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Teacher education can enable or impede democratic socialization of prospective teachers through the provision (or not) of knowledge, skills, and values necessary for democratic teaching and effective functioning in democratic society. This dissertation investigates teacher education for democracy in post-Soviet Ukraine. It examines contextual factors that enable and impede teacher education practice for democracy, teacher educators’ conceptions of democracy and citizenship, and their enactment of these concepts in practice, in four universities in western, central, and eastern Ukraine. The study employs a mixed method multiple-case study methodology: case study profiles of four democratically oriented teacher educators, each working at a different university, are contextualized through background interviews, surveys of additional teacher educators, and document analysis. It illuminates political, cultural, and pedagogical dimensions of democratic citizenship education in an ostensibly post-authoritarian context. Survey findings reveal that, despite some changes, teaching approaches remained predominantly transmissive, and most teacher educators did not emphasize the promotion of political and cultural dispositions such as active citizenship, personal responsibility, civic patriotism, or tolerance of other viewpoints, nations, ethnicities, and cultures. Preparation of teacher candidates to function in a democracy was obstructed by multiple societal, institutional, and personal factors. This study demonstrates the value of considering such factors, in order to understand the challenges of implementing education for democracy in non-Western, transforming contexts. Case studies of four exemplary teacher educators shed light on pedagogical and content dimensions of teacher
education for democracy that were possible, although by no means typical, in this context. Their pedagogy departed from the dominant reliance on transmissional teaching and steeply hierarchical teacher-student relationships. Their course content promoted citizenship responsibility and a non-fearful mentality instead of paternalism and culture of fear; ethnic, racial, gender, and interregional tolerance instead of ethnocentrism; civically rather than ethnically oriented national pride and patriotism; and student-centered instead of solely teacher-centered pedagogies. The study contributes to comparative international research on education for democracy by providing practical examples of teacher education for democracy in a post-authoritarian context and by showing that Western-based typologies of democratic citizenship education can acquire different meanings, relevance, and significance in transitioning contexts such as Ukraine.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Background of the Study

For Harber (2002), “the achievement of greater levels of democracy will not be possible unless political culture and civil society … become more democratic but this will depend on the spread of more democratic values and behaviours” (p. 267). Education can play an important role in democracy through the promotion of democratic values, skills, and behaviour, since these do not emerge by themselves and need to be nurtured (Parker, 2001). Teacher education, in particular, can contribute to the development of democracy through the provision of democratic experience via instruction and the cultivation of knowledge, dispositions, and civic responsibility towards democracy among teacher candidates (Evans, 2006; Kennedy, 2005; Schweisfurth, 2002a). As Harber and Davies (2014) put it, teacher education can be “a source of political learning for future teachers and via them for students in schools.” Multiple studies show that the knowledge and beliefs of teachers about democratic citizenship and pedagogies can influence the learning experiences, political knowledge, and political participation of students (Patterson, Doppen, & Misco, 2012; Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010). For example, in their study of American high school students, Kahne and colleagues (2013) found that students who reported that they had experienced open discussion of societal issues in their classes showed a firmer intention to vote, a higher interest in politics and in divergent perspectives, and more commitment to political participation. In the 1999 IEA Civic Education Study, Torney-Purta and colleagues (2005) found that teachers’ civic-related initial teacher preparation and professional development often influenced the civic knowledge and inclinations of their students.
While extensive research has been conducted into education for democratic citizenship in primary and secondary schools, little research has been undertaken at the level of tertiary institutions (Sloam, 2008), including pre-service teacher education programs. Studies conducted in the contexts of Western democracies concentrate on such dimensions of teacher education for democracy as equity and social justice (Zeichner, 2009), intercultural tolerance (Cushner, 2011), human rights (Myers, 2007a) and global citizenship (Schweisfurth, 2006). Empirical studies from post-authoritarian contexts focus primarily on student-centered pedagogy, and fail to examine other content areas that could influence the democratic socialization of teacher candidates. Overall, as Harber and Davies (2014) observe, “we know little about the micro-political dimension of teacher socialization in relation to education for democracy – its daily practices, processes and relationships of curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation and rewards and sanctions.” In particular, there is very little research on this topic in the context of the countries that began to transition towards open, democratic societies after the collapse of the Soviet Union. This study adds to this limited body of research by examining democratic citizenship education – the cultivation of democratic identity and training for democratic teaching – in pre-service teacher education programs in post-Soviet Ukraine.

Two main rationales explain the need for this study. First, although democracy and democratic citizenship education are global phenomena, they remain contested concepts because local historical, economic, social, and political contexts shape their meanings and interpretations, and hence the ways that they are taught and learned (Hahn, 1999; Quaynor, 2011). One must examine them in the light of particular local circumstances to understand what they mean and what implications they have for democratic development. For example, based on her study of citizenship conceptions among Jamaican teachers, Williams (2013) contests conceptions of
“minimal” citizenship based on theory and research in established democracies, arguing that they can have more robust meanings in other contexts. She contends that the predominant Western conceptual frameworks are insufficient for understanding citizenship in the educational, economic, and social contexts of Jamaica.

Second, the transition process in post-authoritarian, post-socialist, and post-Soviet contexts has not been linear. Some outcomes of these transitions bear little resemblance to true, open democracies (Silova, 2009a). The process has been characterized by multiple tensions. As Bain (2010) notes, on the one hand many post-Soviet states have declared allegiance to the ideas of liberal democracy in order to cultivate critical thinking and pluralistic views; on the other hand, they have promoted monolithic, nationalist views as a means of maintaining social cohesion. Educational reforms “have taken unanticipated trajectories and led to unknown destinations” because of the persistence of the legacies of previous socialist and authoritarian regimes and tensions between global and local interpretation of new ideas (Silova, 2009a, p. 298). Post-socialism, as Silova (2010a, 2014) argues, is not dead and provides fertile ground for contesting Western theoretical frameworks, theorizing dramatic political changes, and envisioning alternative futures. The investigation of teacher education for democracy in such contexts can expose its context-specific meanings and practices and help to supplement or revise established Western conceptions of democracy, democratic citizenship, and education for these goals.

**Context of the Study**

This section provides a brief overview of the context of Ukraine, which is important in comprehending and analyzing the data of this study. It focuses specifically on its democratic development, public perceptions of democracy, and the general educational reform process, in
particular teacher education with regard to education for democracy. It also overviews teacher education research in the post-Soviet region.

**Ukrainian democratic transformation**

Like other former republics of the Soviet Union, Ukraine declared its turn towards democracy and a free market economy after gaining its independence upon the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991. Its transition to democracy has, however, been patchy, partial, and superficial, often resulting in institutional façades rather than real changes (Allina-Pisano, 2010). Overall, the envisioned linear change, which presupposed abandoning communist legacies, embracing democratic political models, and introducing capitalistic ideas with the assistance of Western countries, has not led to the expected outcomes (Pishchikova, 2010). The transformational process has resulted in “a variety of forms, some of them perhaps approximating Western capitalist market economies and many of them not” (Verdery, 1996, p. 16) and in hybrid political regimes falling somewhere between democracy and authoritarianism (Nikolayenko, 2012). Ukraine has not yet succeeded in developing complex democratic institutions. It has been characterized rather by the rise and decline of civil liberties and freedoms, weak adherence to the rule of law, rampant corruption in all spheres of public life, unstable civic engagement, and a combination of authoritarianism with democratic ideologies and institutions (D’Anieri, 2007; Freedom House, 2011a, 2011b, 2012; Transparency International, 2014). As a result, it has been described as a “feckless democracy” (Riabchuk, 2011).

In Ukraine, democracy is viewed in both political and economic terms, and thereby exceeds typical politically-focused understandings and models of democracy (Fournier, 2010). In the early years of independence, many Ukrainians sought to pursue a ‘Western style’ of
democracy, which they viewed primarily in terms of individual liberties and high standards of living. They believed that democratization would be accompanied by economic improvement, and they tended to equate democracy with the economic values of prosperity, equality, and security (Dalton, Shin, & Jou, 2007; Stepanenko, 1999). This view has not changed over time. In 2005, the International Foundation for Electoral Systems reported that “for many Ukrainians, the perceived economic and social welfare benefits of democracy are just as important as the political rights associated with democracy” (p. 23). Over 40% understood democracy in terms of the protection of human rights and social welfare by the state, and only 20 and 11%, respectively, associated it with freedom of the press and freedom of association. In 2012, the Razumkov Center reported that Ukrainians were preoccupied more with the material and economic aspects of their lives than with democracy. When asked about the importance to them of a fair system of justice, democratic development, and the protection of human rights and freedoms, they gave these values a low ranking (18.6%, 13.2%, and 10.2%, respectively). Their focus on material aspects can be attributed to the challenge of daily survival that many of them face because of sluggish economic development, declining standards of living, and a widening socioeconomic gap. For example, 60% of Ukrainians see themselves as poor and almost 26% live below the national poverty line (UNDP, 2012). A low commitment to democratic values and processes can negatively affect the development of democracy in Ukraine.

Many Ukrainians want to see their country achieve its democratic transformation and its integration into the European and global communities. However, they are not always willing to contribute to such goals themselves. A recent survey showed that many Ukrainians supported European values such as the rule of law, justice, solidarity, equality, and tolerance. However, the level of their readiness to act in support of such values was much lower than that of their
declared commitment to them (LvBS & ProMova, 2014). Furthermore, they did not always perceive their own responsibility in the democratic transformation of society but relied on the state to accomplish it, thus perpetuating traditional paternalistic state-citizen relationships. They expected the state to resolve their problems and provide for them, especially when it came to their social welfare. Many Ukrainians limit their citizenship responsibility to working and voting (Fournier, 2010). Such citizenship dispositions, along with an erratic reform process and unaccountable political institutions, have impeded the overall democratic transformation of Ukraine. However, perhaps it is unreasonable to expect a manifestation of engaged participatory citizenship from a population that has not had any extensive experience of democracy. Referring to the drastic change in state-citizen relations after the fall of communism, Tobin (2010) elaborates on this challenge: “Previously voiceless subjects under a dictator are now expected to know how to act as engaged citizens in a democracy: casting votes, staying informed, expressing opinions” (p. 273).

Despite the widespread passivity of most citizens, Ukraine’s nascent civil society surges periodically, playing an important role in the political transformation of the country. Having experienced a massive resurgence during the Orange Revolution\(^1\) in 2004, it subsided into cynicism and apathy, but revived again during the recent Euromaidan protests\(^2\) in which citizens

---

\(^1\) The Orange Revolution (labeled after the colors of the opposition’s presidential campaign) was a nationwide series of peaceful civil protests that took place in Ukraine between November 2004 and January 2005 in response to the allegedly rigged presidential runoff elections and the fraudulent victory of Viktor Yanukovych. Many people viewed him as a successor of a rising semi-autocratic, corrupt regime and as a pro-Russian candidate who would retract Ukraine from its integration into the European Union. As a result of a massive resurgence of civil society and popular resistance, the political opposition forced a repetition of the runoff and thereafter secured control of the presidency. The Orange Revolution was one of a number of ‘colour revolutions’ that arose in the post-Soviet region and followed a similar trajectory. They all took place in response to electoral fraud and aimed to remove from power semi-autocratic and corrupt political regimes through mass protests (D’Anieri, 2010; Tereshchenko, 2013).

\(^2\) The Euromaidan protests were a series of demonstrations and other civil unrest which took place in Ukraine between November 2013 and February 2014. The protests were initially provoked by the decision of the Ukrainian government on the proposed free trade agreement with the EU and by its general tilt towards Russia. A large number of Ukrainians viewed the signing of the agreement as entailing a possible change for a better life. As the protests continued, they came to signify popular dissatisfaction with political unaccountability, poor standards of living, and
fought for justice, dignity, political accountability, and economic wellbeing (D’Anieri, 2010; Snyder & Zhurzhenko, 2014). Since the end of the protests, and the beginning of the war in the east, many Ukrainians have undertaken volunteer work and made donations to assist the military, acted as watchdogs of the government, and set up networks and assemblies to influence the political reform process (Kulyk, 2014; Onuch, 2014). The protests seem to have resulted in increased civic and political engagement among Ukrainians, thus strengthening the country’s civil society and consolidating the nation. The development of civil society, along with the transformation of the country, seems to be further impeded by the ideological polarization of Ukrainians along an east-west axis. The country has been divided into a Russified, Russia-oriented and heavily industrialized east and an ethnically Ukrainian, Europe-oriented, and reform-driven west (Tereshchenko, 2013). Furthermore, as Riabchuk (2003) contends, the problem lies not only in “two Ukraines,” characterized by divergent political orientations and cultural identities, but also in a “third Ukraine,” which constitutes a majority and is comprised of individuals who are “uncertain, undecided, ideologically ambivalent and ambiguous” regarding the future of the country (p. 304).

Some of the issues that Ukraine faces in its democratic transformation are also located in the cultural realm. Ukraine is ethnically and racially relatively homogeneous country with Ukrainians constituting a dominant ethnic group (77.8%), followed by Russians (17.3%), Belarusians (0.6%), Moldovans (0.5%), Crimean Tatars (0.5%), Bulgarians (0.4%), Hungarians (0.3%), Romanians (0.3%), Poles (0.3%), Jews (0.2%), and other (1.8%. See World Factbook, 2015). Although most Ukrainians generally exhibit tolerance towards various ethnic groups that

injustices. They were often referred to as “the revolution of dignity”. A number of protestors were injured and killed during clashes with the riot police in Kyiv, Ukraine’s capital. The protests ended with the ousting of the current president, Viktor Yanukovych. They were followed by Russia’s annexation of the Crimea and by an outbreak of a war backed by Russia in eastern Ukraine.
reside in the country, they often harbour xenophobic and racist attitudes, especially towards the Roma people, Africans, Asians, Arabs, and people from the Caucasus (KIIS, 2012; NISC, 2010). A recent study revealed that many Ukrainians do not view discrimination against the Roma people as unjust and do not see the need to protect them; they do not always consider racial minorities to be equal members of society; and some Ukrainians, especially from rural areas, do not know how to communicate with ethnic and racial minorities because they have rarely interacted with them or developed intercultural communication skills (SocioLogist, 2015). Along with ethnic and racial discrimination, there is also religious prejudice and discrimination in Ukraine, particularly against members of non-traditional Christian groups such as Baptists: Eastern Orthodox, Catholic, and Greek-Catholic religions dominate. Representatives of non-dominant religious groups are often perceived as inadequate or abnormal (SocioLogist, 2015). In terms of gender and sexuality, Ukraine remains a highly patriarchal and heteronormative society. Despite some positive developments, gender and sexual equality have not yet materialized. As Hankivsky and Salnykova (2012) note, “while state legislation, policies, and programs are progressive … change in all sectors is hampered by a range of factors including firmly entrenched beliefs, traditions, stereotypes, and assumptions about the lives of women and men and the proper performance of gender” (p. 441). The above issues impede the pluralistic and equitable development of Ukraine and its integration into European society.

However, as mentioned above, what divides Ukrainian society and impedes its progress the most is its ideological polarization, transcending its relative linguistic, ethnic, racial, and religious homogeneity. As Riabchuk (2015) argues, “it is two different types of Ukrainian identity that determine the main national divide and subsume all other divides (ethnic, linguistic, religious, social, political, regional) as correlated and contributing to the main one” (p. 139). In
the context of Ukraine, cultural difference is constituted not only by ethnic, racial, religious, and sexual minorities but also by the polarized ideological worldviews of many Ukrainians.

**The educational reform process**

Ukrainian political leaders have viewed the educational system as one of the central means of articulating and instilling new social and cultural norms in support of the wider societal transition to democracy (Wanner, 1998). Discourses of nation building, democratization, and globalization, which are reflective of modernist and post-modernist projects, have been shaping an educational reform process (Janmaat & Piattoeva, 2007). A co-existence of these divergent discourses points to a tension between modernist (nation building) and post-modernist (multiculturalism and globalization) projects and the potential promotion of contradictory aspects of citizenship through the educational system (Janmaat & Piattoeva, 2007).

In Ukraine, nation building has been aimed at restoring a national identity suppressed by the Soviet and other former regimes, as well as at fostering patriotism and enhancing cultural unity. It has manifested itself in the introduction of the Ukrainian language instead of Russian as the sole medium of instruction and in teaching such subjects as Ukrainian language, literature, and history both in schools and universities to “provide Ukrainian national identity with a meaningful past and legitimize the current state independence” (Janmaat, 2008, p. 9). Consequently, as Tereshchenko (2014) observes, the educational system has been characterized by an ethnocentric approach that foregrounds the importance of Ukrainian national culture and does not always accommodate the ethnic and cultural diversity found within the nation. Furthermore, as Fimyar (2010) points out, the nation building project seeks to construct two distinct forms of nation and thereby identity at once: “[an] ethno cultural [form], which unites its populace on the basis of one language, history, and ethnicity; and [a] civic [form], which binds
the concept of national identity with concepts of civil rights, laws, and responsibilities” (p. 76). Having been prominent in the 1990s, the nation building project subsided in the 2000s, giving way to democratization and globalization. However, with the recent Euromaidan protests and the war in eastern Ukraine, there has been a revival of interest in patriotic and military education (Ministry of Education and Science, 2015).

Like in other post-Soviet countries, educational democratization in Ukraine has emphasized decentralization, liberalization, pluralism, and the humanization of learning (Silova, 2009a). It has been aimed at the eradication of an authoritarian pedagogy which has suppressed natural talents and capabilities and reinforced uniformity in the educational process as well as an undemocratic learning environment (Janmaat, 2008). It has also resulted in the introduction of new school subjects such as civics, law, economics, philosophy, and a course known as “Humanity and the World,” which are intended to assist with the construction of democratic citizenship. The democratization and humanization of learning have become dominant ideas in Ukrainian pedagogical discourse; however, many schools have failed in practice to establish democratic structures and continue to use teacher-centered pedagogy (Bekh, 2008). For example, Fournier’s (2007) and Tereshchenko’s (2010) studies of citizenship education and civic identities show that the most prevalent teaching approaches are rote memorization, recitation, and passive listening, while class discussion and other opportunities for students to practice their agency are extremely rare. Furthermore, educational democratization has tended to be at odds with the nation building project, since educational policymakers simultaneously encourage individuality and individual choice, on the one hand, and conformity to a somewhat pre-defined ethnocentric national identity, on the other hand (Wanner, 1998).
The educational democratization of higher education resulted in a patchy and superficial transformation. It provided faculty members with relative professional autonomy to determine the content of courses and choose the modes of instruction (Janmaat, 2008). However, it did not always achieve the democratization of institutional governance. Shaw, Chapman, and Rumyantseva (2011) note that the internal structure of Ukrainian universities remains very hierarchical and that faculty members and staff “see themselves as doers whose role is to implement decisions made further up the chain” (p. 76). Furthermore, universities operated until recently within a highly centralized educational system and had limited institutional autonomy. The 2014 Higher Education Law attempts to break these hierarchical and undemocratic structures by granting universities a measure of financial autonomy, the right to make decisions regarding the structure and content of educational programs, and the right of faculty members, students, and staff to elect university rectors through direct elections (Stadny, 2014). The law is expected to facilitate the institutional democratization of Ukrainian universities.

The discourse of globalization, which has become prominent in educational policy documents during the last decade, manifests itself in efforts to bring the Ukrainian educational system into line with European standards in order to ensure the country’s competitiveness in a global market (Janmaat, 2008). Its effects are felt more in higher than in secondary education. As part of its effort to integrate into the European educational space and to raise the international legitimacy of its higher education system, Ukraine joined the Bologna Process in 2005 (Shaw et al., 2011). In secondary education, there were attempts to move from a 10-year to a 12-year school system. The reform also set out to introduce foreign language training in primary schools and to increase its instruction in secondary schools; to change assessment criteria and introduce educational competence tests; and to institute specialized training in high schools (Fimyar,
In educational policy documents, the discourse of globalization also manifests itself in the perception of the individual student through neoliberal lenses which emphasize individual autonomy, mobility, and competitiveness (Fimyar, 2010).

Overall, the educational reform process in Ukraine has been slow and has often resulted in only superficial transformation. It has been complicated by budgetary constraints, weak political commitment, and the absence of a clear reform strategy (Dyczok, 2000; Fimyar, 2010). In many post-Soviet countries, the economic crisis following the collapse of the Soviet Union led to the reduction of public expenditures on education, which fell even below pre-transition spending levels (Pleskovic, Aslund, Bader, & Campbell, 2002). In 2013, public spending on general secondary and higher education amounted to 7.3% and 2.1% of GDP, respectively. While expenditures on education are high in comparison to most other transitioning and OECD countries, the expenditure per student in absolute terms, for example in secondary education, is much lower than these countries because of the country’s low GDP (OECD, 2011; World Bank, 2008). The lack of funds is felt in the outdated infrastructure, lack of instructional resources, obsolete professional development, and the poor remuneration of educators. A national survey of faculty members ($N = 424$) found that low salaries (69%), along with poor material conditions (49%), bureaucracy (45%), and poor governance (42%), were among the key issues of Ukrainian higher education (CEDOS, 2013). Across post-Soviet countries, inadequate salaries have contributed to the deterioration of the social status of educators, the declining prestige of their profession, and even to their lack of motivation to implement educational changes (Niyozov, 2011; Silova, 2009b). As a result, underfunding, combined with a lack of knowledge about alternative educational approaches, a reluctance among some educational leaders and educators to institute educational change, and the persisting undemocratic Soviet legacies, has been
impeding an educational reform process though which Ukraine has been attempting simultaneously to address issues of a weak sense of national identity, democratic development, and global economic competition.

**Ukrainian teacher education: Democratic challenges and prospects**

There has been limited research on pre-service teacher education in Ukraine and other post-Soviet countries, especially in regard to the cultivation of democratic identity among teacher candidates, their preparation for democratic teaching, and the meanings of democratically oriented teacher education. Research so far has focused, for example, on the poor academic quality of teacher candidates and the declining status of the teaching profession (Silova, 2009b), the impact of global neoliberal reforms, particularly the Bologna Process, on teacher education (Aydarova, 2014; Kutsyuruba, 2014a), the professional development of teacher educators (Silova et al., 2010b), comparisons between teacher training systems (Khustochka, 2009), changing educational philosophies (Holowinsky, 1995), and the professional aspirations and personal values of teacher candidates (Shchudlo, 2012). Various international organizations have also produced reports addressing the issues and achievements of post-Soviet teacher education. But most research reports have focused primarily on assessing the introduction of innovative teaching approaches and the implementation of new educational programmes geared towards a knowledge-based economy (European Commission, 2011; UNICEF, 2011). The paucity of research on teacher education in post-Soviet countries can be explained in part by the primary focus of many researchers on in-service teachers who were the immediate agents of change and who were affected by it the most, especially in the early years of post-Soviet transformation. This
scholarly orientation essentially pushed research on pre-service teacher preparation to the margins.³

Available research relevant to teacher education for democracy does not paint a promising picture, though it does point to some promising potential changes. As Koshmanova and Ravchyna (2008) note:

Educational reforms … have resulted only in the external transformations of the teacher education curriculum and the introduction of some innovative methods. Though instructors verbally accepted the philosophy of student-centered education, their values and beliefs remain autocratic, grounded in behavioural pedagogies. (p. 154)

According to their study of teacher educators at one university, most continue to use teacher-centered pedagogy and content-based instruction. However, some teacher educators have been trying to use interactive teaching approaches and to cultivate critical and inquiry skills among teacher candidates. This combination of continuity and change has been common among teacher educators across the post-Soviet region. As Zogla (2001) and others explain, educational changes were introduced so quickly that teacher educators were not ready to accommodate new demands. Some reverted to traditional practices while others attempted to change their beliefs and practices, though without sufficient prior preparation (Salitra, 2003).

