devoted to civic education. In this sense, great changes have been made under exceedingly difficult circumstances, both in creating materials and in making space for civics courses in schools. In conclusion, one can say that democratic civic education in Russia has followed two different lines of development: grassroots initiatives at the school and local community level and policy development at the federal level.

## Current Status of Civic Education

We will discuss school-based initiatives below in another section. In this section we will focus on the development and implementation of policy

related to civic education. Since 1993 the Ministry of Education has adopted a number of documents aimed at the implementation of a new educational paradigm in this area. Currently, there are two major approaches to the development of civic education: the disciplinary approach and the experiential approach. These differ from one another by foci and priorities.

*The disciplinary approach* is the most common for schools in the Russian Federation. It focuses on teaching certain topics and parts of courses comprising the so-called cycle "civic education." Among these courses are: Mankind and Society, Civics, Basics of Political Sciences, Economics and Law, and Ethics and Law. Usually these courses are taught in a very traditional way. Their main objectives are to transmit a set of academic knowledge and skills. The question about the relation between civic education and social studies teaching has not been resolved within this approach. The Russian tradition of having a deep knowledge base has led to a confusion between social studies and citizenship education. The tension is well described by Olgers (2001):

> True Citizenship Education demands a separate subject Social-Political Education, whose content is selected and organized according to the principles of Citizenship. Cross-curricular CE without Social-Political Education does not live up to its promises. Citizenship Education as a separate subject brings the danger of a vague, very broad subject, taught by teachers without a specific education in the social sciences. Research in Europe as well as in the US shows that such a subject leads to the demotivation of pupils, and a low status of the subject in school and in society. (p. 5)

The experiential approach entails the existence of aspects of civic education in the life of school and society. School becomes a model of adult civic life (school self-government). Key elements of school life (teaching style, school policy) are based on democratic values. According to this approach civic education is not confined within the school walls. Some schools put a stronger emphasis on various projects that include community work, discussions, and creating informal youth groups.

The disciplinary approach to civic education dominates. However, many Russian civic educators have begun to argue that information-based courses are not enough. For them, as they now see it, the most important task is to provide students with new intellectual and personal skills that will enable them to take responsibility for themselves and function well in the new democratic, law-governed society. The progressive civic educators think that the experiential approach can provide the right balance

between attention to individual needs and interests and show the benefit of participation in society. Using Vaillant's (1998) metaphor one can say that Russian reformers have recognized that civic education in a period of transition cannot ignore the underwater part of the iceberg. Many of the Western observers of Russian education fail to understand that many skills and habits that are taken for granted in their Western societies did not exist in Russia. Socialization that takes place as a matter of course in stable societies, in families, in schools, and in society as a whole must be undertaken explicitly in Russian schools. The supporters of the experiential approach are trying to make the whole iceberg visible. They are trying to introduce the values of tolerance and recognition in their schools and to promote critical discussion and openness to controversial topics.

Tensions between democratic civic education and the so-called patriotic education became an important factor of civic education development. Having recognized the basic democratic slogans, patriotic forces and communists criticized democratic citizenship education for promoting simplistic universal values. They are trying to move Russian civic education from a constitutional knowledge model toward a patriotic model with the main goal to promote "loyalty to the state or the community as a central concern of citizenship education" (Rowe, 2000, p. 195). Naturally, many state officials and other forces nostalgic for the former world superpower support this approach.

The tension between modern democratic citizenship education and the conservative approach is not resolved yet. It leads to a danger that the growing state and societal interest toward civic education could cause harm. Formally, civic education plays an important role in the recent reform program of the Russian government—the so-called "Education Modernization Program" ("Modernizatsiya Rossiskogo Obrazovaniya," 2002). Among the main objectives of modernization is teaching all secondary school students knowledge and basic skills in the areas that ensure active social adaptation: economics, law, fundamentals of the political system, management, and fundamentals of sociology. The ideas and objectives of civic education are incorporated into the government's program documents.

## Ethnic Diversity and Civic Education

The tension between the so-called "democratic" and "patriotic" citizenship education reflects the fundamental "unity/diversity tension in education for democracy" discussed by Parker (1997, p. 13). This tension can be also interpreted as a tension between the public and the private

(McLaughlin, 1999). It explains uneasy relations between citizenship education and multicultural education. Parker stated:

> Multicultural educators have too often worked for inclusion without attending sufficiently to the character of the public space in which inclusion is sought; democratic citizenship educators, meanwhile, have too often skirted social and cultural diversity, thereby presuming a public space that does not actually exist. (1997, p. 13)

In Soviet times this tension was resolved without any reservations about unity. Internationalism was considered as the key direction of Soviet citizenship education. Introduction to different ethnic cultures was a compulsory element of that citizenship education. However, they were considered less important than the so-called "Soviet culture."

In the section below we describe how multicultural ideas are embedded within citizenship education and how the contradictions we have discussed above influence this development.

### Policy in the Multicultural Component of Civic Education

The main regulatory documents setting the policy in the multicultural component of civic education at the federal level are "Federal Program of Education Development," and "conceptual frameworks" for citizenship education and for patriotic education developed by the Ministry of Education and the government program for tolerance promotion and extremism prevention. The issues of multiculturalism are not reflected in these documents on a sufficient scale.

The "Federal Program of Education Development" ("Federalnaya Programma," 2000) has a number of internal contradictions. On the one hand, it intends to create a common framework for curriculum guidelines in ethnic regions. It stipulates that standards for social studies or for citizenship as a subject should be developed in different ethnic regions under common guidance and control. On the other hand, the program intends to provide special service for ethnic groups that have special education needs (refugees, minority groups in ethnic regions, etc.). This program also states main objectives for political education. One cannot find anything related to ethnic problems.

A "Citizenship Education Conceptual Framework" ("Concepciya Grazdanskogo Obrazovaniya," 2001) is still under discussion. However, the recent status of this discussion allows us to consider this document as an important policy document already. It states the main objectives for citizenship education and provides a list of major requirements for

students to learn in the course of citizenship education. These requirements make it obvious that the theme of ethnic relations and multiculturalism in general is not in the list of priorities. For example, the number of concepts and skills related to the elections process is four times more than those for the ethnic and multicultural area. There are, for example, such concepts as "ethnicity" and "ethnic diversity." However, this list does not include such concepts as "recognition," "cultural pluralism," "ethnic conflicts," and "ethnocentrism."

This is also true about the list of citizenship skills to be mastered. It does not include any specific skills to understand or to establish multiethnic dialogue. It includes general skills to discuss controversial issues, to use human rights protection mechanisms, and to promote tolerance in dialogue. All these requirements look very vague and are suggested from outside the context of real ethnic tensions in modern Russia. The only skill directly related to ethnic issues is "the skill to understand ethnic, religious, regional and other groups in our country; to understand the necessity of mutual understanding and respect for otherness" ("Concepciya Grazdanskogo Obrazovaniya," 2001, p. 7).

However, direct curriculum provisions do not support this requirement. The framework provides some recommendations for moral education, including a recommendation to develop citizenship competencies and values starting from the traditions of the "local motherland" and biographies of outstanding local people. Such a simplistic approach ignores complex relationships between the large and small society. It also ignores the fact that the notion of motherland could be different for students from different ethnic groups living in one territory. The citizenship education conceptual framework has the right words but does not reflect any systematic view on ethnic issues.

The "Conceptual Framework for Patriotic Education" ("Concepciya Patrioticheskogo Vospitaniya," 2002) has a completely different rhetoric. One cannot find a word that Russia is a federation of regions including ethnic republics, that this federation is created not by Russian people exclusively but by all the people of this land. The main concept of this framework is pride for one's own country. The implementation plan for this framework shows that traditions and heroes of Russian ethnic culture are promoted first. It also has a clear military accent. Though it does not say a word about multicultural education, this document should be taken seriously because it affects the whole agenda of new multiculturalism within citizenship education in Russia.

The last federal document influencing multicultural discourse within citizenship education is the "Federal Program for Tolerance Promotion

and Extremism Prevention." This program was adopted immediately after terrorist attacks in Moscow in autumn 1999. The program does not link tolerance and extremism to ethnicity. However, this message is implicit. The program emphasizes the importance of "establishing a tolerant environment for people with different ethnic backgrounds" ("Federalnaya Programma Profilactiki . . . ," 2001, p. 4). It was developed not only for education but has a wider focus. At the same time there are some clear guidelines and requirements for education as a tool for promoting mutual understanding and extremism prevention. Strong political support made this program very important for the support of a stronger multicultural orientation of citizenship education in Russia.