The formation of civic and democratic dispositions among teacher candidates is also complicated by the fact that teacher educators lack a clear and systematic goal to prepare them to function in a democratic society. For example, the vast majority of teacher candidates at one university in Koshmanova’s (2006) study held a conventional view of learning, and had little knowledge about civil society or what role they might play in building it. Many of them believed that their responsibility was to develop students’ patriotic feelings about Ukrainian culture; they

³ Iveta Silova shared this observation during the discussion of the conference session, “Teacher Education Practices and Policies in Post-Socialist Contexts,” at which I presented some of my dissertational findings. The session was part of the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society.
perceived democratic values in terms of patriotism. Some teacher candidates also thought that citizenship education should be organized around extra-curricular activities and not connected with school teaching and learning. In regards to education for tolerance, Koshmanova (2006) also notes that Ukrainian teacher educators have only recently started to speak about tolerance, in the sense of listening to one another and respecting diverse viewpoints. In Zhadan’s (2000) national study, 70% of young teachers ($N = 4,000$) reported not having been involved in any civic actions. Less than 55% of them indicated that they took part in elections, and only 15% believed that it was important to uphold human rights. Thus, many teacher candidates and beginning teachers in Ukraine lack sufficient knowledge about democracy and have not developed civic and political dispositions, which means that they are unlikely to engage in the democratic citizenship education of their own students. However, as some Ukrainian experimental studies show, the exploration of civic, political, and patriotic ideas in courses such as pedagogy, philosophy, Ukrainian history, political science, and law; the enrolment of teacher candidates in civic education and other courses that discuss the civic roles and goals of teachers and education; and their participation in civic oriented extracurricular activities can substantially increase the civic competence of teacher candidates (Mukhailichenko, 2007; Plakhteeva, 2008).

The development of a democratic identity among teacher candidates can also be obstructed by the global market-oriented discourses that have framed educational reforms in Ukraine and other post-Soviet countries. For example, Kutsyuruba and Kovalchuk’s (2015) review of the recommendations issued by international organizations such as the European Commission found that guidelines did not necessarily address local needs, especially in regards to nation building and democratization. They tended to emphasize the transformation of teacher education to facilitate market-oriented goals. The European Commission (2011) report on
teacher education in the countries of the Eastern Partnership approached the process of educational change with a conceptual framework that included structural changes; modernizing educational content and teaching approaches; establishing educational standards and benchmarking; upgrading assessment and monitoring systems; and integrating information and communication technologies. The teacher education programs of former socialist countries, according to the European Commission report, should establish closer cooperation with non-governmental organizations and the business sector and respond more readily to the demands of the modern school, the labour market, and a constantly changing world. Such recommendations tie teacher education to an economic imperative and ignore the other possible needs of a society in transition such as democratization.

Like the wider educational system, teacher education has experienced what Bekh (2008) describes as “a contradiction between an abstract understanding of the need for humanization [and democratization] of learning and the real readiness, understanding, and opportunities for the implementation of such a need” (p. 224). For example, while there is an emphasis on student-centered and constructivist teaching approaches in educational policy documents, there is a limited use of such approaches in teacher preparation courses, which continue to rely mainly on content-based instruction and to emphasize the formation of a knowledge base at the expense of developing practical skills among future teachers. As a result, teacher candidates have limited opportunities to develop the creative skills that they are supposed to promote among students because of the prevalent transmissional modes of teaching (Kremin, 2010). Although the reform process has been slow and superficial, the content and practices of teacher education programs are changing. Teacher educators who have adapted to new educational demands and who advocate educational democratization constitute a particular interest in this study because they
represent an alternative to typical teacher educators. Since there is no blueprint for democratic education, nor any guarantee that what works in one context will produce the same results in others (Biesta, 2007), an investigation into the actual practices of these teacher educators can provide useful insights into teacher education for democracy in the context of Ukraine.

**Research Purpose and Research Questions**

This study examines the meanings, possibilities, and challenges of teacher education for democracy across four universities in western, central, and eastern Ukraine. Its purpose is to shed light on approaches to teacher education for democracy actually implemented in a post-authoritarian context in order to inform the theory and practice of democratic citizenship education from comparative and international perspectives. Because of the ideological division of Ukrainian society along an east-west axis, a further purpose of this study is to investigate potential similarities and differences among faculty members from four universities, especially between those from eastern and western Ukraine, regarding their conceptualization of democracy and citizenship, the skills and values they teach to teacher candidates, and their overall practice for democracy. The overarching research question that the study aimed to address was: *How was teacher education for democracy conceptualized, and what did it look like in practice, in the classrooms of selected teacher educators in four Ukrainian universities?* The following sub-questions guided the study: (1) What contextual factors enabled and impeded teacher education practice for democracy? (2) How did selected teacher educators at the four universities define democracy and citizenship in relation to education? and (3) How and why did they enact these concepts in their practice? The study addressed these questions through case study profiles of four purposively selected teacher educators, each working at a different university,
contextualized through background interviews, surveys of faculty members, and document
analysis.

**Conceptual Framework of the Study**

The conceptual framework of this study draws on three bodies of scholarly work: literature on theories of democracy and democratic citizenship, literature on democratically relevant pedagogies, and literature on teacher education for democracy. This literature provided analytical tools that I have represented in a framework consisting of pedagogical, political, and cultural dimensions (see Figure 2). The pedagogical dimension of the framework synthesizes elements such as the openness of classroom environment, the distinction between transmissive, transactional, and transformational pedagogies (Evans, 2008; Miller, 2007), the connection of what is taught with the lives and social realities of learners (Davies et al., 1999; Freire, 2010), and the degree of change and continuity (Gardinier, 2012; Niyozov, 2008). This dimension guides my examination of the pedagogy used in the selected teacher education classrooms, classroom environment, teacher-student relationships, opportunities for the development of democratically oriented skills and values, and changes and continuities in the practice of teacher educators.

The political dimension of the conceptual framework incorporates elements of minimal and maximal citizenship enacted through different civic and political roles and dispositions, ranging from citizens’ rights, freedoms, and responsibilities to their capacity to challenge elected officials, combat social inequities, and transform the world around them (McLaughlin, 1992). The cultural dimension of the conceptual framework extends from ethnocentric (exclusive) to pluralistic (inclusive) citizenship and provides analytical tools to explore teacher educators’ notions of citizens’ national identity and attitudes towards ethnic, racial, and other forms of
cultural diversity (Korostelina, 2013; Sleeter & Grant, 2007). The political and cultural dimensions of the framework facilitate my analysis of teacher educators’ conceptions of democracy and citizenship and the content articulated in the selected teacher education classes across four universities in Ukraine.

I explore factors impeding and enabling teacher education for democracy through societal, institutional, and personal categories. Societal factors refer to large-scale processes which affect the professional practice of teacher educators and its contribution to democracy. Institutional factors refer to processes taking place inside the universities and teacher education programs. Personal factors refer to individual professional dispositions and habits of teacher educators that constrain or enable teacher education for democracy.

**Methodological Framework of the Study**

This study employed a mixed methods multiple-case study methodology to examine what teacher education for democracy might mean and look like in post-Soviet Ukraine, and to provide specific examples of such education. The study consisted of surveying a large number of teacher educators across selected departments; interviewing university administrators, department heads, teacher educators, and teacher candidates; and interviewing and observing a few purposively selected teacher educators at four universities located in western, central, and eastern Ukraine. In this study, the purposively selected teacher educators represented individual cases that were nested within the four universities. The purpose of the survey and interviews was to obtain a broad picture of teacher education practices and beliefs relevant to democracy, and to contextualize the institutional environments of the selected teacher educators. The purpose of the teacher educator case studies was to illustrate various aspects of teacher education for democracy and to explore in depth their meanings and practices. Data collection procedures included semi-
structured individual interviews with teacher educators, teacher candidates, department heads, and university administrators; focused participant observation of the classes of teacher educator case studies; anonymous, paper-based, open-ended surveys; and document analysis. I conducted fieldwork between February and November 2013, spending approximately five to six weeks at each university.

**Significance of the Study**

This study contributes to the research on teacher education for democracy and it also holds implications for policy and practice. Some studies on this topic have been conducted in the context of North America (Zeichner, 2009), Latin America (Lopes Cardozo, 2012), Africa (Harber & Serf, 2006), and Australia (Zyngier, 2012), but only a few somewhat-related studies have been undertaken in the context of Ukraine and other post-Soviet countries. The significance of this study is that it provides several well-contextualized descriptions and analyses of what teacher education for democracy actually looks like in a post-authoritarian society transitioning to democracy. It generates context-specific knowledge and perspectives that will contribute to the comparative and international discussion of teacher education for democracy. It assesses the current potential and capacity of teacher education programs in relation to the democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates, pointing to major issues and areas for improvement.

Another contribution of this study is its exploration of teacher educators’ conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship. While abundant studies have investigated such conceptions among school students, teacher candidates, and teachers across different contexts (see Castro, 2013; Lanahan & Phillips, 2014; Obenchain et al., 2013), few have probed the understanding that teacher educators hold of democracy, citizenship, and the education that promotes it. It is commonly assumed that students’ learning experiences in citizenship education
can be influenced by their teachers’ understandings and beliefs about democratic citizenship. Similarly, it can be argued that the democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates would be mediated by teacher educators’ beliefs about citizenship. Therefore, there is a need to examine such conceptions among teacher educators and the implications they might have for the democratic socialization of teacher candidates. At the same time, as will be shown in chapter four, the teacher educators surveyed across the four universities did not always report teaching teacher candidates the skills and values that they had advocated in their own conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship. Thus, this study raises questions about the presumed influence of educators’ beliefs about democracy and citizenship on their teaching.

This study also contributes to the existing research on factors impeding democratic citizenship education. It identifies constraints that are often ignored in the Western literature, such as educational corruption and politicization, a societal devaluation of academic knowledge, teacher candidates’ inability or unwillingness to engage with dialogical pedagogies, and educators’ traditionalist beliefs about teaching. For example, some research critiques teacher educators for using transmissional, content-based instruction and failing to model democratic pedagogies to teacher candidates (see, for example Harber & Mncube, 2012). However, studies do not usually consider the engagement of school students or teacher candidates with such pedagogies, even when they are offered to them. Furthermore, although educational systems are reported to be corrupt in many countries (Transparency International, 2013), little citizenship education research identifies corruption as an obstacle to democratic citizenship education.

This study adds to the existing literature on the national, civic, and political identities of Ukrainians in the borderland regions of western and eastern Ukraine, which, as mentioned in the previous section, are recognized to be politically and culturally divided. For example,
Nikolayenko’s (2011) study showed divergent levels of national attachment among school students from eastern and western Ukraine. Similarly, Tereshchenko’s (2010, 2013) research demonstrated that students from borderland regions conceptualized national identities differently to each other but shared similar civic beliefs and political positions. Like Tereshchenko’s study, my analysis of conceptions of democracy and citizenship of faculty members from eastern and western Ukraine did not overall support a regional contrast in terms of civic and political beliefs.

This study lastly contests Western-based⁴ conceptions of democratic citizenship and the education that promotes it and thereby contributes to the comparative and international discussion on this topic. Like other studies (Williams, 2013), this study revealed that what would be considered minimal citizenship along the political and cultural dimensions in Western established democracies might not be so minimal in the context of non-Western countries in transition such as Ukraine. A consideration of context can help to explain this variation. Similarly, some practices such as patriotic education and ethnocultural tolerance education, which are often critiqued for promoting possibly nationalistic views and ignoring structural inequities of cultural minorities in Western scholarship, respectively, acquire a different meaning and relevance in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine.

⁴ In this dissertation, when I use terms such as ‘Western-based typologies,’ ‘Western scholarship,’ or ‘Western contexts,’ I refer to contexts such as the United States, Canada, England or Western Europe and the scholarship produced in these contexts. Although I consider Ukraine to be part of Western civilization, I do not view it as a Western society, especially if the Western lenses of political (liberalism) and economic (market economy) development are applied. As mentioned in the section on democratic transformation, Ukraine has been described as a “feckless democracy” (Riabchuk, 2011) because of the weak or even absent democratic institutions and the combination of democracy with authoritarianism. According to the 2014 Corruption Perceptions Index, Ukraine was one of the most corrupt countries in the world, occupying 142 position in a worldwide ranking of corruption in relation to other countries and territories ($N = 175$; Transparency International, 2014). In 2014, Ukraine’s GNI per capita was $3,560, with almost 26% of the country’s population living below the national poverty line (UNDP, 2012; World Bank, 2014). Furthermore, Ukraine can hardly be considered a Western society, since, as Riabchuk (2014) notes, there has historically been a controversy between the Slavophiles and the Westernizers, and anti-Western forces present in the region have been emphasizing “the profound “otherness” of mythical, essentialized, East Slavonic, Eurasian, Orthodox Christian civilization and reject[ing] western values and institutions, including the notion of human rights, civic national identity, and liberal-democratic nation state” (p. 206). Therefore, for the purposes of this dissertation, I contrast Ukraine with the West and view it as a non-Western context.
Researcher’s Positionality

My research interest in teacher education for democracy stems not only from the lack of available empirical evidence on this topic but also from my personal commitment to the democratization of Ukraine as one of its citizens. Like many other scholars, I view both formal and informal education as potential vehicles of democratization. Parker (2001) observes that democratic identity must be nurtured, since it does not emerge by itself, and this is especially true in a post-authoritarian context where citizens had not experienced democracy before. Democratic development involves not only establishing democratic institutions, but also transforming social consciousness. Teachers can be potential agents of changes in social consciousness through the appropriate curricula, methods of instruction, and school climate. Yet they need to learn and experience democratically oriented knowledge, skills and values themselves before they can introduce them to their students. In other words, like a citizen’s democratic identity, a teacher’s democratic identity also needs nurturing. Although Ukrainian teacher education programs are generally not conducive to the promotion of democratic identities and democratic teaching, I hope to show, by my findings on the individual initiatives and efforts of reform-oriented teacher educators, that they do have potential.

As mentioned above, there are various conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship which can shape our social roles and outlooks, including our views on pedagogy. It is important to be frank about my own conceptions of democratic citizenship because they constitute an ideological perspective with which I designed my study and entered my fieldwork and which inevitably influenced my interpretation of the data collected. I espouse ideas of maximal and multicultural citizenship and transformational pedagogy. My belief is that citizenship should be based on participatory democracy and be inclusive of and impartial towards
others regardless of their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexuality, and culture. I view participatory democracy in terms of daily actions ranging from obeying the law to deliberating on public issues and holding politicians accountable so that citizens can contribute to their own wellbeing and that of others. I also believe that citizenship should be based on civic patriotism (Peterson, 2012). I see transformational pedagogy as one instrument for the development of politically oriented and engaged democratic citizens. I also acknowledge that the conceptions of democracy, citizenship, and pedagogy that I use in this study emerged in Western contexts such as the United States, Canada, and England, which influenced their interpretive origins. As will be apparent throughout this study, I am cautious about applying them to the context of post-Soviet Ukraine.

**Overview of the Study**

In chapter two, I overview various theories of democracy and democratic citizenship, various pedagogical approaches to democratic citizenship education, and possible conceptions of teacher education for democracy. I also discuss the likely outcomes of such education, justifying its need for the development and maintenance of democracy. This scholarly literature provides the foundations for the conceptual framework that guided this study. In chapter three, I introduce and justify my mixed methods multiple-case study methodology and study design. I also review my process of participant selection and sampling, describe the research participants and research sites, and present my data collection, management, and analysis procedures. I conclude by discussing the strengths and limitations of the study. Throughout the chapter, I also reflect on challenges that I encountered during the data collection process and their potential impact on the quality of the data I collected.
In chapters four, five, and six, I present and analyze the data. I start by examining the survey data and presenting its findings in chapter four. I will describe the societal, institutional, and personal factors that teacher educators viewed as impeding teacher education for democracy in the four universities. I then overview and discuss the survey respondents’ conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship. I conclude with the presentation of the teaching approaches that survey respondents reported using and the skills and values that they claimed to promote in their classes. Chapter four provides broad contextual information about teacher education for democracy and institutionally situates the purposively selected teacher educator case studies in the four universities. In chapter five, using interview and classroom observation data, I discuss the pedagogical aspect of teacher education for democracy through an examination of the teaching practices of the teacher educator case studies. I focus particularly on their teaching approaches, the skills and values they sought to teach through enacted pedagogies, their teacher-student relationships, changes and continuities in their teaching practice, and the engagement of their teacher candidates with the pedagogies offered. In chapter six, I explore the curricular content through an analysis of what each of the teacher educators taught. Each case study illustrates a different aspect of education for democracy, showing what democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates can mean in a post-authoritarian society in transition such as Ukraine.

In chapter seven, I summarize the key findings and discuss the significance and implications of the study. I also show how my research extends the established Western conceptions of democratic citizenship and what constitutes teacher education for democracy in post-authoritarian and post-socialist contexts. I then reflect on the strengths and limitations of this study and offer recommendations for future research. Lastly, I discuss my research findings
and their implications in light of the Euromaidan protests that emerged in Ukraine as my fieldwork was ending.
Chapter 2
Literature Review:
Democratic Citizenship and Teacher Education

In this chapter, I overview theories of democracy and democratic citizenship, pedagogical methods of democratic citizenship education, and possible approaches to teacher education for democracy. One purpose of this overview is to explain and substantiate analytical tools for the conceptual framework of the study; another is to show the role of education, particularly teacher education, in the development and maintenance of democracy. The conceptions of democracy, citizenship, and teacher education for democracy that I present below come primarily from Western scholarship. Questions might arise about the appropriateness of using such conceptions as interpretative lenses in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine. However, as we will see in the next chapters, consideration of the historical, political, and social context of Ukraine can help to challenge and adjust these Western interpretative lenses. Questions might also arise about the setting of this research: while it is situated within higher education, most conceptions of democratic citizenship and their corresponding pedagogical practices come out of research conducted in elementary and secondary schools. However, multiple studies have applied these conceptions to higher education and other contexts (see, for example, Catalano, 2013; James & Iverson, 2009; Patterson et al., 2012).

In what follows, I first summarize possible political and civic roles of citizens, as well as aspects of their national and cultural identities. These aspects of democratic citizenship will constitute political and cultural dimensions of the conceptual framework. I then describe various democratically oriented pedagogies, the elements of which will comprise a pedagogical dimension of the framework. I lastly present different orientations to teacher education for democracy and their possible outcomes, as well as the principal factors that impede such
education. Different approaches to teacher education for democracy, ranging from humanism and multiculturalism to social justice and global citizenship, can provide different opportunities for the democratic socialization of teacher candidates, and these can be located along political, cultural, and pedagogical continua. The use of analytical tools from the political and cultural dimensions of democratic citizenship, along with consideration of their respective pedagogical approaches and the factors impeding and enabling them, allowed for a comprehensive analysis of teacher education for democracy in Ukraine.

**Democracy, Citizenship, and Citizenship Education**

Democracy, citizenship, and citizenship education are complex and contested terms. Different types of democracy are reflected in different types of citizenship; they put different demands on citizens (Harber & Serf, 2006; Myers, 2007b). For the purposes of this study, I will draw on McLauglin’s (1992) interpretations of minimal and maximal citizenship to synthesize multiple conceptions of citizenship along a political dimension. I will also draw on Sleeter and Grant’s (2007) conceptions of multicultural education and Korostelina’s (2003) narratives of nation building to organize conceptions of citizenship along a cultural dimension. I adopt Audigier’s (1998) viewpoint that citizenship education does not limit itself to one subject but rather encompasses all forms and levels of education through which individuals are taught to function in a democratic society.

**Democracy: Types and conditions of viability**

Democracy does not have “one clear, unambiguous, universal meaning” (Beyer, 1998, p. 66), for its practices “differ widely from epoch to epoch and from place to place” (Dewey, 1927, p. 65 as cited in Cunningham, 2002, p. 144). In Western scholarship, theorists commonly distinguish between participatory, deliberative, and critical democracy, on the one hand, and
liberal, privatized, and market democracy, on the other (Portelli, 2001; Sehr, 1997). The former group refers to the non-repressive and non-discriminatory participation of citizens in making decisions and policies concerning their lives, their constant control of governing institutions, and their active involvement in sustaining, challenging, and transforming a democratic order (Torres, 1998). The latter group, which owes much to the rise of neoliberalism, is concerned with the governance of people and the distribution of power; it involves political representation and political spectatorship and favours economic rationality (Torres, 1998). These types of democracy differ from each other by their conceptions of citizen-state relations, the role of government, the forms and levels of political engagement of citizens, and the levels of their concern for private interests and the common good. Scholars also distinguish between established democracies (countries such as the USA, Canada or England), emerging democracies (countries coming out from autocratic and military regimes and colonial rule), and new democracies (some countries of Latin America that do democracy differently to the established democracies. See Zyngier, 2012).

Democracy requires a number of conditions to be in place in order to be viable and flourish. Cohen (1971) puts forward the following conditions: material (environmental, mechanic, and economic conditions), constitutional (protection of rights and freedoms), intellectual (education of citizens and informed choice), psychological (kinds of citizens), and protective (protection against threats to democracy). Putnam (1993) asserts that there is a need for the active participation of citizens in public affairs, for social capital in the form of trust, reciprocity and respect among citizens, and for social equality. Macpherson (1977) emphasizes the absence of large economic disparities between citizens as a condition of democracy, since these can hinder engagement in political participation. Others mention a high level of
commitment to democratic values, skills, and behaviour among the citizenry and strong
democratic institutions and processes such as free and fair elections, the separation of the three
branches of power, the rule of law, political accountability, and free media as conditions of
democracy (Harber & Mncube, 2012). Thus, rights and freedoms, democratic institutions,
democratic behaviour among the populace, and equality are generally considered to be essential
requirements of democracy (see also Dalton, Shin, & Jou, 2007).

**Democratic citizenship: A political dimension**

Citizens can perform different civic and political roles in a democracy. McLaughlin
(1992) proposes interpretations of minimal and maximal citizenship located along a continuum
to capture the contested nature of democratic citizenship, particularly its political dimension.
Other scholars have labeled minimal citizenship “elitist citizenship” (Sears, 1996), “personally
responsible citizenship” (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), “traditional citizenship” (Parker, 2003),
and “citizenship as a legal status and a set of duties” (Osler & Starkey, 2005). According to these
interpretations, which are aligned with liberal representative democracy, citizens are holders of
civil, political, and social rights, freedoms, and obligations such as voting, paying taxes, military
service, and obeying the law. Citizens are also supposed to be knowledgeable about the history
of their country, understand the mechanics of democratic governance, defer to authority, support
national values and norms, and adapt to, rather than change, the reality they encounter (Freire,
1974; Sears, 1996). Minimal citizenship education therefore concentrates on the structural,
procedural, and legal aspects of political institutions; it promotes blind patriotism and
compliance to the state, and avoids discussion of contested issues (Ichilov, 1998). It also focuses
on character education, foregrounding the formation of personal qualities such as morality,
integrity, and personal responsibility rather than political orientations.
Minimal citizenship education has been criticized for accommodating individuals to the existing socio-political order, and hence reproducing, as opposed to challenging, that order (Biesta, 2011). For example, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) argue that a focus on character education by itself falls short of democratic citizenship. They advocate a shift from “the narrow and often ideologically conservative conception of citizenship embedded in many efforts at teaching for democracy” (p. 237). Similarly, Osborne (2004) argues that citizenship education needs to go beyond the cultivation of “good person” qualities because a democratic society presupposes good citizens as well as good persons. As he puts it:

[citizenship] requires a willingness and ability to play an active and morally principled part in the public life of one’s society, at the very least by casting an informed vote in elections and, ideally, by being engaged with and in public affairs. (p. 13)

For these scholars, an exclusive focus on teaching rights and obligations, patriotic sentiments, and good person qualities limits the possibilities of promoting politically oriented, participatory, and critical forms of citizenship. Some scholars also consider minimal citizenship education inadequate in the context of increasingly ethnically, nationally, and culturally diverse societies because of its assimilationist and nationalistic focus (Ichilov, 1998; Parker, 2003).

The concept of maximal citizenship is contrasted to that of minimal citizenship. Other related terms used in the literature include “activist citizenship” (Sears, 1996), “progressive citizenship” (Parker, 2003), “participatory” and “justice-oriented citizenship” (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004), and “citizenship as a practice” (Osler & Starkey, 2005). Maximal citizenship encourages a participatory approach to democracy and emphasizes the capacity of citizens to challenge elected officials and influence the world around them (McLaughlin, 1992). In this conception, citizens are not considered to be passive spectators of political processes; instead they try to influence those processes, for example, through referenda, town hall legislative
assemblies or voluntary neighbourhood associations (Cunningham, 2002). Maximal citizenship prioritizes group solidarity and concern for the common good over that of individuals; thus, it favours a collective rather than an individualistic mentality. It also critically examines social reality and power relations and promotes social justice and change. While some scholars combine the participatory and social justice perspectives of citizenship, others differentiate them. For example, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) question whether citizenship education that emphasizes civic and political participation necessarily promotes capacities for critical analysis and social change, and vice versa. Maximal citizenship education does not ignore the knowledge base provided in minimal citizenship education, but it focuses rather on the development of critical thinking skills and the creation of spaces in which individuals can experience participation and practice agency.