Let's move from very general policy statements toward specific policies in the field of curriculum development and teacher training. One can see that the existing curriculum standards and teacher training programs for citizenship education do not reflect ethnic issues on a sufficient scale. There are some general slogans in the "objectives" section of the standards that are not supported by the corresponding curriculum provisions. Multiculturalism is almost neglected in preservice teacher training and looks like a small component for in-service training.

The existing policy framework does not prohibit but does not encourage inclusion of multiculturalism (with its ethnic focus) within citizenship education discourse. Ethnic issues are almost ignored in government education policy. Individual statements and ideas are not coordinated and systemic. One of the problems in policy development is a lack of consultation with stakeholders. Many religious and ethnic-cultural organizations could contribute to the development of a regulatory and practical framework for ethnic education.

## Good Policy and Bad Implementation

Here we will consider what measures have been adopted to implement these policies and what the main difficulties and barriers are in the process of implementation. In order to answer these questions, I interviewed 36 leading experts in the field of citizenship education in Russia. The interviews took place between November 2001 and February 2002. They represent teacher training institutions, curriculum developers, school directors and teachers, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) working in this field. The following comments are based on the results of these interviews.

First, it is necessary to stress that only the "Tolerance Program" has some implementation strategy (at least a list of actions and possible

performance indicators). All the so-called "conceptual frameworks" do not have any implementation plans. They can include individual actions and events.

These programs do not take into account any opposition, risks, and obstacles for their implementation. However, the reality is that there is strong opposition to multicultural education (especially in the framework of citizenship education) among radical nationalists. There is also a risk that the programs are reduced to good political slogans but will be implemented superficially because teachers' stereotypes will dominate the implementation process. There is also a risk that the topics for discussions and investigations in schools will be too "hot"—parents and teachers will be against students' involvement in these matters.

The following are the main obstacles for effective implementation:

○ Lack of teacher training in the field of citizenship education with an emphasis on multicultural education

○ Lack of school managers' involvement in teacher training and their underestimation of the importance of this work

○ A very superficial quality of teaching and learning materials in this field. In practice there are no textbooks or supplementary learning materials that would give teachers and students multiple perspectives and facilitate critical discussion of ethnic issues.

Piloting of new approaches and materials is always a key condition for successful implementation on a large scale. Many innovative schools (often supported by NGOs) are piloting innovative curricula and ways of building the culture of multiculturalism. However, even when these innovations are politically supported by the federal or regional authorities, they do not get financial support, and there is no strategy for the dissemination of these best practices. So these pilots are not linked with the implementation of the policy.

Having said all these negative things, almost all experts have noticed that the whole environment for multicultural citizenship education has become more favorable. Mostly this happened because of grassroots initiatives. Significant improvement happened in the following directions: *communications* (better information access and flow of information including the Internet; opportunities to listen to the voices of practitioners from different regions and voices of the representatives of different ethnic groups); and *resources* (mechanisms to enable nongovernment and community-based organizations to mobilize and manage funds).

### How Do Textbooks in Social Studies Reflect Ideas of Ethnic Pluralism?

In 1992 I attended a meeting at the Ministry of Education on a new textbook policy. The minister, Professor Edward Dneprov, showed the audience examples of newly published textbooks in Russian history and Russian literature with large portraits of Lenin on the first pages. The minister became very angry. He started to shout and throw those books on the floor. He announced the Ministry decision: In two years all old textbooks in humanities in 60,000 Russian schools should be replaced by new textbooks reflecting democratic values. That scene came to my mind in 2001 when I visited a small school in the Chuvash Republic. I saw the same textbooks the minister disliked.

In fact one should not underestimate the efforts of the Russian government to move away from one right textbook to a variety of textbooks for 20 million Russian students. This process was extremely difficult because of a lack of a variety of textbooks and a lack of capacity for writing new textbooks (especially in the field of social studies and history). For example, in 1994 the Soros Foundation announced a grant competition for the development of new textbooks in humanities for schools. Only two applications were submitted for law-related education and none for social studies.

In the mid-1990s the first groups of textbook writers started to fill the gap by writing materials on human rights (this topic was prohibited in the Soviet times). Those materials were quite naïve and were based on the simplistic assumption that modern capitalism is a good example of a successful solution to the human rights problem. There was no special emphasis on ethnic issues or the rights of minorities. The second wave of curriculum materials was directed toward law-related education. That series of textbooks also did not pay any attention to legal regulations of ethnic relations and legal mechanisms for ethnic conflict resolution.