While conceptions of minimal and maximal citizenship are useful to characterize levels of civic and political engagement of citizens, they do not necessarily provide tools to account for social and cultural diversity and thus may not adequately address contemporary issues of unity and difference. As Parker (2003) argues, public agency and citizen action by themselves are not sufficient for democracy because politically active citizens can be exclusive of others, particularly of cultural minorities and marginalized groups. He proposes an advanced conception of citizenship which embraces participation, individual and group differences, multiple identities, and a unifying political community (p. 25). Thus, there is a need for consideration of both political and cultural identities in the analysis of democratic citizenship and its requisite education.
Democratic citizenship: A cultural dimension

Parker’s concept of advanced citizenship includes a key aspect that others have termed multicultural or pluralist citizenship (Banks, 2004a; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter & Grant, 2007). This conception emerged as a response to the rise of racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse nation-states under the influence of globalization and mass migration and as a response to claims by marginalized minority groups (Banks, 2004b; Siim & Squires, 2008). Multicultural citizenship consists in “learn[ing] about and respect[ing] the histories, identities, and cultures of the groups with whom we share a common state, as a way of making the state more just and inclusive” (Kymlicka, 2004, p. xvi). In other words, it embodies respect for social and cultural difference. Banks (1990) advocates mixing and blending multicultural and citizenship education to cultivate multicultural literacy and cross-cultural competency among citizens as a means of combating forms of discrimination such as racism, sexism, xenophobia and creating a just, humane society. Similarly, Ichilov (1998) advocates citizenship education that goes beyond the “inculcation of traditional patriotism or conventional nationalist ideology” to address the needs of culturally pluralistic and racially, ethnically, and nationally heterogeneous societies (p. 268).

There have been many interpretations of multicultural citizenship and the types of education it entails (Gay, 2004; Kumashiro, 2000). For example, Sleeter and Grant (2007) suggest five approaches to multicultural citizenship education, locatable along a continuum. The first approach, “teaching the exceptional and culturally different,” is the most assimilationist and traditional. It focuses on teaching students who belong to various racial, ethnic, and cultural minority groups the cognitive skills, concepts, language, and values of the traditionally dominant group to enable them to function effectively in a particular educational and societal setting. The second approach, “human relations,” is a form of intergroup education. It aims to reduce and
eliminate prejudice, biases, and stereotypes and to cultivate care, acceptance, and respect for others regardless of ethnicity, race, gender, and other markers of identity. The third approach, “single-group studies,” focuses on the study of a particular marginalized group of people in order to develop learners’ respect for that group and to raise its social status. Like the previous approaches, the fourth approach, “multicultural education,” also underscores the reduction of prejudice and discrimination against marginalized groups and works towards achieving equal opportunity and social justice for all groups. Its distinctive features are that it deals with multiple cultural groups at the same time, advocates reform of the educational system, and organizes the whole educational process around principles of pluralism and equality. Lastly, the fifth approach, “multicultural social justice education,” deals more assertively with issues of oppression and structural inequality based on race, class, gender, or disability and advocates reconstruction of the society to achieve greater equity. These five approaches provide insights into the different levels of cultural responsiveness of citizens and their engagement with ethnic, racial, and other forms of cultural diversity, as well as into various models of society. For example, while the first approach reinforces an exclusionary model of society because of its assimilationist nature, the other four approaches work towards a more inclusive, pluralistic, and just society.

Although multicultural citizenship education deals with the construction of citizenship identity, especially its cultural aspect, much of this literature, because of its worldview based on the context of the United States, does not directly engage with national identity and nation building. In the context of this study, these topics are important, since Ukraine has been undergoing a nation building process since the proclamation of its independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union. One can construct either an ethnocentric and chauvinistic national identity that will be exclusive of other ethnic minorities or a pluralistic national identity that will
be inclusive of different ethnic groups while being rooted in national affinity. In her study of widely shared concepts about national identity in Ukraine, Korostelina (2013) delineated five different narratives which, like the concept of multicultural citizenship education, can be located along a continuum of exclusive (assimilationist) and inclusive (pluralist) citizenship. They are useful analytical tools which can be summoned to examine the construction of national identity in the post-Soviet context.

“Dual identity narrative” describes Ukraine as a country consisting of two co-equal ethnic groups (Ukrainians and Russians); it advocates establishing Russian as a second state language, and conceives the country as being divided by regional differences. The “fight for Ukrainian identity narrative” depicts Ukraine as a homogeneous culture comprised of ethnic Ukrainians with enclaves of pro-Soviet Russians who threaten Ukrainian culture, history, and language. This narrative advocates creating policies to enforce Ukrainian as the sole state language and does not consider Ukrainian nationalism to be ethnically based. The “recognition of Ukrainian identity narrative” describes Ukraine as a homogeneous culture of ethnic Ukrainians with small ethnic minority groups which should be integrated into Ukrainian culture. Ukrainian is properly the sole state language but the Russian-speaking population may speak and preserve their language.

Lastly, the “multicultural-civic narrative” paints Ukraine as a multicultural society with co-equal ethnic groups. In this narrative, national identity is based on a civic, not an ethnic, conception of the nation. The Ukrainian language serves to unite the country but ought not to be enforced in an exclusionary manner. This narrative is grounded more firmly than the other four in ideas of inclusive citizenship. Reflecting ideas of ethnic and civic nationalism, these narratives shed light on types of national identity and society which can be promoted along ethnocentric (exclusive) or pluralist and civic (inclusive) lines.
Although minimal and maximal conceptions of citizenship are generally used to characterize the civic and political roles of citizens, their typology can also be helpful in identifying levels of multicultural citizenship and their corresponding types of education. For example, multicultural citizenship education that advocates an assimilationist approach can be viewed as minimal while education that engages learners in a critical deconstruction of structural inequalities of cultural minorities and promotes change can be categorized as maximal. Minimal and maximal conceptions of citizenship along political and cultural dimensions, coupled with different conceptions of nation building, provide broad areas for inquiry into the different meanings and aspects of democratic citizenship and its education. These conceptions are not mutually exclusive and can be enacted simultaneously (DeJaeghere, 2007). Further, they are not fixed and static; they can acquire different meanings in different political and historical contexts (see Williams, 2013).

**Pedagogy and Democratic Citizenship**

Methods of instruction, or pedagogy, along with curricula and the overall learning environment, can both scaffold and impede the learning of democratically oriented content, skills and values; they can form various types of citizenship (Parker, 2001). For example, the formation of maximal citizenship requires the use of interactive, active and critical pedagogies that would enable individuals to discuss contested issues, practice their agency through decision-making and other activities, and think for themselves. In contrast, the development of minimal citizenship relies primarily on transmissional, content-based instruction. In what follows, drawing from different studies and pedagogical frameworks, I will explore various aspects of instruction and learning environments that are conducive to democratic citizenship education. These aspects,
synthesized below, constitute the pedagogical dimension of my conceptual framework, to be placed alongside the political and cultural dimensions.

Hess (2009) and other scholars view the discussion of controversial political issues as essential to democratic citizenship education. They believe that conflict is unavoidable in democracy because of the existence of diverse individual viewpoints, and they suggest that exploration of these viewpoints creates opportunities to engage with divergent perspectives, learn tolerance and respect, practice agency and voice, and develop critical and creative thinking (Avery, 2002; Bickmore, 2014; Dull & Murrow, 2008; Sheppard et al., 2011). Furthermore, various studies show that discussion of social and political matters correlates positively with civic knowledge and political engagement. For example, large-scale international citizenship education studies found that open classroom discussion of contested issues, during which teachers encourage students to explore and express a range of viewpoints, was positively associated with civic knowledge, support for democratic values, and a capacity for engaged citizenship (Schulz et al., 2010). Similarly, based on their survey of high school students in the United States, Kahne, Crow, and Lee (2013) concurred that open discussion of societal issues in classrooms promoted interest in political issues and formal and electoral types of political engagement. However, as Bickmore (2014) and other scholars note, open classroom discussions are rarely organized and sustained by teachers or inclusive of all students.

The creation of democratic educational structures and processes inside and outside the classroom is another important aspect of democratic citizenship pedagogy (Apple & Beane, 2007). For example, in his study of the implementation of citizenship education pedagogy in Canada and England, Evans (2006) found that teachers established a democratic classroom environment by seeking student input into classroom decisions and rules, facilitating open
discussions and encouraging multiple perspectives, allowing students choice on projects, and encouraging participation in school councils. Such experiences created space for the students to exercise their agency and potentially to acquire democratically oriented dispositions and capacities. Others also underscore the transformation of hierarchical teacher-student relationships based on authority and conformity in order to empower students (Hemmings, 2000; Ross, 2008). Under reordered relationships, students can become equal participants of the learning process and encounter a sense of respect for their viewpoints and experiences (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Hess & Avery, 2008). Lastly, a democratic curriculum needs to relate to real life issues, particularly the social realities of students (Davies, 2012; Davies et al., 1999). As Freire (2010) argues, content should not be “alien to the existential experience of the students” if it is to facilitate their empowerment and liberation (p. 71).

Although there has been extensive research on citizenship education, Evans (2006) points to a general lack of empirical research on citizenship education pedagogy inside classrooms. Building on Miller’s (2007) framework of transmissional, transactional, and transformational pedagogical orientations, Evans (2008) demonstrates different approaches to citizenship pedagogy. He locates these three pedagogical orientations along a continuum, with transmissional orientations at one end and transformative orientations at the other. These orientations overlap with each other: they can be enacted simultaneously and emphasized to varying degrees. They incorporate, to a various extent, the characteristics of democratic teaching outlined above. The ‘transmissional’ or ‘content-driven’ orientation is comparable to Freire’s (2010) concept of “banking education,” which consists in the transmission of fixed and expert knowledge from teacher to student and the rote memorization of this content alienated from the lived experiences of students. This orientation reinforces hierarchical teacher-student
relationships and provides limited opportunities for students to exercise their agency.

Transmissional teaching practices are aimed at the mastery of content and are composed primarily of methods such as lectures, dictation, copying notes, reading or viewing for content, and practice activities (Evans, 2008).

In contrast to the transmissional orientation, the ‘transactional’ orientation rejects the monolithic and static nature of knowledge. It views knowledge rather as fluid, changing, and constructed. Transactional teaching is aimed at the development of problem-solving, decision-making, and enquiry skills. It cultivates these skills through interactive and dialogical activities such as independent and group inquiry projects, case studies, and discussion of contested real-life issues (Evans, 2008). Like the transactional orientation, the ‘transformational’ orientation also relies on dialogical teaching approaches. Its distinctive feature is that it advocates political and social change and views students as active and responsible participants in that social change (Evans, 2008). It encourages students to use the findings of their critical studies of social and political issues to facilitate personal and social change; in other words, it extends learning beyond the classroom. These three pedagogical orientations facilitate the development of different types of democratic citizenship and correlate approximately with the minimal and maximal conceptions of citizenship outlined in the previous section.

Although these pedagogical approaches to democratic citizenship education were developed in the context of primary and secondary school studies, similar approaches have been advocated and used in higher education institutions, such as those in which this research study was conducted. For example, in their study of education for political engagement in tertiary institutions in the United States, Colby, Beamount, Ehrlich, and Corngold (2007) outlined key pedagogies such as discussion and deliberation of social and political issues, political research
and action projects, politically focused internships and service learning, and structured reflection. These approaches were integrated into courses and extracurricular activities to facilitate political teaching and learning. In his study of citizenship education initiatives in three English universities, McCowan (2012) describes efforts spanning from single courses to embedding citizenship perspectives across the curriculum and focusing on the activist and ethical aspects of citizenship. Instructors who facilitated these initiatives used dialogical teaching approaches and examined controversial political and moral issues to teach democratically oriented skills and values to students. The resemblance of the pedagogical approaches presented in these studies to those used in schools suggests that the same citizenship pedagogical frameworks can be employed across different educational levels.

The studies and frameworks outlined thus far emerge mainly from the context of Western established democracies, and they do not necessarily account for the challenges facing educational systems in post-authoritarian and post-conflict contexts. Despite declarations of educational democratization, the educational systems in these contexts still preserve many traditional features that impede democratic citizenship education. In her review of citizenship education in post-conflict contexts, Quaynor (2011) notes that, although teachers valued human rights and democracy in general, some of them continued to exhibit authoritarian tendencies and did not believe that the school should constitute a democratic space. Furthermore, the teachers’ adoption of democratic pedagogies was impaired by a lack of training and resources. Similarly, in her study of citizenship education initiatives in post-communist Poland and Romania, Tobin (2010) indicates that “some traditions of the dictatorship still remain in schools,” particularly in Romania (p. 281). She notes that students had limited, if any, opportunities to practice their
agency in the classroom and that teachers did not usually show respect for the dignity of students.

Other scholars observe that educational transformation in post-authoritarian contexts has been fragmented and interspersed with old and new practices. Gardinier (2012) finds that, while introducing new paradigms and practices into their instruction, Albanian teachers retain some aspects of traditional pedagogies and teacher authority. She refers to these teachers as “agents of change and continuity” (p. 659). The framework of “change and continuity” is a useful analytical tool to capture both the preservation and the transformation of traditional teaching practices and citizenship views among educators in post-authoritarian contexts because the past does not seem to dissipate but rather continues to influence their practices and beliefs. Furthermore, Vavrus (2009) and other scholars argue that the analysis of teaching practices should be placed in larger political, material, and cultural contexts as they vary considerably around the globe and therefore affect instruction differently. She proposes a notion such as a “contingent pedagogy” that accounts for “the material conditions of teaching, the local traditions of teaching, and the cultural politics of teaching” (p. 310). This notion is a useful tool in considering the multiple factors that influence methods of instruction; it enables us to move beyond a simplified analysis of teaching through the lens of content and pedagogy (Niyozov, 2009).

**Teacher Education and Democracy**

Teacher education is not only a space of academic, professional, and technical socialization, but also a realm of political development (Ginsburg & Lindsay, 1995). Teacher education programs can prepare teacher candidates, formally or informally, “to assume active or inactive, conservative or change-oriented political roles in their work and lives,” thus influencing their political orientations and identities (Ginsburg & Lindsay, 1995, p. 8). Furthermore, teacher
education is central to any process of educational change, including educational democratization (Davies, 2002). Teachers need to gain democratically relevant knowledge, skills, and values before they can contribute to democratic transformation by teaching students about and by means of democracy (Harber & Mncube, 2012; Kennedy, 2005; Schweisfurth, 2002a). As studies show (Patterson et al., 2012; Torney-Purta et al., 2005), teachers’ knowledge and beliefs about democracy and democratic citizenship can influence the learning experiences and civic identities of their students. Teacher education programs can therefore play an important role in nurturing and advancing democratic identities among teacher candidates and preparing them to teach democratically.

**Contested meanings and diverse practices**

Like democracy and democratic citizenship, teacher education for democracy is a contested terrain (Robertson, 2008). In Western scholarship, there are two main theoretical perspectives on teacher education for democracy. The “instrumentalist” or “economic imperative perspective” views teacher education as a process of preparing cadres whose responsibility will be to produce workers with specialized knowledge, skills, and values for knowledge-based economies (Wang et al., 2011). This perspective is guided by the economic demands of globalization and neoliberalism. As Bonal and Rambla (2003) note, “the development of knowledge-driven economies, the technological revolution of our times, and changes in production processes are some of the factors that may alter what is taught and how it is taught” (p. 170). In contrast to the economic imperative perspective, the “critical resistance” or “social justice” perspective advocates politically oriented teacher education. Under this perspective, a task of teacher education is to enable future teachers, by means of the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions, to prepare citizens “to be committed to social justice and human rights
[and to] acquire the critical consciousness, necessary knowledge, and skills to participate actively in the democratic process” (Wang et al., 2011, p. 116). It puts the learning of teachers in a socio-political context, and equips them with an awareness of the impact of social and political realities on their teaching, as well as a sense of self-capability and agency towards action (Cochran-Smith, 2010; Giroux, 1989; Pinar, 2010). Although the critical resistance perspective has been advocated and theorized by many scholars, it has had a limited influence on policy making and teacher education because of its revolutionary nature; it has manifested itself mainly in individual rather than in systemic initiatives (Wang et al., 2011).

In practice, teacher education for democracy could include a number of related notions, such as social justice education, human rights, intercultural education, global citizenship education, special education, gender education, and progressive, humanistic, and child-centered education. These focuses point to different aspects of teacher education for democracy that are shaped by context-specific needs. For example, in the United States, Canada, and England, some teacher education programs adopt a social justice approach to help to eradicate educational and social inequalities (Boylan & Woolsey, 2015). Although there are divergences among the programs organized around social justice (Zeichner & Conklin, 2008), an idea common to them is “enhancing students’ learning and their life chances by challenging the inequities of school and society” (Cochran-Smith et al., 2009, p. 350). In Latin America and Africa, teacher education programs have been used to facilitate the democratic transformation after countries gained independence from colonial rule and military dictatorships. For example, in Bolivia, as Lopes Cardozo (2012) notes, educational reform was organized around the ideas of decolonization, multiculturalism, and productive and communitarian education in order to reevaluate the indigenous, cultural, and linguistic heritage and to address historical social
injustices. Teacher education programs were supposed “to train critical, reflexive, self-critical, innovative and research oriented professionals, who [were] committed to democracy, social transformations, and the full inclusion of all Bolivians in society” (Lopes Cardozo, 2012, p. 762). Most teacher education research conducted in the African context reports primarily on the promotion of learner-centered pedagogy, often paying little attention to other content taught. For example, after gaining independence from South African colonial and apartheid rule, Namibia organized its educational reform around the principles of access, equity, quality, and democracy. Among the main features of the redesigned teacher education programs were learner-centered education, critical inquiry, reflective practice, school-based studies, and awareness that knowledge was socially constructed and dependent on contextual factors (Dahlstrom, 1999). In their study of teacher education for democracy in South Africa, Harber and Serf (2006) found that teacher candidates had studied inclusion by means of discussion of the politics and history of multi-racial schools, had become informed about AIDS, and had completed sessions on relevant teaching methods such as classroom discussion.

The above examples help to demonstrate some of the different meanings and emphases of teacher education for democracy and the influence of local, national, and global processes on the formation of those meanings. Teacher education for democracy can mean preparing teachers to equip the future workforce with knowledge and capacities so that it can contribute to the economic and perhaps democratic development of the state. It can also mean promoting a progressive, humanistic, and learner-centred approach to education as an alternative to traditional, authoritarian pedagogies. It can, finally, signify cultivating social justice and other democratically oriented dispositions among teachers who will then be able to address societal issues ranging from intolerance to political apathy, thereby facilitating social change. These
different orientations to teacher education for democracy can have implications for the
democratic socialization of teacher candidates, and they can be placed in different positions
along the political, cultural, and pedagogical continua of our conceptual framework, depending
on the aspects of democratic citizenship that they emphasize. For example, teacher education
programs that focus on promoting various aspects of tolerance can potentially cultivate cultural
aspects of democratic citizenship among teacher candidates. Depending on the approaches to
multicultural citizenship adopted and the methods of instruction utilized, they can socialize
teacher candidates into minimal or maximal dimensions of multicultural citizenship and model
either transmissive, transactional, or transformational aspects of pedagogy. Thus, teacher
education programs can, so to speak, propel teacher candidates along the political, cultural, and
pedagogical continua during their preparation.

Outcomes of democratic socialization

While there is extensive research evidence on the outcomes of democratic citizenship
education in primary and secondary schools, research about the outcomes of such education in
tertiary institutions is scarce. In particular, there is scant empirical evidence regarding the
influence of teacher education for democracy on the actual practice and beliefs of teachers.
However, the available research does provide some compelling initial evidence. For example,
based on the 1999 IEA Civic Education Study data from eight countries, Torney-Purta,
Richardson, and Barber (2005) found that civic-related pre-service teacher preparation and
subsequent professional development had an influence on the civic knowledge of students in
some circumstances. They also found that there was a significant relationship between teachers’
confidence in teaching political topics and the likelihood that their students expected to vote in
elections. Teachers who had high confidence in teaching political and social topics tended to
have high levels of education and training. These findings point to the important role that teacher education programs can play in the democratic development of society by introducing democratically related content knowledge and pedagogical approaches to future teachers.

Some small-scale studies also demonstrate the positive influence of democratically oriented teacher education programs on the professional knowledge, beliefs, and practice of future teachers. Cochran-Smith and her colleagues (2009) studied American teachers who were part of a teacher education program committed to social justice during the pre-service period and the early months of the first year of teaching. They found that, as a result of their training, these teachers embraced ideas of social justice ranging from confronting race and inequality to teaching basic skills. In practice, they taught critical thinking and challenged the universality of knowledge, tried to reach all students in their classes, and used culturally responsive pedagogy to meet the cultural and linguistic needs of their students. These authors also found that, although teachers demonstrated commitment to improving the learning and life chances of their students, and believed that they could help to secure those ends, they did not necessarily adopt critical and activist perspectives or challenge the larger structures and arrangements of schooling. However, despite these omissions, as the authors note, the teachers did talk about and practice equity and social justice at the individual level. This study shows how teacher education for social justice can positively influence the teaching philosophies of future teachers and facilitate the transformation of the learning environment and the elimination of educational inequalities, at least in individual classrooms.

Similarly, other studies have showed how teaching democratically oriented knowledge, inclinations, and capacities in teacher education programs, and organizing such programs around specific themes, shapes the practice of future teachers. For example, five out of six Canadian
teachers in Schweisfurth’s (2006) study, who had chosen to prioritize the exploration of global citizenship issues in the compulsory high school civic education course they taught, were graduates of a democratically oriented ‘community and global connections’ teacher education program. As part of their studies, these teachers were taught how to read curricular guidelines through the lens of global citizenship education, to exercise their professional agency over the prescribed curriculum, and to teach topics relevant to social justice and global citizenship education. Similarly to Cochran-Smith and her colleagues, Pryor (2006) studied teacher candidates from the first semester of their final year of studies to the middle of their first year of teaching in order to see whether they maintained and acted upon beliefs about democratic theory and practice taught in a social studies methods course. She found that teachers retained positive beliefs about democratic classroom practice and intended to continue implementing it in their classrooms.

While these studies point to the potential influence of teacher education programs on the beliefs and practice of teachers, other studies do not always support this conclusion. For example, James and Iverson (2009) studied the influence of a one-semester, change-oriented, community-based service-learning project offered as part of a social studies methods course on teacher candidates’ thinking about citizenship and citizenship education. The project involved first critically discussing various social issues and then taking individual or group action in relation to one of the independently identified social issues. James and Iverson found that teacher candidates’ conceptions of citizenship changed from a personally responsible type involving rights, obligations, and good character to a more participatory and justice-oriented type after completion of the service-learning projects. Their conceptions of citizenship education aligned with their changing conceptions of citizenship. However, when surveyed 6 months after the
service-learning projects, most teacher candidates had reverted to their initial views of citizenship and citizenship education. This study provides insights into how teacher education can facilitate shifts in citizenship perspectives of teacher candidates, but how these influences intersect with other factors and cannot be simply assumed. For example, using an example from Belize, Jennings (2001) notes that, although teacher candidates were exposed to innovative teaching approaches, they were discouraged from practicing them by school principals who favoured traditional pedagogies.

Impediments to Democratic Citizenship Education

The implementation of democratic citizenship education across different educational levels has been facing numerous challenges. Some of these challenges are context specific while others are common to diverse societies and educational levels. Overall, the factors impeding democratic citizenship education can be divided into three large, interrelated categories: societal, institutional, and personal.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, societal factors capture various large political, economic, and social processes that affect the educational process, the professional practice of educators, and the contribution of the educational system to the development of democracy. In many countries, the political climate is not susceptible to the promotion of democratically relevant knowledge, skills, and values. Teachers often find it hard to teach democratic citizenship in contexts that exhibit rampant corruption, authoritarian tendencies, and political disengagement, since these can contradict the democratic knowledge and behaviours that they seek to introduce to students (Quaynor, 2011). Economic factors, most notably the underfunding of educational systems, can further obstruct democratic education, especially in developing countries where public investment in education is usually low. For example, the implementation
of student-centered pedagogy, an essential feature of democratic citizenship education, is often impeded by poor infrastructure, large class sizes, insufficient teaching materials, and teacher capacity (Schweisfurth, 2011). In her study of the implementation of student-centered educational reform in Tanzania, Vavrus (2009) notes that it is not only a lack of effort and technique among teachers that constrains social constructivist teaching but also substantial material inequalities in schools. Tanzanian teachers worked in small, overcrowded classrooms, with infrastructure and furniture poorly designed for group work or other interactive activities, and these conditions often kept them from practicing constructivist pedagogies.

Institutional factors refer to processes that constrain or facilitate democratic education from within educational establishments. As mentioned in previous sections, one of the main institutional issues is that many schools and universities, including teacher education programs, continue to preserve hierarchical and authoritarian structures and learning environments and to favour teacher-centered instruction, thus providing limited, if any, opportunities for the development of democratic knowledge and experience (Tse, 2009). For example, in her study of Bolivian teacher education programs, Lopes Cardozo (2013) notes that institutional challenges including insufficient infrastructure, corruption, ethnic, class and gender discrimination, traditional teaching styles, hierarchical teacher-student relationships, apathy, and institutional inertia undermined a declared educational transformation. Another institutional obstacle faced by democratic citizenship education, especially in higher education, is a debate on the appropriateness of promoting any moral, civic, and political orientations in educational institutions. In England, as McCowan (2012) points out, some universities resist the organization of citizenship oriented courses because of their association with government agendas. Moreover, educational policies have been increasingly informed by economic imperatives that have further
marginalized the civic and political commitments of educational establishments (see, for example, Sleeter, 2008). Lastly, another crucial institutional constraint is limited classroom time, which can impinge on the organization of transactional and transformational teaching activities, the inclusion of democratically relevant topics in curricula, and even the provision of courses geared towards democratic citizenship education.

Personal factors refer to the individual professional dispositions and habits of educators that influence their teaching and thereby the learning experience of students. Personal experiences, professional training, institutional environment, and cultural norms and traditions shape the professional identities of educators. In many parts of the world, educators emerged from a system of authoritarian schooling in which they did not experience democratic teaching or develop democratic skills and values. Nor were they necessarily exposed to such teaching during their teacher preparation (Harber & Mncube, 2012; Schweisfurth, 2002b). As a result, they might not be versed in a pedagogy supportive of democratic citizenship. However, even exposure to democratically oriented content and pedagogy does not guarantee their enactment. For example, in his study of the implementation of student-centered pedagogy in five developing countries, Ginsburg (2009) found that a lack of incentives such as increased salary, promotion prospects or recognition was among the factors that prevented teachers from modifying their teaching approaches. Educators, as Schweisfurth (2011) underscores, can resist educational changes and innovations “either as a conscious reaction against the reform, or more subtly as a manifestation of their identities, priorities, and perceived limitations” (p. 424). Some cultural traditions that influence the professional identities of teachers are not always receptive to democratically oriented pedagogies, which typically run against established societal and educational norms (O’Sullivan, 2004).
These factors point to the difficulty of implementing democratic citizenship education in various contexts. They suggest that its successful enactment depends not only on content and pedagogy but also on the professional identities of educators, institutional environments, material inputs, the imperatives of educational policies, and wider societal processes. A consideration of these societal, institutional, and personal factors allows us to gain a more complete understanding of the processes that constrain and enable democratic citizenship education.

**Summary: Democratic Citizenship and Teacher education**

This literature review has presented conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship as well as pedagogical approaches to democratic citizenship education. It has showed that different conceptions of democracy translate into different conceptions of citizenship and pedagogical orientations towards citizenship education. For example, transmissional, transactional and transformational pedagogical orientations can be distinguished by the extent to which they cultivate either minimal or maximal citizenship. Various curricular content of teacher education for democracy can also reflect different conceptions of citizenship. For example, promoting blind patriotism or good person qualities among teacher candidates, and encouraging them to cultivate such dispositions among their own future students, can be interpreted as minimal citizenship, while an emphasis on social justice can be aligned with maximal citizenship. This literature review has also demonstrated that historical, political, and social contexts shape the meanings of teacher education for democracy and that they can differ, yet also share similar characteristics, across various contexts. The results of large and small-scale empirical studies point to the capacity of teacher education to influence the democratic transformation of schools and thereby the wider society. Finally, this literature review has pointed out that an analysis of societal, institutional, and personal factors can help us to
comprehensively understand the difficulties of implementing democratic citizenship education as well as the processes on which its successful enactment is contingent in various contexts. The elements within political, cultural, and pedagogical dimensions of democratic citizenship education give rise to analytical foundations and tools that guide the research and analysis presented in the following chapters.
Chapter 3
Research Design and Methodology

In this chapter, I present the study’s research design and methodology. I first justify the use of a mixed methods multiple-case study methodology. I then outline the criteria employed to select participants for the study and I provide an overview of the teacher educator cases and research sites selected. I also discuss and justify the study’s research methods, including semi-structured interviews, classroom observation, open-ended survey, and document analysis. While overviewing these research methods, I also highlight challenges that I faced throughout my fieldwork arising from the research topic selected and the research instruments employed. I conclude the chapter by describing the data management, analysis, and validation processes and reflecting on the limitations of the study.

Overview of Methodological Framework

This mixed methods multiple-case study examined the meanings, possibilities, and challenges of teacher education for democracy across four universities in Ukraine, aiming to shed light on what such education might mean and look like in a post-authoritarian society undergoing democratic transformation. The study consisted of surveying a large number of teacher educators across selected university departments, interviewing university administrators, department heads, and teacher educators, and studying in depth a small group of selected teacher educators along with their teacher candidates, at the four universities. One purpose of the survey and interviews was to obtain a broader picture of teacher education for democracy and to contextualize the institutional environments of the selected teacher educators. One purpose of the case studies of teacher educators was to present specific exemplary instances of such education and to explore its meaning and practice in the context of Ukraine.
Although the study employed a mixed methods methodology, it was primarily qualitative. I chose a qualitative approach because it allowed me as a researcher to “study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3). It also allowed me to approach fieldwork “without [necessarily] being constrained by predetermined categories of analysis” (Patton, 2002, p. 14), to keep my inquiry open, and to gather multiple sources of data, thus producing a complex, nuanced picture in relation to the study’s research questions (Creswell, 2007). As we will see below, the employment of qualitative research methods raised questions and even suspicion from some study participants; however, the use of these methods, especially interviews, allowed me to collect information that some participants seemed to feel uncomfortable disclosing even in anonymous surveys out of fear of possible negative repercussions on their employment. For example, I found that faculty members tended to speak about educational corruption more readily in interviews than they did in their survey reports on the factors impeding their teaching. Overall, the use of qualitative research allowed me to adopt the role of an active learner, to answer how and what questions about the phenomena studied, and to explore these phenomena in the political and historic contexts of Ukraine (Creswell, 2007; Glesne, 2006).

As Creswell (2007) notes, “those undertaking qualitative studies have a baffling number of choices of approaches” (p. 6). Among such possible approaches are narrative research, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, case study, participatory action research and many others. I chose case study methodology, as it allowed me to focus on the systematic and in-depth examination of a specific phenomenon in particular contexts that influence this phenomenon (Stake, 200; Yin 2014). The four purposively selected teacher educator cases were
phenomena whose views and approaches to teaching I closely explored in relation to the research questions. These four cases were embedded within the four universities. Although I examined differences and similarities among the universities through the survey data, they themselves did not constitute cases. I used a multiple case study design both to illustrate various possible approaches to teacher education for democracy in Ukraine and to produce more compelling and robust evidence (Yin, 2014). The four case studies were interpretive: they went beyond mere data description and were characterized by “complexity, depth, and theoretical orientation” (Merriam, 1988, p. 28). They could therefore contribute to the theorization of democratic citizenship education and its implementation in teacher education programs (Merriam, 1988).

Although I describe my methodology as a mixed methods multiple-case study, I use the term “mixed methods” with caution because my study falls somewhere between mixed methods and multimethod research. As Creswell and Clark (2007) note, mixed methods research “focuses on collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study … [in order to] provide a better understanding of research problems” (p. 5). Quantitative data, as they explain, includes closed-ended information while qualitative data consists of open-ended information. The survey administered for this study consisted of ten open-ended questions, of which four also contained five-point Likert scales that provided closed-ended information. Thus, the survey collected mainly qualitative information which I quantified on occasion only in order to substantiate thematic trends and to identify the scope of variation and commonality across age groups, departments, and universities. As a result, there is some question as to whether this is a mixed methods study because the survey was not designed to collect quantitative information, except for the four Likert scales, the results of which were then mixed and analyzed with qualitative data. At the same time, the study is not really an instance of multimethod research –
that is, research based on multiple qualitative or quantitative methods and data sets – because the
survey did ask some closed-ended questions. Neither mixed methods nor multimethod research
fully captures the nature of my study, which collected, analyzed, and mixed different types of
data (survey, observations, and interviews with diverse stakeholders) in order to provide a
stronger array of evidence and a richer understanding of the research problems (Creswell &
Clark, 2007; Yin, 2014).

**Participant Selection and Sampling**

Since a primary purpose of the study was to explore what teacher education for
democracy might mean and look like in Ukraine and to provide specific examples of such
education, I employed purposive sampling to select study participants who could facilitate an
sampling is based on the assumption that one wants to discover, understand, gain insight;
therefore one needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most” (p. 48). The principal
study participants were teacher educators. My rationale for focusing my study on exploring the
work of teacher educators, rather than whole programs or institutions, was that there were no
programs in Ukraine with an explicit emphasis on social justice, intercultural tolerance, or global
citizenship (as there are, for example, at some teacher education institutions in the United States
and Canada. See Cushner, 2011; Cochran-Smith et al., 2009; Schweisfurth, 2006; Zeichner,
2009). I applied criteria derived from the work elaborated in chapters one and two to select a
smaller group of teacher educators to be interviewed and observed along with their teacher
candidates, the larger sample of teacher educators to be surveyed, and a few university
administrators, department heads, and teacher educators to be interviewed. In what follows, I
outline my sampling criteria for these three groups of study participants.
As a review of the literature showed, there were not many teacher educators in Ukraine who embraced educational change and facilitated the democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates. My goal was to explore the work of these reform-oriented teacher educators who could be viewed as unusual, unique, and exemplary cases (Merriam, 1988; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2014). Thus, my first sampling criterion was to select teacher educators who exhibited a commitment to transforming traditional teaching practice and infused democratic ideas and principles – social justice, multiculturalism, gender equality, human rights, active citizenship, and democratic and humanistic education – into their teaching.

My initial second sampling criterion was to recruit teacher educator cases from pedagogical universities. In Ukraine, future teachers can receive their degrees either from a pedagogical college, a pedagogical university, or a classic university. One main difference between them is that pedagogical universities set out to prepare only teachers and other educational professionals while classic universities aim to prepare various professionals, especially in the areas of humanities and social sciences. (Pedagogical universities offer ‘concurrent’ teacher education programs that include both basic university courses and teacher preparation). I originally wanted to select cases only from pedagogical universities because students who enter these are more likely to pursue a teaching career and they receive more specialized pedagogical training than do those at classic universities. However, an opportunity presented itself to work with two teacher educators at a classic university. I decided to add one classic university to my study in order to probe a potential difference between pedagogical and classic universities in relation to the phenomena being investigated. As a result, I ended up with teacher educator cases from three pedagogical universities and one classic university.
My third sampling criterion was to select teacher educators from a range of departments such as Ukrainian language and literature, history, philosophy, sociology, geography, primary education and pedagogy. At these departments, faculty members potentially had more opportunities to form political, civic, and patriotic dispositions among teacher candidates than did those from departments such as mathematics, physics or computer science. I was also interested in recruiting faculty members who taught courses such as political science, philosophy of education, “Humanity and the World,” civic education, and the fundamentals of pedagogy or upbringing. These courses are directly related to citizenship education and thus can potentially be important explicit locations of the political socialization of teacher candidates.

The fourth and last case sampling criterion was to identify teacher educator cases in universities located in western, central, and eastern Ukraine. My goal in recruiting cases from different geographical locations was to see whether there were regional differences or similarities in conceptions of democracy and citizenship, the skills and values promoted in courses, and the overall preparation of teacher candidates for democracy. As current research shows (Nikolayenko, 2011; Tereshchenko, 2010), there are variations, for example, in national attachment and the conceptualization of national identity between people from western and eastern Ukraine.

I identified nine teacher educator case studies, out of which I selected four to present in this dissertation, through personal contacts, a review of Ukrainian scholarly literature, an examination of faculty profiles on institutional websites, and the recommendations of university administration and department heads. Upon approval of the ethics protocol of my study by the University of Toronto, I sent out recruitment and consent letters (see Appendix A) through personal contacts and professional networks. Upon receiving responses to the recruitment letter
and undertaking initial conversations with some potential teacher educator cases, I sent an information and consent letter (see Appendix B) to the relevant university administrations asking for permission to conduct the study at their institutions. This initial contact with the university administration allowed me not only to gain official access to the research site, but also to establish relationships and receive support that I could use to facilitate data collection. For example, at one university, a vice-rector issued a letter asking department heads to assist me with the survey administration. Without such support, it would have been much harder for me to gain access to the departments and administer the survey.

I also purposively sampled the departments in which to administer the survey. I selected departments such as Ukrainian language and literature, history (mainly departments of Ukrainian history and world history), philosophy, sociology, geography, pedagogy, and primary education. As mentioned above, I chose these departments because of their potential to promote democratically oriented knowledge and values and to teach political and civic dispositions. I did not apply any sampling criteria to select survey respondents at these departments, but simply distributed surveys to those who agreed to complete them. I did not use the survey as a means of identifying and recruiting teacher educator cases.

As a part of my study, in particular for the purposes of case study data triangulation, I interviewed four or five teacher candidates who were enrolled in the classes of the teacher educator cases. I did not use any sampling criteria to recruit these candidates, except for their course enrolment and willingness to participate in an interview. In addition to teacher educator cases, survey respondents, and teacher candidates, I also interviewed university administrators, department heads, and other faculty members. When seeking faculty members to interview, I generally used snowball sampling to expand my understanding of the contexts and phenomena
being studied (Berg, 2009). Figure 1 presents my study design and Table 1 summarizes the total number of teacher educator cases and survey respondents, as well as the university administrators, department heads, faculty members, and teacher candidates interviewed.
Figure 1. Research Design of the Study
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher educator cases (TEC)</th>
<th>Classic university (western Ukraine)</th>
<th>Pedagogical university (western Ukraine)</th>
<th>Pedagogical university (central Ukraine)</th>
<th>Pedagogical university (eastern Ukraine)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of study</td>
<td>October-November 2013</td>
<td>May-June 2013</td>
<td>February-March 2013</td>
<td>March-April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher educator cases (TEC)</td>
<td>Maria Andriivna, pedagogy</td>
<td>Oleh Petrovych, poli sci</td>
<td>Anna Dmytrivna, civic ed</td>
<td>Oksana Viktorivna, ethnoped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 interviews with TEC</td>
<td>2 interviews with TEC</td>
<td>2 interviews with TEC</td>
<td>2 interviews with TEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 interviews with TCs</td>
<td>5 interviews with TCs</td>
<td>6 interviews with TCs</td>
<td>5 interviews with TCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 classroom observations</td>
<td>8 classroom observations</td>
<td>6 classroom observations</td>
<td>5 classroom observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher educator cases not included in the dissertation (except embedded in background context)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic ed elem TEC</th>
<th>Ukrainian literature TEC</th>
<th>Ukrainian language TEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 interview with TEC</td>
<td>1 interview with TEC</td>
<td>2 interviews with TEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 interviews with TCs</td>
<td>5 interviews with TCs</td>
<td>5 interviews with TCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 classroom observations</td>
<td>5 classroom observations</td>
<td>4 classroom observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds of upbringing TEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 interviews with TEC</th>
<th>2 interviews with TEC</th>
<th>6 interviews with TCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 classroom observations</td>
<td>7 classroom observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents (teacher educators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey respondents (teacher educators)</th>
<th>N = 45/50</th>
<th>N = 41/50</th>
<th>N = 3/50</th>
<th>N = 46/50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>9 teacher educators</td>
<td>6 teacher educators</td>
<td>5 teacher educators</td>
<td>6 teacher educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 department heads</td>
<td>2 department heads</td>
<td>1 department head</td>
<td>2 department heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A university administrator</td>
<td>1 university administrator</td>
<td>1 university administrator</td>
<td>1 university administrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 TC (teacher candidate)
6 Duration of each classroom observation was 1 hour and 20 minutes – a standard lecture and seminar time in Ukraine.
Overview of Teacher Educator Cases and Research Sites

I conducted fieldwork between February and November 2013, spending approximately five to six weeks at each university. Although my initial plan was to collect data at three pedagogical universities and to study six teacher educator cases in depth, I ended up conducting fieldwork at four universities and working with nine teacher educator cases. At the first research site, a pedagogical university in central Ukraine, I started to work with two teacher educators – from a civic education course (secondary level) and a fundamentals of upbringing course – and then added another teacher educator – from a history of Ukrainian literature course – as a backup. In eastern Ukraine, I also worked with three teacher educators who taught courses such as ethnopedagogy, Ukrainian language, and “Humanity and the World.” At a pedagogical university in western Ukraine, I managed to work with only one teacher educator, an instructor of a political science course. I arrived at the latter research site in early May, one month before the end of the academic year, when most faculty members were completing their courses. I was able to find only one teacher educator who both met my selection criteria and still had enough remaining class sessions for me to observe. In the fall of 2013, I spent five weeks at a classic university in western Ukraine where I worked with two teacher educators who taught pedagogy and civic education (elementary level). At this research site, I was able to conduct classroom observations only during the first three weeks. During the last two weeks of my fieldwork, students did not attend classes, as they were taking to the streets to protest the government’s last-minute decision not to sign a free trade agreement with the European Union but to lean instead towards Russia. These events became known as the Euromaidan protests.
As mentioned in the previous section, out of the nine teacher educator cases, I selected four to present in this dissertation. They are Anna Dmytrivna⁷ (civic education, pedagogic university, central Ukraine), Oksana Viktorivna (ethnopedagogy, pedagogic university, eastern Ukraine), Oleh Petrovych (political science, pedagogic university, western Ukraine), and Maria Andriivna (pedagogy, classic university, western Ukraine). Table 2 provides demographic information by case.

---

⁷ I changed all names to pseudonyms to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of research participants. I used culturally ethnic pseudonyms. I preserved the formal, respectful way in which faculty members are addressed in Ukraine, namely by their first and patronymic names.
### Table 2

*Teacher Educator Cases: Demographic Information and Teaching Context*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maria Andriivna</th>
<th>Oleh Petrovych</th>
<th>Anna Dmytrivna</th>
<th>Oksana Viktorivna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic location</strong></td>
<td>Western Ukraine</td>
<td>Western Ukraine</td>
<td>Central Ukraine</td>
<td>Eastern Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time of study</strong></td>
<td>October-November 2013</td>
<td>May-June 2013</td>
<td>February-March 2013</td>
<td>March-April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University type</strong></td>
<td>Classic</td>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of experience</strong></td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>Over 4 years</td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training by international funded projects</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course taught</strong></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>Civic education</td>
<td>Ethnopedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curricular area</strong></td>
<td>Pedagogical/ educational studies</td>
<td>General studies (social foundations)</td>
<td>Academic studies (subject specialization)</td>
<td>Pedagogical/ educational studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level taught</strong></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major of teacher candidates (TCs)</strong></td>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td>Elementary education</td>
<td>Social studies/history</td>
<td>Early childhood/ elementary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCs’ year of studies</strong></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classes observed</strong></td>
<td>Lectures &amp; seminars</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>Lectures &amp; seminars</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom observations (#)</strong></td>
<td>7 (9 hours 20 minutes)</td>
<td>8 (10 hours 40 minutes)</td>
<td>6 (8 hours)</td>
<td>5 (6 hours 40 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews (#)</strong></td>
<td>2 (TEC)&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2 (TEC)</td>
<td>2 (TEC)</td>
<td>2 (TEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (TCs)</td>
<td>5 (TCs)</td>
<td>6 (TCs)</td>
<td>5 (TCs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>8</sup> TC (teacher candidate)

<sup>9</sup> TEC (teacher educator case)
One could view my nine-cases phase as an extended pilot study to identify the most promising cases to analyze in depth. For several reasons, I decided not to include five other teacher educator cases that I had observed. First, some of them represented the same aspects of teacher education for democracy as other cases. For example, the case of Maria Andriivna resembled, to some extent, another teacher educator who taught the fundamentals of upbringing. During the classes that I observed of the latter teacher educator, she underscored many aspects of humanistic education but focused primarily on the psychological and physiological rather than the social or political aspects of upbringing. I did not have a chance to observe her teaching other aspects of upbringing, as I had to move to another university. A civic education (elementary level) instructor at a classic university taught mainly methods instead of the civic and political content I had expected to witness in her classes. As a result, I ended up with three teacher educator cases that focused on varying aspects of pedagogy, from which I chose one to profile in this dissertation.

Second, in the case of the instructor who taught the course “Humanity and the World,” there was some mismatch between what she had stated in an interview and what I actually observed during classroom visits. Although she spoke in the interview of her efforts to modify traditional pedagogy, she resorted to content transmission and recitation during the lectures and seminars that I attended. Third, I also had reservations about the ideology of the instructor who taught a Ukrainian literature course. She delivered the lectures I observed in a transactional manner, detailing the negative effects of the suppression of Ukrainian culture by the Russian empire in the seventeenth century, and drawing connections between past and present political and cultural processes. She also challenged traditional gender roles through examples from literary texts, thus potentially empowering her female teacher candidates. However, while
observing her lectures and talking to her, I became concerned about her sometimes negative and uncritical presentation of Russia, which could potentially have encouraged nationalistic views or even exacerbated hostile attitudes towards Russia among teacher candidates. I decided not to foreground her work in the dissertation, as some aspects of it appeared to run against the pluralistic principles of democratic citizenship. Although I did not include in-depth analysis and description of these cases in the dissertation, I mixed data obtained from interviews with them and their teacher candidates with my survey data as key additional information about the context of four universities.

The four purposively selected teacher educators that I chose to present in this dissertation taught courses that belonged to different curriculum areas. In Ukraine, the teacher education curriculum, especially in pedagogical universities, consists of four main components: academic studies (courses geared toward a major subject area), pedagogical or educational studies (courses that teach pedagogical theories, teaching approaches, and child development), general studies (philosophy, sociology, history, political science or culture studies courses aimed at the general intellectual development of students irrespective of their majors), and student teaching (practicum in schools). Anna Dmytrivna taught civic education, an academic studies course, with a teaching assistant to second-year social studies teacher candidates. Oksana Viktorivna taught ethnopedagogy, a pedagogical studies course, to fourth-year teacher candidates in early childhood and primary education. Oleh Petrovych taught political science, a general studies course, to teacher candidates with various majors. Maria Andriivna taught pedagogy to teacher candidates with various majors. Using teacher educator cases from a range of disciplines and curricular areas allowed me to capture different approaches to teacher education for democracy and to demonstrate the possibility of such an education across the curriculum.
Three teacher educators – Anna Dmytrivna, Oksana Viktorivna, and Oleh Petrovych – taught at pedagogical universities and one teacher educator – Maria Andriivna – at a classic university. In Ukraine, there are more than 20 pedagogical and 90 classic universities (SSSU, 2013). The classic university was the largest in terms of faculty and student population across the four universities, with over 1,000 faculty members and 15,000 students. The three pedagogical universities had approximately 500-700 faculty members and an average student population of 8,500 students. Among the four universities, the pedagogical university in western Ukraine featured the most modern infrastructure. Many classrooms were renovated, with new desks and chairs, though they still lacked multimedia equipment. In other universities, classrooms were in poorer condition. For example, in Maria Andriivna’s classroom, one of the ceiling corners seemed to be leaking, judging by a large visible spot of mold. Across all universities, there was a notable difference between administrative offices and classrooms. The offices of department heads, university presidents and vice-presidents were fully renovated, with modern furniture, air conditioners, and new curtains or blinds. One could find oneself in two strikingly different spaces within one building. All four universities were located in urban areas and regional centers. Chapter three will provide detailed contextual information on the four universities, and chapter four will describe physical and material conditions of classrooms of the four profiled teacher educators.