The next stage was the development of new materials on social studies and political science. In some cases new textbooks emerged as the result of translation of Western textbooks. They adopted a political approach to democracy, when the notion of democracy is limited to free elections. Almost all these textbooks were not linked with real life problems. So even at the time of the first war in Chechnya, questions of ethnic relations were not given sufficient space in those textbooks.

The main problem of that first period in citizenship/history/social studies textbook development was a lack of choice of textbooks and advanced ideas in pedagogy and social science. In the late 1990s the situation

changed. New groups of authors came to the field. Small independent publishers started to develop their own teaching resource publications. Currently, the Russian textbook market offers many different textbooks in all areas of social science and citizenship education. We undertook a study of secondary school textbooks to see how these new textbooks promote ideas of ethnic multiculturalism within the social studies/citizenship education area.

Ten textbooks in social studies and three teacher's manuals were analyzed (Bolotina et al., 2000; Erlik, Ivanov, & Marushenko, 1999; "Grazdanskoye Obrazovanie," 2001; Kishenkova, 1998; Kononovich, 2000; Korolkova, Suvorova, Sukolenov, & Sukolenova, 2000; Kravchenko, 1999; Nikitin, 2000; Ostapenko, 1996; "Perepodgotovka . . . ," 2001; Sokolov, 1997; Voskresenskaya & Froumin, 2001). The main questions for the analysis were:

- Does the textbook provide sufficient space for the discussion of ethnic issues and problems?
- Does the textbook emphasize the values and genesis of different cultures?
- Does the textbook discuss legal mechanisms for resolving ethnic tensions?
- Does the textbook present different sides of ethnic conflicts (territory, culture, religion, social status)?
- Does the textbook promote ideas of multiculturalism?
- Does it discuss the notions of "recognition," "cultural pluralism," and "tolerance"?
- Does the textbook contain implicit ethnic stereotypes?
- Does it discuss them openly and critically?

Only three of these books have a special section about ethnic relations and conflicts. The problem of ethnic diversity is not recognized as one of the most critical for the modern world. Only two books support the ideas of multiculturalism explicitly. Only one book describes the international humanitarian mechanisms of ethnic conflict resolution. Ethnic conflicts are described very uncritically and without an extensive discussion. Ideas of mutual value of cultures and recognition are not reflected in the textbooks. None of the textbooks discuss political and historical stereotypes regarding different nations and their relationships.

One of the teacher's manuals states quite clearly that in order to understand the history of the multiethnic Russian empire students should be

told that the growth of the empire can be explained by such positive features of Russians as the ability to communicate with other ethnic groups and the ability to protect them ("Grazdanskoye Obrazovanie," 2001, p. 68). There are no recommendations to teachers about the controversial nature of ethnic relations. Another clear statement is the following: "Russian civilization was formed not as a result of aggression, but as a result of 'natural' integration of different people" (Bolotina et al., 2000, p. 84). Only one teacher's manual (Voskresenskaya & Froumin, 2001) contains a section about conflict resolution and stereotypes. However, these sections are too general and do not have a particular ethnic focus. Despite the growing diversity of social studies textbooks, the issues of ethnic diversity and ethnic tensions do not get sufficient coverage. There is still a tendency to avoid controversial issues.

Eleven Russian history textbooks were analyzed (Danilov & Kosulina, 2001; Danilov & Kosulina, 2000; Dmitrienko, Esakov, & Shestakov, 2000; Dolutskiy, 2001; Mishina & Zarova, 1999; Ostrovskiy & Utkin, 2001; Preobrazenskiy, 2002; Saharov, 2001; Volobuev, Klokov, Ponomarev, & Rogozkin, 2000; Vorozeykina, Soloviev, & Studenikin, 1998; Zagladin, 2001). The main questions for analysis were:

- What kind of history do textbooks present: history of ethnic Russians or history of all people living in Russia?
- Do textbooks provide sufficient space for the discussion of ethnic issues and problems?
- How do textbooks discuss the main historical events having a strong ethnic component: conquest of Kazan and Siberia, ethnic cleansings in the late 1940s, etc.?
- How do textbooks interpret the struggle for independence by different ethnic groups in Russia?
- Do textbooks present different aspects of ethnic conflicts (territory, culture, religion, and social status)?
- Do textbooks promote the ideas of multiculturalism? Do they discuss notions of "recognition," "cultural pluralism," and "tolerance?"
- Do textbooks contain implicit ethnic stereotypes? Do they discuss them openly and critically?

Only a small number of the textbooks have a chapter on the ethnic structure of the Russian state and ethnic relationships. Major tragic events that affected different ethnic groups are not mentioned in many textbooks (e.g., involuntary resettlement). Only 2 of 11 textbooks contain different

interpretations of rebellious ethnic movements. The textbooks are based on an assimilation point of view and deny any controversy in this area. Such quotations as "From the very beginning Russia became a financial donor for all other republics" (Ostrovskiy & Utkin, 2001, p. 179) or "Ethnic groups argued first for ethnic culture renaissance. However after that a strong wave of nationalism and chauvinism emerged" (Dmitrienko et al., 2000, p. 78) are quite common in textbooks. These are mainly textbooks on the history of the Russians rather than the history of all ethnic groups in Russia. For example, most textbooks indicate that Russian Kazak Yyermak discovered Siberia. At the same time there are no sources presented to describe the same event from the perspective of the indigenous people.

The overall conclusion would be that most information in these textbooks is still presented from an ethnic-Russian perspective in a way that avoids controversial issues. But progress is obvious when compared to 1990. We can use Kohli's (1996) statement about the changes in tackling multicultural issues in the United States to describe the Russian situation:

> Many of the curricular gaps have been filled; the histories of women, people of color, and working people, for example, are more prominent in texts. But all too often they are given short shrift, trivialized, or relegated to the margins at the end of the chapter. (p. 5)

### Effective Initiatives Aimed at Building Multicultural Citizenship Education

Here we will describe some examples of interesting practice where researchers and practitioners are trying to build a new type of citizenship education closely connected with the ideas of multiculturalism. We will start with the projects almost exclusively directed toward multicultural education. Then we will consider the most promising projects which have a broader citizenship agenda in which the multicultural issues are important.

A good example of a comprehensive program is the "Tolerance" program run by the Open Society Institute (Soros Foundation). This program has a broad focus to promote tolerant attitudes toward all differences (including ethnic). The activities of the program are slightly diluted, and the materials developed are too general. However, the program supported a number of interesting initiatives including the competition for a "school with a tolerant environment" and a contest for the best poster of "accepting the differences." The most promising part of the program is support for school-based students' initiatives to promote a culture of tolerance and

recognition. Most of these initiatives came from stable regions. In some schools students established organizations (youth clubs) to discuss differences and to promote a dialogue.

It was difficult to find an innovative initiative in the field of multicultural citizenship education in ethnic regions. One of the most interesting is a comprehensive program called "School of Ethnic Culture" developed and implemented in the city of Sochi in Northern Caucasus. The city education department developed this program together with ethnic cultural societies (Armenians, Georgians, Greeks, Jews, and Abkhaz). A special curriculum component, native culture, was introduced in many schools of this city. One of the objectives of this program is "developing children's skills of international communication" (Prodanov, 2000). This curriculum component has a cross-subject design. It is manifested especially in language, arts, and history. A study conducted in the region in 2000 shows improved interethnic understanding and mutual interest (Prodanov, 2000). Within the framework of this program, a new teacher training institution was created—the "Multicultural Teacher-Training College." It is the first such attempt in Russia. With the support of the British Council, local experts developed new courses for teachers to provide them with the skills necessary for developing the culture of recognition in schools. These approaches are implemented already in foreign language teaching and in Russian language teaching.

A global education project was developed and implemented in a very different Russian region—in the old Russian city of Ryazan. A local teacher-training institute in collaboration with their U.S. partners introduced elements of global education into the teacher training curriculum. Five years later that project grew to a full-scale curriculum development and teacher training project. A Center for Global Education was established in Ryazan. This center united teachers from many Russian regions. They share their learning resources, trying to provide their students with the experience of dealing with multiple perspectives on different issues. The most important feature of this approach is that these perspectives come not from teachers or books, but from students of similar age from different regions and cultures.

Among innovative citizenship education projects which have some multicultural component are Citizens Forum, I Am a Citizen, New Civilizations, and Civic Education for the Information Age.