**Data Sources and Data Collection Methods**

In this study, I drew data from interviews, classroom observation, surveys, and documents. My research began with interviews with potential teacher educator cases. I interviewed each teacher educator twice, at the beginning and at the end of the classroom observation period. Towards the end of each session of classroom observation, I interviewed
teacher candidates enrolled in the classes of teacher educator cases. While working with these cases, I also administered surveys at the selected departments and interviewed some faculty members, department heads, and university administrators. These procedures were replicated at each research site. During my fieldwork and data analysis, I took measures to protect the anonymity of the study participants. I assigned pseudonyms to the four teacher educator cases and kept the names of their institutions confidential. I also developed a system of codes to encrypt any identifiable information emerging from interviews, classroom observations, and fieldwork notes. I stored electronic documents – typed interview transcripts, classroom observations, and fieldwork notes – in a locked file on a password-protected computer. I kept paper-based surveys and other hard-copy documents such as course programs in a locked desk drawer. In what follows, I describe the research instruments utilized and the research challenges faced.

**Semi-structured individual interviews**

In case study research, interviews are among the most common instruments of data collection (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 2014). As Patton notes (2002):

> We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe … We cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions … We cannot observe how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on. (pp. 340-341)

There is a wide variety of interview formats (Fontana & Frey, 2005). I chose a semi-structured interview format so that I could “ask a series of regularly structured questions, permitting comparisons across interviews, and … pursue areas spontaneously initiated by the interviewee” (Berg, 2009, p. 109). I used protocols that consisted mainly of open-ended questions to facilitate interviews with the study participants (see Appendix D, Appendix E, Appendix F). After each interview, I tried to make a brief entry into a fieldwork journal, highlighting key viewpoints aired
and my initial reflections regarding them. Interviews with teacher educator cases, faculty members, department heads, and university administrators lasted on average between 40 and 60 minutes. Interviews with teacher candidates were shorter, on average 30 to 50 minutes.

I conducted most interviews with faculty members in vacant classrooms, since faculty members in Ukraine do not usually have their own individual offices. Instead they share one large departmental office with many desks. Despite the fact that they did not know me very well, many teacher educator cases and other faculty members were open and willing to critically discuss sensitive issues during interviews. Some department heads and university administrators were also quite open about various institutional issues. Sometimes I felt that they wanted a person like myself who would listen to them and to whom they could vent their dissatisfaction and frustration with institutional and societal problems. Although all study participants agreed to take part in interviews, I learned through conversations that most of them were not used to giving interviews or participating in qualitative inquiries, because of the prevalence of the positivist psychological quasi-experimental paradigm in most educational research in Ukraine. In her multi-site case study of Ukrainian orphans, Korzh (2013a) notes that Fontana and Frey’s (2005) comment about people living in an “interview society” – where interviewing is extensively used to acquire information – cannot be assumed in the context of Ukraine because of the lack of qualitative research in the field of education.

I conducted a first interview with each potential teacher educator case to check whether they matched the sampling criteria of the study. I inquired about how they conceptualized democracy and citizenship, how they promoted principles of democracy in their classes, what skills and values they aimed to cultivate among teacher candidates, what teaching approaches they used during instruction, and what factors impeded or enabled their teaching. The first
interview also allowed me to gather information – in particular about teaching approaches and the cultivation of skills and values – that I would then trace during the classroom observations. After each classroom observation, I also tried to hold a very short interview to talk about the lecture or seminar observed. I used a second interview to ask questions that had arisen from my observation notes and to clarify some responses from the first interview. I employed the same interview protocol used with teacher educator cases for interviews with other faculty members whom I identified through snowball sampling.

I interviewed teacher candidates in order to triangulate survey and case data. I inquired about how teacher educator cases taught lectures and seminars, whether their pedagogy was different from that of other instructors, what the candidates thought of these teaching approaches, and how they themselves conceptualized democracy and citizenship. Another question that emerged from classroom observations across all cases was why teacher candidates occasionally came unprepared for classes. Some teacher candidates were hesitant to take part in interviews, although their number was small. Some of them asked why I wanted to interview them and what questions I was going to ask them, even though I had explained the purpose of my research (see Appendix C). I held interviews with teacher candidates either in vacant classrooms, university cafeteria or cafés nearby the university. Unlike teacher candidates from western and central Ukraine, those from eastern Ukraine asked whether they could speak Russian during the interview. They told me that it would be easier for them to answer questions in Russian, although most of them spoke Ukrainian or switched between the two languages during the classes I observed.

Lastly, when the opportunity presented itself, I also interviewed the head of the department where each teacher educator case worked, as well as the vice-president with whom I
had initially established a connection at each university. I inquired about their viewpoints on factors impeding and enabling the teaching of faculty members, the challenges of educational democratization, the academic quality of students, and institutional efforts to facilitate teacher education for democracy. These interviews provided me with an institution-wide perspective in regards to the research questions.

**Classroom observations**

Participant observation is another major instrument in case study research (Merriam, 1988). In this study, classroom observation was used both to complement teacher educator interview data and to check congruity between ‘rhetoric’ (what teacher educators say they do) and ‘reality’ (what teacher educators actually do through their pedagogy. See Evans, 2006). As Merriam (1988) notes, “[Participant observation] gives a firsthand account of the situation under the study and, when combined with interviewing and document analysis, allows for a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon being investigated” (p. 102). Unlike interviews, observation usually takes place in natural settings, which makes it possible to record behavior as it is happening, to experience personally the phenomenon under study, to learn things that might be not be mentioned in interviews, and to better understand and capture the context of the study (Angrosino, 2005; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 2002).

Since one of the goals of the study was to explore the meaning and practice of teacher education for democracy in Ukraine, my classroom observations focused on teaching approaches and content. In particular, I paid attention to what teaching approaches each teacher educator case used, and how and whether teacher candidates engaged with them. I also took notice of the content that each case presented, the skills and values they promoted, and the ways in which teacher candidates reacted to these. Lastly, I attended to the material conditions of teaching,
particularly the availability of learning resources, including multimedia equipment, and the
general conditions of classrooms. I conducted focused classroom observations (Angrosino, 2005)
guided by an observation protocol (see Appendix G). The duration of each classroom
observation was 1 hour and 20 minutes, the standard length of classes in Ukrainian universities.
The observation protocol contained a section for reflective comments and questions that arose
during each observation session. Reflective notes both facilitated the ongoing analysis of data
and generated questions for the second interview with each teacher educator case and for
interviews with teacher candidates. Lastly, I observed only those courses of teacher educator
cases that were relevant to my study, although some of them taught other courses during my
fieldwork as well. For example, in addition to her ethnopedagogy course, Oksana Viktorivna
taught research methods, family pedagogy (simeina pedahohika), and a graduate seminar.

During classroom observations, I initially set out to be an observer as participant. My
activities were known to everyone present in the classroom and my participation was secondary
to my role of information gatherer (Merriam, 1988). However, sometimes I had to switch from
observer as participant to participant as observer. For example, Anna Dmytrivna twice invited
me to participate in some classroom activities. In one instance, when teacher candidates were
taking turns to express their understanding of freedom, Anna Dmytrivna asked me to share mine
as well. In another instance, while discussing gender roles, she and her teaching assistant asked
teacher candidates to locate themselves on a family-career continuum, and they invited me to
join in this exercise. I had similar experiences in the classes of Oksana Viktorivna and Oleh
Petrovych. As a result, my role as an observer was fluid, not fixed. Although I sometimes
participated in activities, I tried to keep my participation minimal and my comments neutral in
order not to overly influence the conversation and the perspectives aired.
Although I explained the purpose of classroom observations to teacher educator cases, both in a consent letter and in the initial interview, some of them told me later that they had found it puzzling and strange, even discomforting, to see me sitting at the back of their classrooms taking notes. For example, Oksana Viktorivna remarked on one occasion, “You sit and write there all the time. You have a record of everything that is happening here” (SObs, April 16, 2013). Similarly, a teaching assistant of another teacher educator, one not included as a case study in this dissertation, said to me in an interview, “I remember you coming to the first seminar … You were sitting [at the back] and writing down every single word … You were constantly writing. I kept thinking about what you could possibly be writing there” (TIntv, March 14, 2013). This reaction can be attributed in part to the infrequent practice of qualitative research involving participant observation in Ukraine. Faculty members are not used to being observed for research purposes in their classrooms. Their reactions may also have reflected a perception of me as an inspector or evaluator rather than a researcher, for there is a traditional practice whereby department heads or faculty members attend class sessions of their colleagues in order to assess their teaching.

**Open-ended survey**

Surveys are a common instrument of data collection used in mixed methods or multimethod research (Creswell & Clark, 2007). In this study, I administered an anonymous, paper-based, cross-sectional, open-ended survey to a large sample of teacher educators at the selected departments across the four universities. I recruited approximately five to ten percent of faculty members at each university. I asked respondents to insert the completed surveys into
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10 SObs (seminar observation)
11 TIntv (interview with a teacher educator)
envelopes provided in order to further protect their confidentiality. In total, I distributed 200 surveys (50 per university) and collected 175 completed surveys.

As Yin (2014) notes, “case studies are used to gain insight into explanatory processes, whereas surveys provide an indication of the prevalence of a phenomenon” (p. 194). In this study, the survey was used to obtain a broad picture of the phenomena under investigation and to contextualize the four teacher educator cases. In particular, it asked faculty members about the teaching approaches they used in their classes, the skills and values they promoted among teacher candidates, the factors impeding and enabling their teaching, and their understanding of democracy and citizenship (see Appendix H). The survey consisted of continuous scales and open-ended questions, some of which were supplemented with prompts to ensure the respondents’ understanding of them.

In their study of the understanding of the meaning of democracy across different countries, Dalton, Shin, and Jou (2007) note, “the value of the open-ended format is that it allows … respondents to define democracy in their own words. This is a more rigorous test of democratic understanding than providing a list of items which respondents rate as important” (p. 145). I similarly adopted an open-ended survey format in order to gain a more authentic understanding of the beliefs and practices of faculty members, to reduce socially desirable responding, and to allow them to answer questions in their own words. I did not design a closed-ended survey as I did not find relevant scholarship from which I could derive local conceptions of the characteristics of democracy, democratic citizenship, and democratic education and I did not want to borrow these conceptions from Western scholarship because I would run the risk of their failing to capture or accurately represent the local context.
The administration of the survey shed light on a number of issues, from which I could learn more about the research problem under investigation. Some faculty members were hesitant to complete the survey because they were suspicious of the questions examined, which they considered to be politically provocative. Through conversations, I found that they equated democracy, a central notion examined in the survey, with politics, and that they did not want to be associated with politics because of its corrupt nature and the negative repercussions they feared they might face, especially if they openly criticized the political system. Many of them also considered education to be politically neutral and therefore did not want to complete a “politically provocative” survey. For example, in central Ukraine, after denying me permission to distribute the survey in his department, one head told me that I should have addressed my questions about democracy to politicians, not teacher educators, because education was outside the political arena. Thus, the equation of democracy with politics, the highly politicized nature of Ukrainian society, and the ongoing politicization of the educational system, to be discussed in chapter four, somewhat impeded the administration of the survey.

The administration of the survey was complicated further by a lack of trust. Although the survey was anonymous, some faculty members seemed to fear that their responses would be shared with university administration or other parties. For example, when I asked faculty members in western Ukraine why they did not want to complete the survey, one of them told me that I could have been from the secret services and that the information I was collecting could potentially be used against them. She then asked whether she could complete the survey orally. This shortage of trust seemed to stem not only from a lack of rapport between the survey respondents and myself but also from the fragile state of freedom of expression in Ukraine and
the vestiges of the Soviet culture of fear. As a result, faculty members may have substantially
censored their responses to the survey questions.

Lastly, although I tried to distribute the surveys myself, I sometimes had to leave them
with department heads to circulate and collect them back from faculty members. This
arrangement raised the concern that the department heads would assign surveys to faculty
members without their consent or only to those who seemed likely to provide the ‘right’
responses. In either case, the quality of the collected data might have been jeopardized.

**Document analysis**

In this study, I employed document analysis to examine mainly course programs
requested from each teacher educator case. I used the course programs to gather detailed
information about the content and objectives of the courses and the teaching approaches and to
explore these in relation to teacher education for democracy. I also reviewed higher education
policy documents and teacher education standards to see what skills and values higher education
institutions in general and teacher education programs in particular were encouraged to promote,
and whether these were related to teacher education for democracy. However, an analysis of
policy documents was not a focus of the study because its intent was to inquire mainly into actual
practice; to look beyond official policy discourses.

**Data validity and reliability**

Researchers across the board attempt to ensure that their research accounts and findings
are valid, credible, trustworthy, and transferrable. Validity, as Maxwell (2005) explains, is “the
correctness or credibility of a description, conclusion, explanation, interpretation, or other sort of
account” (p. 106). The credibility of qualitative inquiry, according to Patton (2002), depends on
“rigorous method, the credibility of the researcher, and [the] fundamental appreciation of
naturalistic inquiry, qualitative methods, inductive analysis, purposeful sampling, and holistic thinking” (pp. 552-553). Validation strategies may entail intensive and long-term involvement in the field, the collection of rich data, triangulation, acknowledgement of the research bias from the outset of the study, member checking, the provision of thick descriptions, external audits, and a search for negative cases and discrepant evidence (Berg, 2009; Creswell, 2007; Maxwell, 2005). Cresswell (2007) recommends qualitative researchers to employ at least two such strategies during any study. I made use of a number of them during the study design, data collection, and data analysis stages of this study.

Throughout my study, I was explicit about my ideological predispositions, biases, and assumptions about the phenomena under investigation, which in turn could have influenced the selection of study participants, especially the teacher educator cases studies, as well as the focus of interviews, observations, and survey questions, and the interpretation of the data collected. During my fieldwork and data analysis, I engaged in what Angen (2000) calls “ethical validation;” that is, a constant questioning and re-examination of one’s own moral convictions, theoretical stances, and political implications, along with attendance to, and equal treatment of, the diverse voices of study participants (as cited in Creswell, 2007). One of the outcomes of this ethical validation was that I modified my assumptions about the characteristics of minimal and maximal citizenship along political and cultural dimensions under the influence of the data collected. My assumptions were initially informed by a Western standpoint. However, the data that I gathered did not necessarily fit into those Western categories and the categories were not always useful in explaining the data. The mechanical application of these categories would almost certainly have resulted in an inadequate interpretation of data. I also employed substantive validation, which involves a solid understanding of the topic studied, its thorough
examination through other sources, and the documentation of these processes (Creswell, 2007). Throughout all the stages of my study, I continued to read relevant literature that could inform my analysis and give substance to my inquiry.

Another validation strategy that I used was triangulation. This entails “collecting information from a diverse range of individuals and settings, using a variety of methods” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 112). As mentioned in the previous sections, I employed interviews, classroom observation, survey, and document analysis not only to collect rich data but also to corroborate evidence. The use of multiple methods does not increase validity by itself but it helps one to gather data which will corroborate evidence, check its consistency, and reduce the risk of chance associations and research biases (Maxwell, 2005). For example, I conducted interviews with different stakeholders such as teacher educators, teacher candidates, department heads, and university administrators, as well as classroom observations and surveys, to gain and compare multiple perspectives on the teaching approaches used in teacher education courses and to check my assumption about the prevalence of transmissive methods. The use of classroom observations helped to check the consistency between ‘rhetoric’ and ‘practice,’ especially in teacher educator case studies, and to further substantiate the findings. Moreover, the application of different research methods generated the vast amount of data that I then used to produce thick descriptions about the societal and institutional environments of teacher educator cases and their teaching practices in relation to the democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates. The inclusion of diverse voices and perspectives in these descriptions, along with the direct quotes that rendered the personal meanings and insights of study participants, further helped to ensure the validity of findings and to facilitate their potential transferability.
Throughout the analysis process, my supervisor served as an external auditor to some extent, further helping me to ensure the credibility of my interpretations and findings. While reading my individual case reports and data analysis chapters, she examined whether my interpretations and findings were consistently supported by the respective data (Creswell, 2007). Furthermore, as I was working on an intensive and focused analysis, I considered alternative themes and patterns and searched for supporting evidence in my data. This procedure helped me to “assess the weight of evidence and look for those patterns and conclusions that fit the preponderance of data” (Patton, 2002, p. 553). Similarly, I kept revising and expanding an initial set of codes, categories, and themes that I used to organize survey responses, classroom observations, and interview transcripts. This constant refinement of codes, categories, and themes helped in the analysis as well as the organization of data. Another validation strategy that I used, though only partially, was member checking. When conducting the second interview with each subject following the classroom observations during my fieldwork, I took time to speak with them about some of their responses from the first interview and questions arising from my observation notes to clarify their meanings and to check my interpretation of them. This helped to ensure that I had correctly understood and interpreted their responses.

In order to ensure reliability and comparability among teacher educator cases, I applied the same sampling criteria for each teacher educator case. I also used the same interview and observation protocols. Even though the second interview was more case-specific than the first one, because it built on classroom observations and responses from the first interview, it did not go beyond the set research parameters and guiding research questions. Some questions that emerged during the classroom observations or interviews with other teacher educators were included in an initial interview protocol and subsequently posed to all subsequent interviewees.
For example, one of the questions that I added was about the preparedness of teacher candidates for classes and their academic quality. Similarly, I administered the same survey across the same departments in all four universities and thereby targeted faculty members who shared similar characteristics. When permitted, I also used a voice recorder during interviews to generate detailed transcripts and thus reduce any misconstruction of the responses provided. Lastly, in addition to these validation and reliability strategies, I was explicit about the difficulties that I faced during the data collection and the ways in which they might have influenced the findings of this study. The acknowledgment of these difficulties, along with the presentation of the findings, sheds light not only on the potential weaknesses of the study but also on the difficulties of conducting it in specific contexts.

**Data Management and Analysis**

I managed classroom observation notes, interview transcripts, and fieldwork reflective memos using Microsoft Word. After each classroom observation, I typed handwritten notes and wrote initial reflections and questions. I purposefully decided to employ handwritten note-taking in order to make my observations less conspicuous, especially considering that teacher educators and candidates were not accustomed to the use of laptops during classes. I transcribed whole interviews with teacher educator cases, using Express Scribe, a transcription software. I transcribed only parts of interviews with teacher candidates, faculty members, department heads, and university administrators, complementing them with extensive typed notes. I developed an indexing system to organize a voluminous amount of classroom observation notes and interview transcripts. When coding and analyzing classroom observations and interviews, I employed Microsoft Word’s comment and track changes features. Before analysis of the survey responses,
I entered them into Microsoft Excel’s spreadsheet and then transferred them into NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software.

In order to facilitate data analysis, I employed analytical tools from a self-developed conceptual framework that consisted of pedagogical, political, and cultural dimensions. Elements from each dimension provided an initial set of codes and categories that I used to organize and interpret the data. Figure 2 graphically represents the conceptual framework of the study and summarizes the analytical tools used for each dimension.
## Figure 2. Conceptual Framework of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimal citizenship</th>
<th>Maximal citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political dimension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Political dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights, freedoms &amp; responsibilities; law obedience; paying taxes; voting; good person qualities; knowledge of government structures and processes; blind patriotism; individualism, paternalistic relationships with the state</td>
<td>Keeping elected officials accountable; active participation in political processes through referenda or voluntary neighborhood associations; group solidarity and concern for the common good (communitarianism); active patriotism; critical examination of social reality; commitment to justice and social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Elitist citizenship” (Sears, 1996); “traditional citizenship” (Parker, 2003); “personally responsible citizenship” (Westheimer &amp; Kahne, 2004); “citizenship as a legal status and a set of duties (Osler &amp; Starkey, 2005)</td>
<td>“Activist citizenship” (Sears, 1996); “progressive citizenship” (Parker, 2003); “participatory/justice-oriented citizenship” (Westheimer &amp; Kahne, 2004); “citizenship as practice” (Osler &amp; Starkey, 2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural dimension</th>
<th>Cultural dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racism; xenophobia; chauvinism; sexism; patriarchal and ethnocentric model of society; assimilationist and exclusionary attitudes towards racial, ethnic and other cultural minorities</td>
<td>Empathy and respect for racial, ethnic, and cultural minorities; civic model of society; achievement of equal opportunity and social justice for all groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic nationalism</td>
<td>Civic nationalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Teaching the exceptional and culturally different” approach to multicultural education (Sleeter &amp; Grant, 2007); “fight for Ukrainian identity” approach to nation building (Korostelina, 2013)</td>
<td>“Multicultural/multicultural social justice” approach to multicultural education (Sleeter &amp; Grant, 2007); “multicultural civic concept” approach to nation building (Korostelina, 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 2 (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical dimension</th>
<th>Transmissional pedagogy</th>
<th>Transactional pedagogy</th>
<th>Transformational pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Banking education” (Freire, 2010); content-driven instruction; content alienated from lives and social realities of teacher candidates; rote memorization of content by students; hierarchical teacher-student relationships based on authority and conformity; limited, if any, opportunities for decision-making and expression of viewpoints, including diverse ones; “classes with student talk and tangential attention to issues” (Hess &amp; Avery, 2008)</td>
<td>Education through dialogue between teacher and students; teacher/instructor as a facilitator of learning process; teacher-student relationship based on respect and equality; content linked to lives and social realities of students; constructive approach to learning; development of problem-solving, decision-making, and enquiry skills, “issues-rich discussion classes” (Hess &amp; Avery, 2008).</td>
<td>Transactional pedagogy combined with advocacy of personal, social, and political change and viewing students as active and responsible citizens of society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods: lectures, dictation, copying notes, reading or viewing for content, and practice activities (Evans, 2008)</td>
<td>Methods: independent and group enquiry projects, case study, discussion of real life issues (Evans, 2008)</td>
<td>Methods: dialogical and interactive activities with a possible extension beyond the classroom (Evans, 2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity manifested through the preservation of transmissional teaching approaches and traditional teacher-student relationships (Gardinier, 2012; Niyozov, 2001)</td>
<td>Change manifested through the use of transactional teaching approaches and the modification of traditional teacher-student relationships (Gardinier, 2012; Niyozov, 2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A pedagogical dimension consists of elements such as the openness of classroom environment, the distinction between transmissional, transactional, and transformational pedagogies (Evans, 2008; Miller, 2007), the connection of what is taught with the lives and social realities of teacher candidates (Davies et al., 1999; Freire, 2010), and the degree of change and continuity in teaching methods (Gardinier, 2012; Niyozov, 2008). For the purposes of this study, an open classroom environment is defined as a space in which an instructor adopts a facilitative role (Ross, 2008), encourages students to express their own and diverse viewpoints (Hess & Avery, 2008), investigates issues through dialogical questioning (Dull & Murrow, 2008), and shows respect for students and their viewpoints (Engle & Ochoa, 1988). A political dimension contains elements of minimal and maximal citizenship (McLaughlin, 1992; Osler & Starkey, 2005; Parker, 2003; Sears, 1996; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). A cultural dimension includes elements of ethnocentric (exclusive) and pluralistic (inclusive) citizenship. For the purposes of this study, ethnocentric citizenship is viewed as emphasizing national identity rooted in ethnocentrism, chauvinism, and other exclusionary views and preserving ethnic, racial, religious, and gender stereotypes and prejudices. In contrast, pluralistic citizenship foregrounds a national identity rooted in civic rather than ethnic membership and challenges various dominant stereotypes and prejudices in order to form an inclusive, tolerant, and pluralistic society. I used five approaches to multicultural education (Sleeter & Grant, 2007), five narratives of national identity (Korostelina, 2013), and the notions of ethnic and civic nationalism to analyze citizenship along the cultural dimension. Finally, I used a self-developed typology consisting of societal, institutional, and personal factors to examine impediments and factors enabling teaching practice in general, and teacher education for democracy in particular.
The historic, political, economic, and cultural contexts of Ukraine were instrumental in comprehending and analyzing data collected through surveys, interviews, and classroom observations. As Bain (2010) argues, the study of post-Soviet transformations should not be taken out of their historical and political contexts, since particular Soviet and post-Soviet conditions greatly influence the meanings of such transformations. The consideration of context also helped me to adjust the Western conceptual lenses that I used to interpret the data. For example, in established Western democracies, personal responsibility, voting, paying taxes, obeying the law, and individual rights and freedoms are often considered to be aspects of minimal citizenship, as they tend to reproduce the status quo and to impede the development of more engaged, critical citizenship. However, as we will see in the next chapters, to interpret the teaching of personal responsibility for oneself and others as minimal citizenship education would be inappropriate in the context of Ukraine where, as sociological and ethnographic studies show (Fournier, 2010; LvBS & ProMova, 2014), many are unwilling to take personal responsibility for the practice of democratic values and are content to limit their citizenship responsibility to voting and working. In the socio-political context of Ukraine, the teaching of personal responsibility should rather be interpreted as maximal citizenship. In short, the consideration of context helped to “give greater complexity to what would otherwise be regarded as minimalist conceptions of citizenship” (Williams, 2013, p. 367).