The first three projects have a strong extracurricular focus. They provide conditions for students' active participation in the solution of local issues. Students participate in public debates and in creative community services. Some of the topics for local public debates relate to regional,

federal, and global issues, including issues of ethnic conflicts and diversity. Teachers and students have already created a number of very stimulating teaching resources on ethnic issues.

Civic Education for the Information Age (CEIA) is a curriculum development project implemented jointly by educators from the University of Hawaii and Krasnoyarsk State University (Siberia). This project attained nationwide popularity and is considered one of the most innovative projects in this field. It is difficult to find the existing terms that capture the nature of CEIA as a new, experience-oriented civics curriculum. CEIA students begin the study of civics by exploring the functional ways in which citizens, government, business, and other social actors actually operate in their community; how they make decisions and work to solve and accommodate conflicts and problems; and how they seek to improve the world they inhabit ("Sovremennye Socialnye Problemy," 2001). The CEIA curriculum is built around the "hot issues" of modern social life. Each issue is presented within a separate curriculum unit, which starts with a controversial question and ends with finding a possible solution(s) for this controversy.

The set of issues covered by the CEIA curriculum includes ethnic ones. One of the most controversial units is called "Should the Moscow Government Allow Chechens to Live in Moscow?" This question provokes not just emotional discussion but careful study of legal, historical, economic, psychological, and other aspects of this problem. The title of the unit refers to a well-known decision of the Moscow government to introduce special registration procedures for new Moscow citizens coming from Northern Caucasus.

A report on piloting this unit in 10 schools shows that students' knowledge of ethnic issues and their different aspects has grown significantly. They have learned such concepts as stereotype, discrimination, ethnic group, nationalism, separatism, fascism, patriotism, ethnic mentality, tolerance, and recognition. They have learned different mechanisms for the resolution of ethnic conflicts. They have also learned how to interpret the same historical event from different ethnic points of view and how to make a hypothesis about the reasons for terrorism. They have learned how to find hidden ethnic discrimination in their social life.

After studying this curriculum, 70% of students reported that they became more tolerant toward people of different ethnic backgrounds (CEIA Piloting Report, 2001). They reported that one of the most important discoveries they made was that some of their values are not values but stereotypes. Eighty percent of the students reported that they are ready to act in situations of ethnic discrimination. Teachers found that there is

always a group of students (about 7% to 15%) with the radical nationalistic position "Russia for Russians." These piloting reports show that open and thoughtful discussion of ethnic issues within a citizenship education course can have a significant effect on students' attitudes and skills development (CIEA Piloting Report, 2001).

## Conclusion

It would be unfair to finish this chapter with critical remarks about the status of multiculturalism within citizenship education in Russia. Despite all difficulties and mistakes, Russian educators have moved forward a great way from totalitarian education toward democratic pedagogy and curriculum. In times of turmoil and explosion of ethnic conflicts, Russian schools continued to promote values of peaceful conflict resolution and interethnic friendship. Even though the federal policy is not accompanied by effective implementation, Russian educators have their own ideas and initiatives to develop real multicultural education in Russia, the culture of recognition, and conflict resolution. Now Russian citizenship education is facing a challenge of simplistic patriotic rhetoric. The only way to move ahead is to find new strategies to give Russian students a vaccine from aggression and hatred.

## REFERENCES

Banks, J. A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (1981). *Education in the 80s: Multiethnic education.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Bolotina, T. V., Borodich, V. F., Ioffe, A. N., Lebedeva, T. V., Karadje, T. V., & Kishenkova, O. V. (2000). *Vvedenie v socialniye nauki* [Introduction to social studies]. Moscow: Vedi.

Chapman J., Froumin I., & Aspin, D. (Eds.). (1995). *Creating and managing the democratic school.* London: Falmer Press.

CIEA piloting report. (2001). Unpublished manuscript, Krasnoyarsk State University, Civic Education Center.

*Concepciya grajdanskogo obrazovaniya* [Conceptual framework for citizenship education]. (2001). Moscow: RIPKRO.

*Concepciya patrioticheskogo vospitaniya* [Conceptual framework for patriotic education]. (2002). Moscow: Ministry of Education.

Danilov, A. A., & Kosulina, L. G. (2000). *Istoriya Rossii v 19 veke* [History of Russia of the 19th century]. Textbook for 8th-grade students. Moscow: Prosveshenie.