During my fieldwork, I engaged in an initial analysis of data by writing reflective memos about what I was learning through classroom observation and interviews. Intensive and focused analysis began, however, only upon completion of the fieldwork. I first analyzed teacher educator cases and then survey responses. As Stake (2006) notes, the analysis of multiple case studies consists of first producing individual case reports and then conducting cross-case analysis.
to find commonalities and differences within and across cases. A primary goal of cross-case analysis is to represent an “understanding of the aggregate” derived from individual case reports (Stake, 2006). In the course of analysis of each case, I first brought together all relevant information – interviews, classroom observations, course documents, and reflective memos – to produce a case record. As Patton (2002) notes, “the case record pulls together and organizes the voluminous case data into a comprehensive, primary resource package” (p. 449). I then began carefully to read the case data, seeking patterns and regularities and assigning them to the categories initially derived from the conceptual framework as well as to those that emerged during the analysis. Throughout the analysis, I revised and fleshed out certain codes and categories to better organize and interpret data. I then wrote individual case reports.

During the analysis of each case, I examined the pedagogy used, the aspects of democratic citizenship taught, and the factors impeding and enabling teaching practice. When analyzing, for example, pedagogy, I paid particular attention to the teaching approaches that each case used and the rationales that they offered for these approaches, to the ways in which they reworked the classroom environment and their relationships with teacher candidates, and to the opportunities they created for the development of democratically oriented skills and values. I also paid attention to the manner and substance of teacher candidate engagement with the activities and content offered in courses. During the cross-case analysis, I first explored commonalities and variations among the pedagogies of the four teacher educator cases, as well as among the factors that they cited as impeding and enabling their teaching. I then examined commonalities and variations among the aspects of democratic citizenship that the four cases promoted in their classes.
During the analysis of the survey data, I similarly investigated the teaching approaches that survey respondents indicated using in their classes, the skills and values they claimed to teach, the factors reportedly impeding and enabling their teaching, and their conceptions of democracy and citizenship. For the purposes of analysis, I did not consider answers in which respondents merely underlined or rewrote question prompts without providing any further information. I viewed these responses as invalid. For example, in the question about teaching approaches, 18 respondents simply underlined or rewrote listed prompts. As a result, I analyzed only 157 out of 175 responses. Furthermore, some respondents answered questions selectively. For example, 152 out of 175 respondents wrote what democracy meant to them. Thus, the number of responses analyzed did not always match the total of 175 survey respondents. The exact number of responses used for the analysis of each survey question is reported throughout the manuscript.

During the examination of open-ended survey data, I employed the same initial set of codes and categories as for the teacher educator case studies and, as in those case studies, I continuously revised them throughout the analysis. I first read the responses of survey respondents in order to identify recurring keywords and phrases among them, and then assigned codes to recurring instances in order to group similarly coded data into categories and to identify themes amongst them (Saldana, 2013). I compared survey responses either across age groups, departments, universities, or geographical regions. For example, one such comparison took the form of a juxtaposition of the reported teaching approaches across age groups, departments, and
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12 I did not compare survey responses across gender because most respondents were females. One hundred twenty four out of those who indicated their gender in the survey (N = 166/175) were females and 42 were males. I did not compare responses across years of teaching experience either, since the age of respondents correlated with years of teaching experience: those who were younger had less teaching experience compared to those who were older. I did not collect information about the ethnicity of survey respondents or the language that they speak (Ukrainian or Russian) because, as Riabchuk (2015) notes, the value-based and identity-driven divide among Ukrainians correlates much less with their ethnicity and language and much more with their education and age (p. 149).
universities. Another comparison was made to determine more and less prominent themes in the conceptions of democracy and citizenship held by respondents and to explore variations and commonalities among those conceptions across universities. I compared the themes identified either by running NVivo cross-tabulated content analysis or by contrasting the numbers of coded references across the selected themes. I also compared survey and teacher educator case data in order to enhance analysis and to demonstrate the uniqueness of the four selected teacher educators. Using closed-ended survey data, I ran a Pearson chi-square test of independence to examine the relation between the age of survey respondents, the geographic location of their universities, and their Likert scale responses.

**Limitations of the Study**

As Korzh (2012) notes, “it is essential for researchers to critically reflect on the potential limitations or weakness of the research, as well as present its delimitations, by setting parameters or boundaries of the research scope” (p. 95). One limitation of this study is that it provides an understanding of teacher education for democracy on the basis of only four teacher educator case studies and interview and survey data collected at only four universities in Ukraine. The four case studies are by no means representative of all aspects of teacher education for democracy in the country. As I was preparing for and journeying through my fieldwork, I came across teacher educators who did relevant work to democratic education in the areas of gender, history, civic, and environmental education. Had I worked with them, I could have produced case studies providing insights into other areas of teacher education for democracy. However, some of these teacher educators either worked at universities in northern and southern Ukraine that I did not plan to visit or did not teach the relevant courses at the time of data collection.
Even though I used the survey to target a large number of faculty members across the four universities, I did not fully capture a picture of teacher education for democracy even within these institutions. I distributed a total of 200 surveys across these universities, targeting approximately only five to ten percent of faculty members at each research site. I administered the survey only at selected departments and thus did not necessarily produce complete pictures of teacher education practice for democracy even within the institutions. However, other researchers can use its results to paint a more comprehensive national picture of the state of preparation of future teachers to function in a democracy and to contribute to its development through education.

Another limitation of this study was the amount of time that I spent observing each teacher educator. Although I conducted at least five observations for each case, I was able to observe only a small portion of their courses. For example, Anna Dmytrivna’s civic education course consisted of 16 lectures and 12 seminars, of which I observed only three lectures and four seminars. Observation of Maria Andriivna’s classes was interrupted by the teacher candidates’ participation in the early stages of the Euromaidan protests, which entailed their absence from classes. If I had spent more time observing each teacher educator, I could have produced a more nuanced picture of their teaching practice. However, a research design that required study of teacher educators at universities located in different parts of Ukraine and the timeline of my doctoral program did not allow me to spend extensive time at each research site. If I had chosen to work with teacher educators at only one research site, and had immersed myself in that project for sufficient time to capture the data fully, I would not have been able to use survey and case study data to demonstrate commonalities and variations in teacher education for democracy across sites.
The use of my chosen research methodology and corresponding research instruments, along with the topic of the study, may have also limited the findings of the study. As mentioned above, some teacher educator cases found it slightly strange that I was observing them and taking notes. My presence and note-taking may have caused them to ‘censor’ their actions and statements, which in turn would have influenced the quality of the collected data. Similarly, the use of an allegedly “politically provocative” survey, along with its open-ended nature and the limited time that many faculty members had to spend on it, may have resulted in incomplete and inconsistent information. As mentioned above, some survey respondents seemed to censor their answers not only because of their conceptions of socially desirable representation but also because of a concern that the information they provided could have negative repercussions for them. Overall, the interdisciplinary nature and qualitative methodology of this study raised questions among some faculty members. In sum, a lack of comfort with the study’s chosen research instruments and with its topic may have influenced the responses of faculty members, particularly in the survey.

The study took place between February and November 2013, ending with the outbreak of the Euromaidan protests, which were followed in turn by the annexation of the Crimea, undeclared war in the eastern part of Ukraine, and unscheduled presidential and parliamentary elections. These turbulent events may have influenced the conceptions of democracy and citizenship of the survey respondents and teacher educator cases, as well as the content, skills, and values that they taught in their classes. In other words, had I conducted the study during or after the Euromaidan protests, I might have collected different data. I did not conduct any follow-up interviews with the four teacher educator cases after these events to probe changes in their
conceptions of democracy and citizenship and in their teaching practice. Thus, the findings of the study should be considered in the light of a specific temporal period.

Another limitation of the study is the difficulty of rendering the exact meanings of local realities and cultural concepts when translating or explaining them in another language. While working with data that was collected in Ukrainian and Russian, like Korzh (2012), I “[ran] into difficulty translating emic perspectives or specific cultural terms that do not exist … beyond the borders of Ukraine and former Soviet Union republics” (p. 95). Like Kutsyuruba (2014) in his study of Ukrainian policy documents, I faced two challenges. I first had to understand the meaning of the data in Ukrainian or Russian and then to ensure its comprehensible explanation or translation into English. I used paraphrases and other linguistic approaches to arrive at the translation that would be closest to its original meaning. Like Korzh (2012), I also consulted Ukrainian colleagues studying in English-speaking countries regarding the accurate translation and interpretation of local realities and concepts.

There may also be limitations stemming from my being an insider and a novice researcher. On the one hand, being a Ukrainian national, knowing the Ukrainian and Russian languages, and being familiar with local realities and the operation of the ‘system’ helped me to immerse myself in and navigate through fieldwork and to interpret the data collected. On the other hand, as an insider, I may have unintentionally missed details during classroom observations or data interpretation because “they were either so much the norm … or because they became commonplace” as a result of my cultural background, familiarity with the educational system, and overall immersion in the local context (Parker, 2012, p. 76). It is also possible that I missed details because, as a novice researcher, I lacked experience in fieldwork and data analysis.
A final possible limitation of this study is researcher bias. As mentioned in chapter one, I espouse maximal and multicultural citizenship and transformational pedagogy. The lens through which I analyzed the data may have been clouded by these theoretical perspectives. However, the use of various validation strategies contributed to the credibility of findings and helped to limit researcher bias in their interpretation.

Despite these limitations, this mixed methods multiple-case study provides a unique and in-depth perspective into teacher education for democracy in a post-authoritarian context. By utilizing various research methods and drawing from multiple sources, this study gathered rich data which will be presented and discussed in the following three chapters. The diversity of the data allowed me to triangulate the information gathered, thus increasing the reliability and validity of interpretations; to produce nuanced insights into the meanings, possibilities, and challenges of the democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates in Ukraine; to provide alternative views of teacher education for democracy, and to contest conceptions of democratic citizenship established in Western scholarship.
Chapter 4
Teacher Education for Democracy in Ukraine: Context

This chapter provides contextual information about teacher education in Ukraine. In particular, it identifies factors that impede and enable teacher education for democracy, the conceptions of democracy and citizenship of faculty members, their pedagogies, and the skills and values that they claim to teach. It responds to the three research questions, using mainly survey data collected across selected departments – pedagogy, primary education, Ukrainian language and literature, history, sociology, philosophy, and geography – at four universities located in western, central, and eastern Ukraine. The survey, which consisted of qualitative and quantitative items, was completed by 175 out of 200 invited faculty members, but not all of them answered all questions. I complement the survey data with interview comments of teacher candidates, faculty members, department heads, and university administrators, as well as with the findings of other related studies, in order to corroborate, extend, and triangulate the data and to provide detailed contextual information. The chapter provides insights into what Vavrus (2009) terms a “cultural politics of pedagogy,” that is, the political, economic, and cultural forces that influence the process of teaching and thereby the democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates. Recognition of these contextual forces helps to permit a thorough understanding of the complexity of implementing teacher education for democracy in a post-authoritarian society transitioning to democracy. The chapter also serves as a contextual foundation for chapters five and six which, through analysis of the perspectives and practice of four selected teacher educator case studies, demonstrate what teacher education for democracy might mean and look like in the context of Ukraine.
I analyze the survey and interview data through various lenses drawn from my conceptual framework. I used societal, institutional, and personal categories to examine the factors which, in the views of the survey respondents, impeded or enabled their teaching practice in general, and teacher education for democracy in particular. I applied elements from both the political and cultural dimensions of the conceptual framework to examine the skills and values that the respondents claimed to promote in their classes and their conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship. I employed characteristics of transmissional, transactional, transformational pedagogies to explore the teaching approaches reported by survey respondents (Evans, 2008). I lastly explored continuities and changes in those teaching approaches as well as in the skills and values and the conceptions of democracy and citizenship reported by respondents (Gardinier, 2012; Niyozov, 2008).

In what follows, I first present the societal, institutional, and personal factors indicated by survey respondents as impeding or enabling teacher education for democracy. I then introduce the survey respondents’ conceptions of democracy and citizenship. Finally, I describe the teaching approaches reportedly employed by respondents during instruction and the skills and values that they claimed to teach, and I compare these to their conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship. In each section, I also compare the responses of faculty members across age groups, departments, and universities. While I provide some quantitative information in parentheses throughout the chapter to substantiate thematic patterns, my goal was not to quantify the survey responses but rather to seek information about the scope of variation and commonality across them.
Factors Impeding and Enabling Teacher Education for Democracy

The implementation of democratic citizenship education depends on a number of factors, including the nature of the state’s political system and the extent of democratically oriented state reforms; a democratic environment in educational establishments; teachers’ personal views of democratic citizenship, the teaching approaches they adopt and their relationships with students; and the availability of learning and other material resources (Davies, 2002; Harber & Mncube, 2012; Schulz et al., 2010). When asked about the capacity of the current system of teacher education to contribute to democracy, and the factors constraining and enabling their teaching practice, survey respondents underscored mainly societal, institutional, and personal impediments. Table 3 summarizes the factors reported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societal factors</th>
<th>Institutional factors</th>
<th>Personal factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impeding factors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weak state of democracy in the country</strong></td>
<td>Lack of personal responsibility and agency to embrace change among some faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational politicization (influence of changing political climate on education and use of university administrative resources by political elites during election campaigns)</td>
<td>‘Traditional’ dispositions of some faculty members (use of transmissive teaching approaches, preservation of hierarchical teacher-student relationships, and focus on teaching abstract content)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General underfunding of higher education system (low remuneration, outdated university infrastructure and learning resources, lack of computer and multimedia equipment, limited access to new literature and teaching resources, and conference funding cutbacks)</td>
<td>Lack of supportive attitude from ‘traditional’ faculty members for those who try to rework their pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rise of the culture of higher education credentialism, devaluation of knowledge in society and low motivation for learning among many students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling factors</strong></td>
<td>Access to information through the Internet (academic literature and teaching resources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student motivation for learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Undemocratic institutional environment (hierarchical model of governance, widespread use of traditional teaching approaches, authoritarian teacher-student relationships, and corruption)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Formal and incomplete educational reforms that result only in superficial transformations (e.g., Bologna process)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bureaucracy (excessive paperwork)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teaching workload</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reduction of course instruction time without a reduction in content</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Emphasis on testing to measure the achievement of stated learning outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Academic freedom (relative freedom in choosing how to teach, structure course content, and what content to present)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Use of educational technology (e.g., multimedia equipment) in teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Introduction of the Bologna process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Passion for teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professional development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Positive working environment (friendly attitude of colleagues, support of colleagues and university administration, and collaboration with colleagues)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three out of 167 faculty members who answered the question about the capacity of the current system of teacher education to contribute to democracy indicated that the system was not at all able to contribute to the development of democracy; 30, that it was almost unable to do so; 86, that it was partially able; 33, that it was able, and 15, completely able.\(^{13}\) Those who indicated that the current system of teacher education was not at all able, almost unable, or partially able to contribute to democracy listed similar societal, institutional, and personal factors. These factors ranged from the weak status of democracy in Ukraine and the underfunding of higher education to an undemocratic institutional environment and the authoritarian style of teaching and behaviour of some faculty members. Those who indicated that the current system of teacher education was able or completely able to contribute to democracy generally did not cite societal, institutional, or personal impediments. They argued instead that the dissemination of democratic ideas, values, and skills among teacher candidates, who would in turn cultivate them among their students, could facilitate the development of democracy. Only a small number of these respondents suggested that particular impediments first needed to be overcome for democratic education to occur. Figure 3 compares the Likert scale responses across the four universities. A Pearson chi-square test of independence showed that the relation between the geographic location of universities and age of survey respondents and their Likert scale responses was insignificant, \(\chi^2 (6, N = 167) = 11.02, p = .088\) and \(\chi^2 (6, N = 166) = 5.19, p = .519\), respectively. Thus, the survey respondents across different age groups and universities did not hold different views about the capacity of the current system of teacher education to contribute to democracy.

\(^{13}\) Eight out of 175 faculty members surveyed did not choose any of five options on a five-point Likert scale but did provide responses in the explanation section of the question. In total, 123 faculty members provided explanations of their Likert scale choice. One hundred fifty and one hundred eleven faculty members, respectively, indicated factors that impeded and enabled their teaching.
Figure 3. Survey Results: The Capacity of Teacher Education to Contribute to Democracy

Societal factors

A weak status of democracy, the politicization of education, underfunding of the educational system, and negative attitudes of students toward learning were the societal factors
most prominently reported by faculty members. The faculty members surveyed and interviewed were sceptical about democracy, maintaining that it was confined to mere slogans without substance, meaning, or practice. A small number of survey respondents (8) argued that the social realities characterized by undemocratic processes – such as a weak rule of law, political accountability resulting in unstable political and economic conditions, rampant corruption, and widespread injustice – would obstruct the cultivation of democratically oriented knowledge and values. For example, one of them wrote, “Democracy has been declared, but it is absent in reality. Students understand this perfectly well.” These survey respondents perceived a disjunction between the declaration of democracy and current social reality as an impediment to democratic citizenship education. They seemed to believe that the ‘public curriculum’ of Ukrainian society was more powerful in the citizenship socialization of teacher candidates than their own courses or statements. These faculty members faced what Torney-Purta, Schwille, and Amadeo (1999) describe as the “gap between the ideals of democracy or social justice raised through civic education and the reality of the society and school” (p. 32), an issue that is especially common across many developing democracies emerging from authoritarian regimes and military dictatorships (McCowan, 2009; Quaynor, 2011).

Some survey respondents (8) viewed the politicization of the educational system as an impediment to the autonomous and democratic operation of higher education, and thus to the formation of a democratic educational environment. Politicization manifested itself in the influence of frequently changing ruling elites on educational reforms and processes. In his study of Ukrainian educational documents, Kutsyuruba (forthcoming) notes that “the change of ministers of education, whose personality influenced the development of education, and shifts in political orientations of office-holders had a dramatic impact on reforms in Ukraine.”
Politicization also manifested itself in the use of university administrative resources by political elites during election campaigns. Through indirect support to ruling political elites, universities could potentially secure favours such as funding preference. For example, a pedagogical university in eastern Ukraine, where I conducted my fieldwork, supported the then-president Viktor Yanukovych and his political party, while those in western Ukraine stood in opposition to him. One faculty member in central Ukraine told me in an interview that the university administration had cautioned teaching staff against expressing any critique of public office-holders in their classes (TIntv, March 11, 2013). Such structures perpetuate a culture of subordination and conformity among faculty members, limiting their opportunities to experience democratic culture themselves and impeding the declared democratization of higher education.

As will be shown in the next sections, they also potentially limit the capacity of higher education, including teacher education programs, to critically explore political, economic, and social issues of Ukrainian society, an exercise that could contribute to the formation among teacher candidates of maximal citizenship along the political dimension.

Higher education underfunding was the most reported societal factor influencing the teaching practice of faculty members in the four universities. Underfunding resulted in low remuneration, a lack of conference and research support, outdated infrastructure, and limited access to new publications and other resources for teaching and learning. Survey respondents underscored low remuneration (26) and outdated infrastructure (32) most strongly. One faculty wrote, “Constant low salary and increasing teaching workload impede the instructor’s practice. Many faculty members need to give private lessons in order to survive. One cannot live on a salary of four hundred dollars [per month].” In interviews, many faculty members told me that they tutored, taught extra courses, worked part-time in other universities or in-service teacher
training institutions, or took part in research initiatives funded by international non-governmental organizations in order to supplement their income. This situation led to professional demoralization since, as one faculty member noted, instructors “were not financially, morally, and professionally motivated to work” (TIntv, May 31, 2013). Poor remuneration can have negative consequences for the transformation of an educational system and educational quality, since faculty members may not be motivated to put in the effort required to modify their teaching approaches, update the content of their courses, engage in professional self-development, or embrace educational reforms in general.

Out-dated infrastructure was apparent in the lack of computers in university departments and of multimedia equipment or other innovative teaching resources in classrooms, the non-renovated or semi-renovated classrooms, insufficient course textbooks in university libraries, and even in low, if any, funding for stationery materials. For example, one faculty member wrote:

[There is] a lack of classrooms, many of which are not well-suited to teaching …, [and] an absence of technological means of teaching, except for some ‘show-off’ classrooms. [There is also] an absence of some books in the university library, so that one must have copies made at other libraries at one’s own expense … The printing of handouts and visual materials is [likewise] done at the instructor’s expense.

One department head also pointed out to me that some instructors, especially those of older generations, dictated information to teacher candidates not only because of their traditional teaching habits but also because of a lack of course textbooks in the library (DIntv,14 February 8, 2013). Thus, a scarcity of learning resources, along with traditional teaching habits, further reinforced transmissional instruction in teacher education programs. This is congruent with the observations of other scholars who argue that the enactment of transactional or student-centered teaching approaches requires not only effort and technique on the part of educators but also

14 DIntv (interview with a department head)
appropriate material conditions such as infrastructure, teaching materials, and incentives (Ginsburg, 2009; Vavrus, 2009).

Lastly, some survey respondents (19), along with the interviewed university administrators and faculty members, reported that many teacher candidates were unmotivated to study and weakly prepared academically. Similarly, in a national survey, 40% of faculty members \((N = 424)\) indicated a lack of interest in learning among students as one of the pressing issues of Ukrainian higher education (CEDOS, 2013).\(^{15}\) As a result of a societal devaluation of academic knowledge, many students pursue higher education for the sake of credentials rather than knowledge and skills and they rely on their social and economic capital, rather than on school and university knowledge, to secure employment (Korzh, 2013b). The decrease in the perceived value of academic knowledge and the proliferation of a culture of higher education credentialism complicate the task of teacher educators, as many students attend classes simply to pass courses with minimal effort invested. One survey respondent wrote, “[Teacher education] has the potential to contribute to democracy, but it will not do so soon. First, students need to change their mentality. They need to enter higher education not for the sake of diplomas, but for that of self-realization.” When I asked teacher candidates in interviews why their peers did not prepare for classes or engage in class activities, I often received responses similar to those of faculty members. One candidate remarked, “As a rule, those who do not do anything are tuition-paying students. They pay and [they know that] they will get a diploma. Therefore, they don’t put in much effort. In addition, not everyone has a desire to receive knowledge” (CIntv\(^{16}\), May 28, 2013). As will be shown in chapter five, the unpreparedness of some teacher candidates for

---

\(^{15}\) This issue was preceded by low salaries (69%), poor material conditions of universities (49%), bureaucracy (45%), poor university governance (42%) and followed by high teaching workloads (37%), poor political situation (22%), and centralized system of education governance (15%).

\(^{16}\) CIntv (interview with a teacher candidate)
classes, which can be linked to their low motivation for learning, thwarted, to some extent, the efforts of teacher educators to practice transactional teaching approaches and to introduce democratically relevant content. The negative effects on educational democratization of a weak status of democracy in the country, as well as of educational underfunding, are well documented (Harber & Mncube, 2012; McCowan, 2009; Schweisfurth, 2011). The impact of the social devaluation of knowledge on democratic citizenship education deserves further investigation.