Danilov, A. A., & Kosulina, L. G. (2001). *Istoriya gosaudrstva i narodov Rossii* [History of the state and nations of Russia]. Textbook for 9th-grade students. Moscow: Drofa.

Dmitrienko, V. P., Esakov, V. D., & Shestakov, V. A. (2000). *Istoriya rodiny* [History of the motherland: 20th century]. Textbook for 11th-grade students. Moscow: Drofa.

Dmitryiev, G. D. (1999). *Multiculturnoye obrazovaniye* [Multicultural education]. Moscow: Prosvechenie.

Dneprov, E. D. (1995). Modern educational reform in Russia. In J. Chapman, I. Froumin, & D. Aspin (Eds.), *Creating and managing the democratic school*. London: Falmer Press.

Dneprov, E. D. (1998). Sovremennaya shkolnaya reforma v Rossii [Modern school reform in Russia]. Moscow: Nanka.

Dolutskiy, I. (2001). *Istoriya rodiny. 20 vek* [History of the motherland. 20th century]. Textbook for 10th–11th-grade students. Moscow: Mnemozina.

Education for democratic citizenship and management of diversity in South-East Europe: A regional report. (2002). Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.

Eklof, B., & Dneprov, E. (Eds.). (1993). *Democracy in the Russian schools: The reform movement in education since 1984*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Erlik, S. N., Ivanov, V. M., & Marushenko, V. V. (1999). *Grazdaninom byt obyazan* [You must be a citizen]. Textbook for 10th–11th grade students of the General School. Moscow: Ventana.

*Federalnaya programma profilactiki extremizma i vospitaniya tolerantnosti v rossiskov obchestve* [Federal program of extremism prevention and tolerance promotion]. (2001). Moscow: Prosvechenie.

*Federalnaya programma razvitiya obrazovaniya* [Federal program of education development]. (2000). Moscow: Ministry of Education.

*Grazdanskoyeobrazovanie* [Citizenship education]. (2001). Materials for the teachers. Moscow: Vedi.

Gukalenko, O. V. (2000). *Teoreticheskie osnovaniya podderjli detei iz immigrantskikh semei v multiculturnoi srede* [Theoretical foundations of guidance and support of children from immigrant families in a multicultural environment]. Rostov, Russia: Rostov State Pedagogical University.

Gusenkova, T. A. (1998). *Socialno-kulturnye i etnicheskie stereotipy* [Sociocultural and ethnic stereotypes]. Moscow: Russian State University for Humanities Press.

Kerr, S. (1994). Diversification in Russian education. In A. Jones (Ed.), *Education and society in the new Russia* (pp. 47–74). New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Kishenkova, O. V. (1998). *Osnovy grazdanskikh znanii* [Basic civic knowledge]. Textbook for 9th-grade students. Moscow: Vedi.

Kloprogge, J. (2000). Minorities and nationalities: Factors affecting balance in society. In M. Den Elt & T. Van der Meer (Eds.), *Nationalities and education: Perspectives in policy-making in Russia and the Netherlands* (pp. 68–74). Amsterdam: Sanders.

Kohli, W. (1996). Teaching in the danger zone: Democracy and difference. *International Journal of Social Education, 11*, 1–17.

Kononovich, V. G. (2000). *Ya grazdanin* [I am a citizen]. Voronez, Russia: Voronez State University.

Korolkova, E. S., Suvorova, I. V., Sukolenov, N. G., & Sukolenova, G. G. (2000). *Obchestvoznanie* [Social studies]. Moscow: Prosvechenie.

Kravchenko, A. I. (1999). *Obchestvoznanie* [Social studies]. Textbook for 8th–9th-grade students. Moscow: Russkoe Slovo.

Lunacharsky, A. V. (1976). *Obrazovanie i razvitie cennostei* [On education and values development]. Moscow: Pedagogika.

Malakhov, V. (2001). *Skromnoye obayanie racizma* [Modest charm of racism]. Moscow: Dom intellectualnoi knigi.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1999). Citizenship, diversity and education. *The School Field, 4*, 37–56.

Mishina, I. A., & Zarova, L. N. (1999). *Istoriya rodiny (1900–1940)* [History of the motherland (1900–1940)]. Textbook for 11th-grade students. Moscow: Russkoe Slovo.

*Modernizatsiya rossiskogo obrazovaniya* [Modernization of Russian education]. (2002). Moscow: HSE.