Institutional factors

Undemocratic institutional environments, sporadic and uncompleted educational reforms, widespread bureaucracy, and high teaching workloads were reported to be among the main institutional factors impeding teaching practice in general, and teacher education for democracy in particular. Undemocratic institutional environments, according to survey respondents, consisted in a lack of institutional autonomy, a commanding style of management, traditional teaching approaches and teacher-student relationships, and widespread corruption. Some respondents connected undemocratic institutional environments to the vestiges of the Soviet educational system, suggesting that many Soviet authoritarian practices remained intact and that reform processes did not always result in substantive changes to actual institutional practices. As one survey respondent put it, “We exist between remnants of a totalitarianism that manifests itself in the regimentation of the actions of faculty members and students, [on the one hand], and the formal borrowing of practices from established democracies, [on the other hand].” Even if democratic elements had been built into the institutional environment, many respondents

---

17 For the purposes of this study, I will focus only on the discussion of undemocratic institutional environments, widespread bureaucracy, and high teaching workloads. I will not examine the issue of sporadic and uncompleted reforms and their impact on the transformation of higher education, as this issue goes beyond the scope of the present study. Some survey respondents expressed their frustration with the formal and fragmented implementation of educational reforms. Some of them believed that educational reforms, in particular the Bologna process, had led to the destruction of the educational system rather than to its improvement and democratization.
believed, they generally coexisted with, or were suppressed by, undemocratic ones. For example, like some survey respondents (13), one of my teacher educator cases, Maria Andriivna, felt that she had relative academic freedom to choose teaching approaches, structure courses, and select course content. Yet she considered her university environment to be inconsistently democratic and often overly regulated and regimented because of excessive bureaucratism, hierarchical relations between administration and faculty members, and enforced conformity (TIntv, July 9, 2013).

Corruption was another reported feature of undemocratic institutional environments. One survey respondent wrote:

The current system of higher education is infected with corruption and unprofessionalism and is therefore not a ‘planter’ of democracy. The Soviet totalitarian system has not been overcome in practice. There is a danger of the transformation of a totalitarian system into a corrupt one.

In Ukraine, educational corruption manifests itself in bribery or the use of personal connections to pass tests and courses, to receive higher grades, to purchase educational degrees, to defend theses and dissertations successfully, and to secure university appointments and promotions (Korzh, 2013b; Osipian, 2009). Only very few survey respondents (4) mentioned corruption as an impediment to their work or to the promotion of democracy. However, more of them, especially younger ones who seemed to try personally to combat arrangements such as grade-bribing, brought this issue up during interviews. They often spoke of how they felt pressured by their colleagues, department heads, and even administrators to give satisfactory grades to teacher candidates who did not attend classes or perform well academically. As Hallak and Poisson (2006) assert, teaching ethical behaviours and democratically relevant values requires the formation of a favourable educational environment. Current manifestations of corruption not only reinforce undemocratic institutional environments but also model undemocratic behaviour
to teacher candidates and fall short of promoting even the requirements of minimal citizenship along the political dimension, particularly obeying the law.

Bureaucracy (47) and high teaching workloads (96)\textsuperscript{18} were the most commonly cited institutional impediments. Bureaucracy reportedly manifested itself chiefly in excessive paperwork. Faculty members had to prepare multiple reports and complete various forms, often copying the same information from one form to another. Sometimes such paperwork would arrive at their desks right before deadlines and require them to spend additional work hours to complete it. A teaching assistant of Anna Dmytrivna, another teacher educator case, told me that she was sometimes obliged to complete paperwork at the expense of her class preparation time and then to use her personal time to prepare lectures and seminars (TIntv, April 5, 2013). Bureaucracy thereby negatively affected her teaching. High teaching workloads, as some faculty members indicated in interviews, reinforced transmissive teaching because of the limited time that they had to prepare and facilitate discussions and other transactional activities. Some survey respondents reported working at least 700-900 instructional hours per academic year, and teaching 4-6 different courses per semester. Bureaucracy and high teaching workloads obstructed democratic citizenship education in that faculty members lacked the time and energy to work on their professional self-development or to prepare and deliver content in a transactional manner.

A small number of survey respondents (6) mentioned the reduction of the number of course hours as an impediment to their teaching. However, many faculty members articulated this issue in interviews (TIntv, November 6, 2013). Despite the reduced course hours, faculty members still had to cover almost the same amount of content that they used to teach. One younger faculty member told me that she had tried to conduct problem-posing classes. However,

\textsuperscript{18} High teaching workload was listed as one of the prompts in the survey question. Therefore, the faculty members surveyed might have reported it more as compared to other impeding factors. However, in interviews, faculty members often cited this factor along with other ones as an obstacle to their teaching practice.
it was harder for her to do this because of the amount of content that she was supposed to introduce to teacher candidates in the few hours that were allocated for the course. Thus, the reduction of course hours was a further impediment to the practice of transactional pedagogy and subsequently to the development of skills of reflection and analysis particularly relevant to maximal citizenship. These factors shed light on the institutional environments in which faculty members work in Ukraine as well as on the institutional constraints upon democratic citizenship education. They reveal how various institutional forces stemming from past or current societal and educational problems impede the declared democratization of the higher education system as well as how the teaching practice of faculty members is complicated by numerous constraints beyond their control. They also demonstrate how the institutional environments of universities are not necessarily amenable to the promotion of democratic values, even those that pertain to minimal citizenship.

**Personal factors**

Some faculty members surveyed and interviewed believed that the promotion of democracy was impeded in part by the personal dispositions of teacher educators. As one put it, “The formation of democracy in Ukraine is possible through the cultivation of democratic values among new generations. It will succeed if current pedagogues themselves embrace and model democratic values, behaviour, and communication. But this does not occur.” These faculty members emphasized the necessity of transforming traditional teaching dispositions and teacher-student relationships. They underscored in particular the need to take personal responsibility for reforming education and promoting democracy. As one survey respondent put it, “[Teacher education] is able [to contribute to democracy]. The issue lies not in the system of teacher preparation, which can be modified, but in the personal responsibility of each subject of the
educational process.” Thus, a lack of individual responsibility and sense of agency among many faculty members was another perceived impediment to the democratic transformation of teacher education. Furthermore, the traditional dispositions of some faculty members negatively influenced those colleagues who tried to modify their pedagogy and relationships with students. For example, one teacher educator case, Maria Andriivna, told me that some of her colleagues criticized her for instituting an open classroom environment. Another faculty member mentioned in an interview that some of her colleagues considered her “too democratic” and that their authoritarian dispositions were thwarting her attempts at democratic teaching (TIntv, March 11, 2013). A lack of collegial support was another impeding personal factor.

These societal, institutional, and personal factors provide a multi-faceted understanding of the processes and dispositions that constrain and enable teacher education for democracy in post-Soviet Ukraine. Failure to consider these multiple factors will result in an inadequate understanding of the issues that stand in the way of teacher education for democracy. The analysis reveals that the faculty members surveyed across the selected departments in four universities viewed educational underfunding, high teaching workloads, and bureaucracy as the primary impediments to their teaching. Although some of them mentioned the issues of a weak status of democracy, hierarchical institutional structures, and the undemocratic professional dispositions of some faculty members, they seemed to view these as minor in comparison to low salaries, poor equipment, excessive paperwork, and high teaching workloads. Thus, faculty members may not be very preoccupied with the problems of undemocratic institutional governance, educational politicization, and transmissive teaching, which impede democratic citizenship education as much as any other factors, and they may not seek to resolve these problems until their basic needs are met. Many of the factors that faculty members reported as
impeding democratic citizenship education, such as institutional culture, poor remuneration, and outdated infrastructure, are not unique to Ukraine and have been acknowledged in citizenship education literature. Yet some of these factors – notably educational corruption and the societal devaluation of knowledge – have been largely overlooked in the literature.

**Teacher Educators’ Conceptions of Democracy and Citizenship**

As large and small-scale studies (Patterson et al. 2012; Torney-Purta et al., 2005; Schulz et al., 2010) show, teachers’ personal conceptions of democratic citizenship can have an influence on the citizenship knowledge, engagement and learning experiences of students. In two separate questions, I asked survey respondents to share their conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship. Although the vast majority of respondents provided answers to these questions, some of them mentioned to me that they found them difficult to answer. For example, a few survey respondents at the department of primary education in central Ukraine said that I should have addressed these questions to political scientists, rather than to them, because they taught pedagogical studies courses and had nothing to do with the issues raised in the questions. One department head noted to me:

> They [faculty members] are ready for the name of democracy, but are not ready for their personal manifestation of it. They will tell you how they understand democracy and what should be done with it, but they will not do anything with it themselves. (DIntv, March 12, 2013)

Thus, although survey respondents articulated conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship, they may not have developed consistent conceptions of them, or communicated and practiced them in their classes. I organized survey responses into three categories: the

---

19 One hundred fifty-two out of 175 surveyed faculty members provided their conceptions of democracy and 151 their conceptions of democratic citizenship.
skills and values of democratic citizens. Table 4 summarizes the faculty members’ conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship.

**Table 4**

*Survey Results: Conceptions of Democracy and Citizenship*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of a democratic state</th>
<th>Role of citizens in a democratic state</th>
<th>Values and skills of democratic citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power of the people</td>
<td>Citizen as a personally responsible individual (responsibility for one’s viewpoints, actions and before oneself and responsibility before people, community, society, and the state)</td>
<td>Citizen as a tolerant and respectful individual (respect for other people, opposing viewpoints, and representatives of other nations, ethnicities, religions, and cultures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic, social, and legal protection of citizens by the state</td>
<td>Citizen as a civically and politically engaged individual</td>
<td>Citizen as a law abiding individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State authorities respect human dignity of citizens, consider their interest and needs, and are accountable to them</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen as a patriotic individual (passive, active, and ethnically inclusive, not ethnocentric, patriotism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability, not declaration, of rights and freedoms (individual freedom, freedom of expression, freedom of speech, and freedom of choice)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen as a communitarian individual (someone who cares for one another)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution and enforcement of the rule of law</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen as a good individual (someone who follows universal moral norms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence of three branches of government – legislative, executive and judicial – and existence of the system of checks and balances</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen as a professional individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality (equality of rights and opportunities and equal justice before the law for everyone despite their social status)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizen as a free and just individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship of survey respondents revealed that they underlined many key attributes of liberal and participatory democracy – rights, freedoms, obligations, the rule of law, tolerance, and active citizenship, among many others – but not necessarily prominently. For example, only approximately 16% mentioned the rule of law and the possession and protection of rights and about 30% mentioned active citizenship and personal responsibility in their conceptions, even though the survey was
administered in the departments where faculty members were most likely to have knowledge about democracy and its relevant skills and values because of the nature of the content that they taught. Figure 4 illustrates the distribution of survey responses in relation to the characteristics of democracy and democratic citizenship.

**Figure 4. Survey Results: Percentile Distribution of the Selected Characteristics of Democracy and Citizenship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>45%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State protection &amp; accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law obedience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good person qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of the characteristics of democracy and democratic citizenship: state protection and accountability (social protection of citizens by the state, political accountability, and respect of human dignity by the state); freedoms (freedom in general, freedom of choice, freedom of expression, and freedom of speech); rights (possession and protection of rights); equality (equality of rights and freedoms and equal justice before the law); citizenship responsibility, citizenship engagement (active citizenship and individual agency), generic tolerance (general respect for others), multicultural tolerance (respect of other nations, ethnicities, religions and cultures), and good person qualities (humanism, morality, honesty, communitarianism, kindness, etc.)

Such findings may stem from the survey design, as well as from the relative youth of Ukrainian democracy, the lack of experience of democracy and democratic citizenship among survey respondents, and the undemocratic university environments in which they work. Their underdeveloped understandings could have negative implications for teacher education for
democracy, as they might not know how to go about teaching the characteristics of democracy. This was particularly notable in the comparison between the skills and values that survey respondents claimed to teach in their classes and those that they included in their conceptions of democratic citizenship. For example, a relatively high number of respondents (52) highlighted personal responsibility as a characteristic of democratic citizenship, yet a very small number (12) claimed to develop it in their classes. Similarly, many of them indicated that they sought to develop critical, analytical, and independent thinking and communication skills in their classes, but they significantly underemphasized these skills in their conceptions of democratic citizenship.

In their conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship, survey respondents underscored many aspects that have not been prominent in Ukraine. These conceptions represented ideal types of democracy and citizenship as well as the requirements of democratic transformation in the specific socio-political context of Ukraine. Respondents highlighted such issues as a weak rule of law, an unaccountable state, decaying social protection, the scarcity of personal responsibility and political engagement among citizens, and eroding social morale. For example, when writing about equality as a characteristic of a democratic society, some survey respondents specifically highlighted equal justice before the law and the accountability of all citizens before the law regardless of social status, often referring to the ability of politicians and those with powerful connections to circumvent the law. A relatively high number of survey respondents (52) also underlined personal responsibility – responsibility for one’s own viewpoints and actions and responsibility to other individuals and to society – as a characteristic of democratic citizenship. As mentioned in chapter one, many Ukrainians are not willing to take personal responsibility for the practice of democratic values; they do not consider their own
responsibility for the development of the country, but rather limit citizenship responsibility to working and voting. Lastly, even some personal qualities such as honesty (21) and morality (10), which survey respondents mentioned in their conceptions of democratic citizenship, reflect the lack of interpersonal trust and the decline of social morale in Ukraine (Korzhov, 2009). As will be shown in chapter six, the issues that the survey respondents raised in their conceptions were some of the key aspects that the four purposively selected teacher educators addressed in their classes in order to promote democracy. Thus, the immediate issues that societies face during their democratic transformation can ultimately constitute legitimate aspects of teacher education for democracy.

In a context where many aspects of democracy and democratic citizenship are not prominent and institutions often mimic rather than practice democracy (Allina-Pisano, 2010), it would be erroneous to interpret some of the reported citizenship dispositions and characteristics of democracy as representing minimal citizenship. As will be argued in chapter six, values and behavior which represent minimal citizenship in established Western democracies can be taken as aspects of maximal citizenship in other contexts. For example, personal responsibility is not fully embraced by many Ukrainians and it is an important condition of the democratic transformation of the state. As one respondent indicated, there is a need to develop “the responsibility of each citizen for his [sic] country as an institutional, mental, and practical activity.” Similarly, obedience of the law is not fully developed either. For example, a recent survey found that the rule of law was the democratic value that many Ukrainians were willing to practice the least (LvBS & ProMova, 2014). Thus, citizens’ personal efforts to refrain, for example, from bribery and other illegal practices could embody and help to facilitate the transformation of the country. Lastly, individual rights and freedoms that are essential to the
system of representative liberal democracy and that are sometimes viewed as impediments to the cultivation of more engaged critical citizenship, have not been fully achieved in Ukraine, and their consistent recognition would both require and embody social transformation. Thus, the characteristics of democratic citizenship derived from the Western-based typologies can acquire a different meaning and significance in other contexts.

The survey respondents’ conceptions of democracy and citizenship were evidently informed by both Soviet and Western ideologies of state-citizen relations, which in turn signifies both continuity and change. For example, some respondents (23) understood democracy as the responsibility of the state to protect citizens socially and economically and to ensure their decent and comfortable existence as well as opportunities for their personal development. Such a conceptualization may reflect a desire to preserve Soviet-era paternalistic state-citizen relations, under which citizens relied completely upon the state, did not take responsibility for themselves or others, and did not engage in shaping the state or their conditions of life. However, along with paternalistic relationships, some survey respondents also articulated new state-citizen relations, under which citizens would no longer conform to state authorities, as they had under the Soviet Union, but would instead become civically and politically engaged. Some respondents emphasized aspects of active citizenship indicative of maximal citizenship along the political dimension, such as “engaging in state-building processes,” “defending one’s own rights and freedoms and those of others,” “participating in various civic activities,” “influencing the political process not only during elections,” “taking an active part in the solution of state issues through elected representatives,” “taking part in a civic and political life,” and “defending the attributes of democracy with available methods.” Survey respondents seemed to want both to communicate new citizenship roles and to preserve traditional ones. This continuity and change
in their conceptions reflect what Fournier (2010) describes as “a ‘double becoming’ of Western and Soviet modernities,” whereby the two modernities constantly engage with each other and the Soviet modernity does not dissipate under the influence of Western discourses (p. 115). For teacher education, as was shown in the previous section, such a ‘double becoming’ can mean a combination of Soviet educational legacies with democratically oriented reforms.

There were variations, although not necessarily significant, in the conceptions of democracy and citizenship across the selected departments and universities. When describing the characteristics of a democratically functioning state, survey respondents from the classic university in western Ukraine were most likely to underscore the theme of freedoms and those from central Ukraine, the theme of rights. Survey respondents from the departments of history tended to highlight rights and freedoms more than did those from other departments. Respondents from the classic university in western Ukraine underscored the rule of law more than did those from the three pedagogical universities, although all of them, except for those from a pedagogical university in western Ukraine, almost equally emphasized the obeying of laws. Those from departments of history, sociology, and philosophy stressed the rule of law the most. When articulating the roles of citizens in a democratic state, survey respondents in eastern Ukraine highlighted personal responsibility the most and those in central Ukraine the least. Personal responsibility was emphasized mainly at departments of philosophy, history, sociology, and pedagogy. Survey respondents from the classic university emphasized active citizenship the most and those from the pedagogical university in the same region the least. Thus, there were variations in emphasis not only across the country, but also across western Ukraine. Survey respondents from departments of history and pedagogy were most likely to report active citizenship in their conceptions of democracy and citizenship. When describing the values of
democratic citizenship, survey respondents across all universities mentioned both generic
tolerance and tolerance of opposing viewpoints in particular. However, those from eastern
Ukraine did not include tolerance of other nations, ethnicities, and cultures at all, and those from
central Ukraine mentioned this aspect of tolerance hardly at all. Survey respondents from eastern
and western Ukraine emphasized patriotism almost equally, though it was more frequently
underscored at the pedagogical university in western Ukraine. Overall, survey respondents from
the classic university in western Ukraine tended to report active citizenship, the rule of law, and
freedoms in their conceptions of democracy more than did those from the pedagogical
universities. These differences may stem from the political orientations of survey respondents,
the institutional environment, the type of university, and geographical location. They also
demonstrate that teacher candidates may have varying opportunities to acquire democratically
oriented knowledge, skills, and values across different departments and universities.

**Pedagogy in Teacher Education Classrooms**

Pedagogy is one of the essential dimensions of democratic citizenship education, for it
facilitates the learning of democratically relevant content and the formation of democratic skills
and values. In teacher education programs, faculty members not only deliver content, but also
develop skills and model to teacher candidates, by means of their pedagogies, what teaching
might look like. As Davies (2002) notes, “If teachers are ... to teach democratically, then they are
better placed to do this if they have experienced democratic teacher education for themselves” (p.
259). In the survey, I asked respondents to list what teaching approaches they used in their
classes. I also asked them to indicate and explain whether they touched upon political, economic,
and social issues of Ukrainian society in their courses, since a number of citizenship education
studies claim that students develop more active citizenship skills and political efficacy when
encouraged to discuss controversial societal issues (Hahn, 2010; Hess & Avery, 2008; Kahne et al., 2013; Schulz et al., 2010). In what follows, I first present and analyze the teaching approaches reported, and then survey responses regarding the discussion of Ukrainian political, economic, and social issues.

**Teaching approaches**

Survey respondents \( N = 157 \) reported using the following teaching approaches in their classes: lectures (147), seminars (109), discussion (106), group work (83), questioning (opytuvannia, 25), conversation (besida, 24), role-play (16), debate (16), brainstorming (15), presentation (15), problem posing (13), pairs work (13), projects (metod proektiv, 12), roundtable (11), case study (9), excursions such as museum visits (9), creative writing (6), dialogue (5), and modelling (3). The apparently high use of lectures, seminars, discussion, and group work can be attributed in part to their socially desirable representation and to the four prompts – lectures, seminars, discussion, and group work – listed in the question. The high reported use of lecture and seminar formats may also be attributed to their being essential structural course components in as much as each course consists of a set of sessions called lectures and seminars.

In contrast to the survey data, individual interviews with teacher candidates and faculty members revealed that open class discussion, group work, and other transactional teaching approaches were not typical teaching techniques across the four universities. Teacher candidates noted that most of their classes consisted of writing down information during lectures and then narrating it back through a question-answer format during seminars. Some department heads and university administrators concurred that the use of transactional pedagogies in their institutions was not systematic. As one of them put it:

\[ \text{[student's quote]} \]

---

\[ ^{20} \text{One hundred seventy-five surveyed faculty members replied to the question about teaching approaches used in their classes. One hundred fifty-seven responses were analyzed (18 responses where faculty members simply underlined or rewrote listed prompts were not considered).} \]
The issue is that the [culture of] interactive approaches is not institutionally inherent. One instructor embraces such culture but another does not. [In one class, students can experience interactive teaching], but when they come to another class, their learning can be very routine and authoritarian. (DIntv, November 20, 2013)

The inconsistent adoption of transactional pedagogies impedes the transformation of teaching practices institutionally and limits opportunities for the development of democratically relevant inclinations among teacher candidates. The prevalent use of transmissive teaching approaches further reinforces minimal citizenship along the political dimension, since they create few, if any, opportunities for developing critical thinking and practicing individual agency, for example, by expressing one’s own viewpoints. Although transmissive teaching approaches continue to prevail despite the declared educational democratization, the frequent mention of discussion and group work by survey respondents demonstrates that they do not necessarily resist such methods and could potentially practice them. However, their enactment, as shown in the previous sections, can be impeded by multiple societal, institutional, and personal factors.

Only a small number of survey respondents indicated using transactional teaching approaches in their classes, especially over and beyond discussion and group work, and they underscored their efforts to rework traditional pedagogies. One of them wrote, “[I use] traditional lectures ... I am also integrating interactive teaching approaches such as group work, cooperative learning, discussion, and others during lectures and seminars.” Although such a combination of teaching approaches signifies a departure from a blanket reliance on transmissive teaching, their enactment needs further observation because what is transactional in name might not be transactional in practice. For example, one faculty member, who chose to answer a survey orally, stated:

Here some instructors think that interactive approaches mean the use of technological tools [such as a projector, computer, and presentation]. It is an interaction to some extent.
However, interaction means group work, pair work, [and] brainstorming. Students should be active, not like us who were accustomed to passive learning. (TIntv, May 22, 2013)

Thus, while using the word ‘interactive’ to describe their teaching approaches, some faculty members may not necessarily enact what others would consider interactive. Furthermore, some of them may enact transactional approaches improperly. In one instance, I observed a ‘group work’ activity during which teacher candidates actually worked independently, preparing answers to questions given by an instructor and not discussing them with peers, although they were instructed to do so. Some of them then simply stood up and provided answers that they seemed to have memorized beforehand. Such an improper enactment of transactional pedagogies can impede the formation of democratically oriented skills and inclinations that these pedagogies are supposed to facilitate.

There were differences in the teaching approaches across age groups and departments. Survey respondents from younger generations – those in their 20s, 30s, and 40s – typically reported that they used transactional teaching approaches more often than did those in their 50s. The younger respondents emphasized the use of teaching approaches such as group work, conversation (besida), brainstorming, debate, pair work, presentation, problem-posing, role-play, and roundtable. Thus, younger faculty members might be expected to rework traditional pedagogies and hence to bring change into their teaching. Survey respondents from the department of pedagogy indicated employing various transactional teaching approaches more than did those from other departments. This may be linked to their higher familiarity with diverse teaching approaches, since they teach pedagogical courses. Some teaching approaches, such as brainstorming, debate, case study, pairs work, problem posing, role-play, and roundtable, were not reported at all by survey respondents from some of the selected departments. Thus, teacher candidates working with faculty members from different departments might experience limited,
if any, exposure to transactional teaching approaches and the formation of democratically oriented dispositions. Survey respondents reported using the same teaching approaches in all four universities. The only apparent difference was that survey respondents at different universities varied, though to an insignificant degree, in the extent of their use of some approaches. However, considering that the use of transactional teaching approaches was indicated by only a small number of respondents across all universities, it is difficult to draw conclusions as to possible differences among the four sites and types of universities.