Nazarov, M. M. (1998). *Politicheskaya cultura rossiskogo obchestva. 1991–1995* [Political culture of Russian society, 1991–1995]. Moscow: Editorial.

Nikitin, A. F. (2000). *Osnovy obchestvoznaniya* [Basic social studies]. Textbook for 8th–9th-grade students. Moscow: Drofa.

Olgers, A. A. (2001). Civic education and societal and political education in the Netherlands. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Ostapenko, L. A. (1996). *Khrestomatiya po obchestvoznaniyu* [Readings in social studies]. Nizniy Novgorod, Russia: Volga.

Ostrovskiy, V. P., & Utkin, A. I. (2001). *Istoriya Rossii* [History of Russia]. Textbook for 11th-grade students. Moscow: Drofa.

Parker, W. (1997). Navigating the unity/diversity tension in education for democracy. *Social Studies, 88*, 12–17.

Perepodgotovka uchitelei grazdanskogo obrazovaniya [In-service teacher training in citizenship education]. (2001). Kaluga, Russia: KIPKRO.

Preobrazenskiy, A. A. (2002). *Istoriya rodiny* [The history of the motherland]. Textbook for 6th-grade students. Moscow: Prosveshenie.

Prodanov, I. (2000). *Geopoliticheskaya situaciya v sochinskov regione* [The geopolitical situation in the Sochi region]. In M. Den Elt & T. Van der Meer (Eds.), *Nationalities and education: Perspectives in policy-making in Russia and the Netherlands* (pp. 47–52). Amsterdam: Sanders.

Rowe, D. (2000). Value pluralism, democracy and education for citizenship. In M. Leicester, C. Modgil, & S. Modgil (Eds.), *Politics, education and citizenship*. London: Falmer Press.

Saharov, A. N. (2001). *Istoriya Rossii ot drevnikh vremen do konca 16 veka* [History of Russia from ancient times to the end of the 16th century]. Textbook for the 6th grade students. Moscow: Prosveshenie.

Sobkin, V. S. (Ed.). (1996). *Etnichnost, identichnost, obrazovanie* [Ethnicity, identity, education]. Moscow: CSO RAO.

Sokolov, Y. V. (1997). *Grazdanovedenie* [Civics]. Textbook for 7th-grade students. Moscow: Citizen.

Soldatova, G. U. (1998). *Psichologiya mezetnicheskoi napryazennosti* [Psychology of the interethnic tension]. Moscow: Smysl.

Sovremennye socialnye problemy [Modern social problems]. (2001). Krasnoyarsk, Russia: Krasnoyarsk State University.

Syrodeeva, A. A. (2001). *Polikulturnoe obrazovanie* [Multicultural education]. Moscow: MIROS.

Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and "the politics of recognition."* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tishkov, V. A. (1997). *Ocherki teorii i politiki etnichnosti v Rossii* [Essays on theory and policy of ethnicity in Russia]. Moscow: Russkii mir.

Vaillant, J. (1998). Grazhdanskoye obrazovanie v sovremennoi Rossii [Civic education in contemporary Russia]. In *Materialy konferencii Grazhdanskoye obrazovanie dlya informacionnogo veka* [Proceedings of International Conference, Civics Education for the Information Age]. Krasnoyarsk, Russia: Krasnoyarsk State University.

Volobuev, O. V., Klokov, V. A., Ponomarev, M. V., & Rogozkin, V. A. (2000). *Rossia i mir ot drevnikh vremen do konca 19 veka* [Russia and world from ancient times till the end of the 19th century]. Textbook for 10th-grade students. Moscow: Drofa.

Vorozeykina, N. I., Soloviev, V. M., & Studenikin, M. T. (1998). *Istoriya Rossii* [History of Russia]. Textbook for 5th-grade students. Moscow: Prosveshenie.

Voskresenskaya, N., & Froumin, I. (2001). *Grazganskoye obrazovanie. Materialy dlya perepodgotovki uchitelei* [Citizenship education: Manual for in-service teacher training]. Moscow: RIPKRO.

Zagladin, N. V. (2001). *Mirovaya Istoriya* [World history]. Textbook for 10th-grade students. Moscow: Russkoe Slovo.

Zdravomyslov, A. G. (1999). *Mezhnacionalnyie conflicty v postsovetskom prostranstve* [Interethnic conflicts in the post-Soviet region]. Moscow: Aspect-Press.