**Exploration of societal issues in teacher education**

The vast majority of faculty members reported touching upon political, economic, and social issues (henceforth societal issues) in their classes to varying degrees: one out of 174 – never; 75 – sometimes; 56 – often; 14 – very often, and 27 – always. This shows that there is at least potential for the discussion and analysis of such issues in teacher education programs. However, in interviews teacher candidates indicated having limited opportunities to reflect on and discuss societal issues in their classes, especially with their peers, and they noted that even when such conversation took place, it was usually teacher-centered. One teacher candidate from the class of a teacher educator case commented, “We do not have conflicts like those in our civic education course in other classes, namely confrontations where one expresses and defends one’s viewpoints. We would like to have more of that” (CIntv, March 13, 2013).

Survey respondents (\(N = 136\))\(^{21}\) offered two principal rationales for addressing societal issues in their classes. Approximately 24% (32) reported referring to societal issues in order to prepare teacher candidates for life, to raise their political and national consciousness, and to cultivate their citizenship standpoint. One survey respondent, for example, wrote, “I always try to

---

\(^{21}\) One hundred seventy-four out of 175 surveyed faculty members replied to a five-point Likert scale in the question about references to the political, economic, and social issues of Ukrainian society in their classes, and 136 faculty members provided explanations of their Likert scale choice.
turn students’ attention to the issues of our country, because one cannot teach and bring up conscious citizens and good teachers without that.” Approximately 60% (83) indicated that they referred to societal issues because of the content of the courses and topics they taught. For example, sociology faculty members wrote that it was impossible for them to teach without addressing the societal issues of Ukraine. History faculty members reported drawing connections between current and past societal events to facilitate the learning of teacher candidates. Faculty members of Ukrainian literature touched upon societal issues through the study of Ukrainian writers, many of whom raise issues of Ukrainian identity, nation and state-building and social justice. As one respondent put it, “Analyzing either classic or contemporary literary texts, I often ask how much the issues highlighted in the text are relevant to current social realities.” This suggests that, while coming from different discipline areas, faculty members can raise various issues of Ukrainian society, and thus potentially facilitate the formation of civic and political consciousness among teacher candidates, in a wide range of courses.

Although the vast majority of survey respondents reported touching upon societal issues in their courses, a small number emphasized the inappropriateness of discussing such issues in educational settings, or expressed caution about doing so. Similarly, in responses to other survey questions, some respondents questioned the appropriateness of forming political consciousness and active citizenship among teacher candidates. For example, one wrote in reference to the cultivation of political consciousness, “A pedagogue should not trust herself with politics.” Regarding the discussion of political issues, two asserted, “Politics, money, religion … should be outside of the university classroom. The instructor’s task is to make students evaluate current processes independently … Freedom of learning and instruction should be ensured by freedom from politics” and “Discussion of political issues during instruction violates the norms of the
current Ukrainian legislation.” On the one hand, these reactions reflect a wider international debate on whether higher education should promote any moral and political commitments among students and thus engage in political education (Colby et al., 2007; McCowan, 2012). On the other hand, these reactions reflect the locally specific issues of educational politicization and the equation of politically oriented education with politics.

First, some faculty members seemed to interpret legislation about the political neutrality of education passed after the collapse of the Soviet Union as a prohibition against discussion of any political issues with students (see also Tobin, 2010). Similarly, some of them used the same argument when refusing to complete the survey, pointing to its politically provocative nature and its purported unrelatedness to education. Second, some of them seem to believe that any reference to political issues could be interpreted as exerting political influence and ideological pressures, as had been the case under the Soviet Union, when state authorities used education as a means of political indoctrination. They seem to lack knowledge and skills of how to discuss politically oriented topics with teacher candidates without indoctrinating them. Third, although the educational system has been proclaimed politically neutral, political authorities have used university administrative resources during election campaigns in order to influence the votes of students and faculty members, thus reinforcing educational politicization (Osipian, 2010). As a result, some faculty members are reluctant to express any political viewpoints lest they be accused of promoting particular political interests. Thus, in the context of Ukraine, the discussion of politically charged issues can be obstructed, not only by teacher educators’ lack of knowledge and pedagogical skills necessary to facilitate such discussions (Bickmore, 2008), but also by their fear of politically indoctrination of students and by continuing educational politicization. These issues raise a question about how one can conduct democratic citizenship education in the
context of a system with a long history of political misuse, a system which has given rise to the assumption that education can and ought to be apolitical.

A Pearson chi-square test of independence showed that the relation between the age of survey respondents and their Likert scale responses was significant, \( \chi^2 (6, N = 173) = 18.25, p = .006 \). Survey respondents in their 50s tended to touch upon societal issues more regularly than did those from younger generations. The relation between the geographic location of survey respondents’ universities and their answers was insignificant, \( \chi^2 (6, N = 174) = 8.35, p = .213 \). However, survey respondents from the classic university in western Ukraine tended to address societal issues more often than did those from the three pedagogical universities. Among pedagogical universities, survey respondents from eastern and western Ukraine reported touching upon societal issues more regularly than did those in central Ukraine. Thus, teacher candidates may have varying degrees of exposure to societal issues across universities.\(^{22}\) Figure 5 summarizes the distribution of responses across age groups, departments, and universities.

\(^{22}\) For example, at the beginning of the Euromaidan protests, as I was completing data collection at a classic university in western Ukraine, faculty members and university administration openly supported the participation of students in protests and joined them in protesting in the main square of the city. At the same time, both a teacher educator case and a teacher candidate from a pedagogical university in eastern Ukraine with whom I intermittently communicated told me that many faculty members were opposed to the ongoing events; that they were politically disengaged because of fear of losing their jobs, and that they considered it inappropriate to discuss protests with teacher candidates. They said that their students were less politically active than those in western Ukraine. This situation potentially illustrates a geographic dynamic regarding instruction on societal issues that appears to exist across universities.
Figure 5. Survey Results: Reference to Societal Issues in Teacher Education Courses
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From a pedagogical standpoint, as the analysis of teaching approaches and the exploration of societal issues pointed out, teacher candidates had limited opportunities for the development of democratically oriented knowledge, skills, and values across the four universities. They did not experience systematic transactional teaching or discuss political, economic, and social issues in their classes. As we have seen, the discussion of political issues and the formation of civic and political engagement can be impeded by faculty members’ fear of engaging in political indoctrination and by their perception of education as politically and ideologically neutral. The persistence of transmissive teaching approaches and the issue of educational politicization demonstrate how the past continues to influence current educational practices and obstruct educational transformation.

**Citizenship Skills and Values Promoted in Teacher Education Classrooms**

The promotion of democratically relevant skills and values is another component of democratic citizenship education. Faculty members can facilitate the development of these skills
and values among teacher candidates through course content, teaching approaches, and classroom environment. In the survey, I asked respondents to indicate what skills and values they taught in their classes. I supplemented an open-ended question with the following prompts: developing lesson plans and using various teaching approaches, life-long learning skills, critical thinking, active citizenship, and tolerance. I organized the reported skills and values into two groups: citizenship skills and values and professional skills and values. In this section, I will present and discuss only the former group. In the ‘citizenship’ group, survey respondents indicated skills and values such as critical thinking, communication, active citizenship, tolerance, personal responsibility, and patriotism. A small number of them also underscored such personal qualities as humanity, morality, spirituality, honesty, and kindness. Although they underlined many key attributes of democratic citizenship, the teaching approaches that they reported did not necessarily support the development of these attributes. For example, while a large number of them claimed to teach critical thinking, only a small number indicated using transactional teaching approaches, especially problem-posing teaching, which would be likely to support its formation. Terno (2012) attributes this inconsistency to the lack of conceptual and operational knowledge about critical thinking among many educators in Ukraine, despite the spread of its rhetoric. The fact that survey respondents included the skills and values listed above in their responses suggests that they probably intend to teach them. However, the pervasive traditional teaching paradigms to which they resort, combined with other institutional factors such as high teaching workloads and limited instruction hours, can prevent them from achieving this goal. Figure 6 summarizes the reported skills and values and their percentile distribution.

---

23 One hundred seventy-three out of 175 surveyed faculty members responded to the questions about skills and values promoted in their classes. One hundred fifty responses were analyzed (23 responses where faculty members simply underlined listed prompts were not considered).
Figure 6. Survey Results: Citizenship Skills and Values Taught in Teacher Education Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking skills</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active citizenship</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal responsibility</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic tolerance</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural tolerance</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal qualities</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of citizenship skills and values: thinking skills (critical, analytical, independent, and problem-solving skills), communication skills (public speaking skills, respectfully listening to other viewpoints, and expressing and defending one’s viewpoints), active citizenship, personal responsibility (responsibility for one’s actions and towards one’s work), patriotism (passive and active patriotism), generic tolerance (general respect for others), multicultural tolerance (respect of other nations, ethnicities, religions and cultures and diverse viewpoints), and personal qualities (morality, kindness, spirituality, honesty, etc.)

The skills and values reported by survey respondents, such as critical thinking, communication, active citizenship, patriotism, and personal qualities ranging from morality to honesty, can be referred to the political dimension and categorized as pertaining to either minimal or maximal citizenship. Survey respondents (104), in particular those from departments of history in all four universities, reported teaching critical and analytical thinking more than other skills and values. This can be attributed in part to the listed prompt, although other prompts – tolerance (64) and active citizenship (33) – were less frequently highlighted than thinking skills. Most of them did not elaborate on their responses but those who did mentioned developing skills of comparison, analysis, and critical evaluation of information. A few survey respondents
explicitly connected the cultivation of critical thinking skills with active citizenship; however, such explanations were unusual. As one of them put it, “I believe that when a student learns to think critically, [he or she] will not be passive in civil life.” Traditionally, critical thinking aligns with the formation of maximal citizenship, since it provides individuals with the capacities to analyze information critically and thereby to avoid unreflective socialization. However, it is not clear how respondents taught such skills in an institutional environment of transmissive teaching and whether teacher candidates really had opportunities to practice inclinations of maximal citizenship in their courses.

Approximately 44% of survey respondents (66) indicated teaching communication skills. They included skills such as speaking in front of others, leading and participating in discussions, respectfully listening to others, and formulating, expressing, and defending one’s viewpoints. Some of these skills, especially expressing and defending one’s viewpoints, can be aligned with maximal citizenship, as they enable individuals to practice their voice and agency. As will be shown in chapter five, despite claims by relatively high number of respondents that they taught communication skills, teacher candidates (especially Oleh Petrovych’s students) were greatly lacking in them, which in part prevented them from productive engagement with transactional pedagogies and the development of democratically relevant skills. Survey respondents across all departments, in particular those from departments of pedagogy, history, and sociology, and across all universities claimed to teach communication skills.

Another aspect of maximal citizenship that survey respondents underscored was active citizenship. However, even though it was listed as one of the prompts, only 22% (33) said that they taught it in their classes. Similarly, in response to another question, approximately the same number of respondents (38) mentioned cultivating political consciousness. Such a relatively low
emphasis on teaching explicit political skills suggests that teacher educators are unlikely to encourage civic and political engagement among teacher candidates. As mentioned in the previous section, faculty members may be reluctant to teach such aspects of citizenship because of concerns about political indoctrination and educational politicization, and because of the common equation of politically oriented education to politics. Furthermore, as Koshmanova (2006) argues, Ukrainian teacher educators do not have the clear and systematic goal of preparing teacher candidates to function in a democratic and civil society. As a result, they may not prioritize the development of civic and political dispositions among teacher candidates.

Survey respondents from western and eastern Ukraine claimed to teach active citizenship almost equally, and those from central Ukraine reported to do so the least.

Only 10% of survey respondents (14) mentioned promoting patriotism in their classes when not prompted and 43% (59) when prompted. They used phrases such as these: “a sense of patriotism and pride for Ukraine’s historical past,” “national consciousness,” “a sense of patriotism and love for one’s country,” and “Ukrainian national values: language, traditions, and holidays.” Some of them simply indicated patriotism as one of the values they promoted while others combined it with critical thinking, active citizenship, and tolerance. Thus, some may have promoted passive patriotism rooted in loyalty to one’s country and respect for national symbols, and others a more constructive and active patriotism based on affinity to one’s country and actions aimed at its betterment. The former and latter aspects of patriotism can be aligned with minimal and maximal citizenship, respectively. Although only a few survey respondents reported teaching patriotism when not prompted, those from universities in central and western Ukraine tended to underscore it more often. However, in another question, when prompted explicitly about the formation of patriotism among teacher candidates, survey respondents from eastern
Ukraine emphasized it equally to those from western and central Ukraine. Thus, while the self-reports of survey respondents in one question seemed to point to a western-eastern polarity, their responses to another question appeared to contradict that polarity.

Approximately 20% of survey respondents (31) reported cultivating such personal qualities as responsibility for one’s actions and towards one’s work (12), remaining a good human being despite everything (8), morality (5), spirituality (dukhovnists’), respect (4), politeness (3), kindness (2), and honesty (2). Some of these respondents particularly emphasized what they described as “the development of moral consciousness” or “the development of universal moral values.” Such an emphasis may reflect a tradition of moral education as the basis of all education which was common during the Soviet era (Sukhomlinska, 2010). While some survey respondents underscored the formation only of personal qualities, others combined these with the political qualities of citizenship. Thus, some survey respondents seemed to focus exclusively on character or moral education and were therefore likely to cultivate minimal citizenship. Others claimed to teach both personal and political qualities and might thereby promote maximal citizenship. Survey respondents from the pedagogical university in western Ukraine underscored personal qualities more often than did those from other universities. Among the skills and values from the political dimension of the conceptual framework, survey respondents reported teaching patriotism and personal qualities the least, despite their pervasiveness in educational policy documents. However, their apparent under-emphasis on these values might stem from the survey design, as well as from the low priority that respondents place on the development even of these relatively politically neutral dispositions.

Tolerance, which approximately 43% of survey respondents (64) claimed to teach in their classes, is an element of the cultural dimension of the conceptual framework. Most of the
respondents (44) indicated teaching overall generic tolerance: “respect for people,” “a liberal attitude towards other people,” and “respect for all members of society.” Only a small number reported teaching tolerance and respect for the viewpoints of others (15) and tolerance towards other nations, ethnicities, and cultures (6). This conceptualization of tolerance is similar to that reported by Koshmanova (2006) in her study of faculty members’ and teacher candidates’ beliefs about civic education. They understood tolerance “as passive acts of enduring others and of non-resistance to people who may have different viewpoints” (p. 115). Furthermore, the rare mention of tolerance of opposing viewpoints and ethnic groups reinforces the finding of Koshmanova and Ravchyna’s study (2008) that Ukrainian teacher educators are just now starting to speak about tolerance and understanding of others. The mention of overall, generic tolerance as well as respect for opposing viewpoints and tolerance towards other nations, ethnicities, and cultures suggests that teacher educators may intend to promote an inclusive and pluralistic view of society and thus contribute to the development of the cultural aspect of democratic citizenship.

While survey respondents across all departments and universities reported teaching generic tolerance, those from the departments of philosophy and history and from the two universities in western Ukraine tended to emphasize it more. Only respondents from the departments of philosophy, sociology, pedagogy, and geography mentioned teaching tolerance of other nations, ethnicities, and cultures. Thus, teacher candidates may have an uneven exposure to the ideas and values of pluralistic citizenship in different departments and universities.

Survey respondents also underscored a somewhat pluralistic aspect of citizenship in their conceptions of patriotism. As analysis revealed, they did not necessarily understand patriotism in ethnocentric terms. They seemed to imply that Ukrainian patriotism could be other than ethnically based; that it could be inclusive of others. They tended to combine patriotism with
respect for other nations, ethnicities, and cultures, mentioning “tolerance, patriotism, love for one’s own people and everything Ukrainian, and respect for other nationalities,” or “national dignity and respect for people of other nationalities and cultures.” One respondent specifically underscored “patriotism, but not [ethnic] nationalism.” Thus, they seemed to favour aspects of civic nationalism and inclusive citizenship. However, during my fieldwork, especially in western and central Ukraine, I often heard comments about proficiency in the Ukrainian language as a marker of patriotism and national identity. These comments were frequently aimed at Russian-speaking Ukrainians, who were portrayed as less patriotic than those who spoke Ukrainian. Thus, while some faculty members tend to embrace the language of tolerance towards other nationalities and cultures, they fall short of applying it to the linguistic polarization between Ukrainian- and Russian-speaking Ukrainians.

Analysis of the reported citizenship skills and values pointed out that survey respondents did not highly emphasize the promotion of civically and politically oriented skills and values. Their promotion might be impeded by faculty members’ distaste for political indoctrination and educational politicization. However, survey respondents did not highly underscore less politically prominent citizenship values such as personal responsibility or patriotism either, especially when not prompted by explicit survey questions. An emphasis on patriotism was not prominent even among faculty members in western Ukraine, known for its strong patriotic attitudes. The survey respondents’ rare mention of civically and politically oriented skills and values suggests that there may be limited opportunities for the development of the qualities of maximal citizenship along the political dimension, even in those departments where faculty members potentially had more chances to promote such dispositions. Similarly, while an overall emphasis on tolerance suggests that the promotion of pluralistic, inclusive citizenship would be
likely, the rare mention, in particular, of tolerance of opposing viewpoints and of nations, ethnicities, and cultures indicates limited opportunities for the formation of maximal, pluralistic citizenship along the cultural dimension. Thus, there is little evidence that the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to prepare teacher candidates to function in a democratic society are being taught across the selected departments in four universities. The fairly minimal degree of variation across individual faculty members, departments, and universities show that teacher candidates may have had varying opportunities to develop democratic citizenship skills and values.

**Teacher Education for Democracy: A Broad Picture**

The survey and interview data presented above provides a contextual understanding of teacher education across the four universities in Ukraine. It paints a bleak picture of its capacity to contribute to the cultivation of democratic identity among teacher candidates or to their training for democratic teaching. Multiple factors, ranging from the weak status of democracy in the country and the underfunding of higher education to an undemocratic institutional environment and the traditional dispositions of many faculty members, obstruct the enactment of teacher education for democracy. These factors provide insights into the challenges facing the implementation of such education in Ukraine. As Vavrus (2009) argues, one needs to expand the traditional focus on educational institutions to include the economic, political, and cultural forces that shape teaching in order to comprehensively understand its politics. Many studies on teacher education for democracy in developing contexts fail to recognize these multiple factors, frequently placing the blame on instructors for preserving authoritarian learning environments and thereby impeding educational democratization. Nor do studies conducted in Western contexts report on the societal, institutional, and personal conditions conducive to the enactment of teacher education for democracy. As this study shows, without recognizing the multiple
factors affecting such education, one runs the risk of presenting an oversimplified understanding of its practice and challenges.

The survey data suggests that even in the purposively selected departments, where faculty members have potential opportunities to prepare teacher candidates to function in a democratic society, there is little evidence that such education actually takes place. Although survey respondents raised key attributes of democratic citizenship in their conceptions, analysis revealed that these attributes did not necessarily inform their teaching practice; that is, the faculty members did not consistently translate those ideas into the cultivation of the corresponding skills and values among teacher candidates. This can be attributed to some survey respondents lacking an understanding of ways to promote democracy through their own teaching, as well as to their view of politically relevant education as political indoctrination or the promotion of specific political interests. This inconsistency between survey reports and practice raises questions about the presumed influence of educators’ beliefs about democracy and democratic citizenship on their teaching. Furthermore, even though some survey respondents reported teaching democratically relevant skills, such as active citizenship engagement, critical thinking, and the expression and defense of viewpoints, they did not consistently employ pedagogies that would support the development of these skills. As the survey and interview data pointed out, the pedagogies of faculty members across the four universities remain primarily transmissive and hence unlikely to facilitate the formation of democratically relevant skills and values.

The similarities and differences identified across age groups, departments, and universities, although not necessarily significant, suggest that teacher candidates might have varying levels of exposure to democratically oriented knowledge, skills, and values. For example, survey respondents from central Ukraine claimed to teach active citizenship less than
those from other universities. Those from younger generations tended to report using transactional teaching approaches more than did those from older generations. The survey data did not support a western-eastern Ukraine contrast, at least among higher education faculty members. In their conceptions of democracy and citizenship, survey respondents from eastern and western Ukraine gave almost equal emphasis to active citizenship, personal responsibility, generic tolerance, and patriotism in their conceptions of democracy and citizenship. Similarly, they almost identically reported teaching active citizenship and personal responsibility, though faculty members from western Ukraine claimed to teach tolerance more than did those from eastern Ukraine. The survey data produced mixed results about the promotion of patriotism. When not prompted, those from western Ukraine claimed to teach it more frequently than did those from eastern Ukraine. However, when promoted, they reported promoting it equally. Overall, faculty members from the classic university in western Ukraine tended to report teaching democratically oriented skills and values more than did faculty members from the three pedagogical universities. This difference may stem from the political orientations of faculty members, the institutional environment, the type of university, and geographical location, and it consequently might have implications for teacher education for democracy. In the next two chapters, using the case studies of four purposively selected teacher educators, I will illustrate what teacher education for democracy might mean and look like in the context of Ukraine, despite the multiple challenges raised in this chapter.
Chapter 5
Democratic Pedagogy:
Four Teacher Educator Cases

Education for democratic citizenship presupposes the utilization of democratic pedagogies through which the learning of democratically oriented content and the formation of democratic skills and values can be scaffolded. This chapter explores the curricular choices and pedagogies of the four purposively selected teacher educators, demonstrating how they taught democratically relevant content which will be discussed more fully in the following chapter. The purpose of this chapter is to shed light on the third research question, namely how and why the selected teacher educators enact democratic citizenship in their practice. I analyze the pedagogies of these teacher educators in relation to elements from the pedagogical dimension of the framework: the openness of the classroom environment, the distinction between transmissive, transactional, or transformational pedagogies (Evans, 2008), the connection of what is taught to the lives and social realities of learners (Davies et al., 1999; Freire, 2010), and the degree of change and continuity in the pedagogy of each teacher educator (Gardinier, 2012; Niyozov, 2008). I also examine the skills and values that the teacher educators promoted through the established pedagogical task structures, using elements from the political and cultural dimensions of the framework. This chapter is based on interviews with the four teacher educators and some of their teacher candidates, as well as on classroom observation.

The four teacher educators taught courses belonging to different subject areas of the mandated teacher education curriculum: Oleh Petrovych, political science (general studies); Oksana Viktorivna, ethnopedagogy (educational studies); Anna Dmytrivna, civic education (academic studies); and Maria Andriivna, pedagogy (educational studies). These courses were all taught to fourth-year teacher candidates, except for that of Anna Dmytrivna, which was taught to
second-year teacher candidates. During the conducted observations, Oksana Viktorivna and Oleh Petrovych worked with elementary level teacher candidates, and Anna Dmytrivna and Maria Andriivna – with secondary level teacher candidates. These teacher candidates majored in elementary education, social studies, or foreign languages. Three of the teacher educators – Oleh Petrovych, Oksana Viktorivna, and Anna Dmytrivna – worked at pedagogical universities and one, Maria Andriivna, at a classic university. In Ukraine, most university courses consist of a set of lectures (focused on the presentation of content) and seminars (aimed at further investigation of the content presented in lectures and evaluation of students’ comprehension of the content assigned). I observed the lectures and seminars of Anna Dmytrivna and Maria Andriivna and the seminars of Oleh Petrovych and Oksana Viktorivna. The case study of Anna Dmytrivna includes her teaching assistant, who conducted seminars under Anna Dmytrivna’s supervision. Unlike the three other teacher educators, Oleh Petrovych conducted only seminars, as the lectures for his course were delivered by another instructor.

The four teacher educators experienced the same societal, institutional, and personal constraints reported by the survey respondents and other interviewees. In interviews, they spoke of low remuneration, a lack of professional resources and professional development, high teaching workloads, outdated infrastructure, bureaucracy, prescribed curricula, and reduced course hours. Three of them – Oksana Viktorivna, Anna Dmytrivna, and Maria Andriivna – had received professional development through projects funded by international organizations. They told me that, through this training, they had learned content knowledge and student-centered, active-learning pedagogical techniques which they used in their courses. In what follows, I describe the pedagogy of each teacher educator, along with their rationales for their pedagogical choices and the skills and values that they tried to promote through these pedagogies. I then
compare and contrast the pedagogies of each teacher educator to those of the others and to the teaching approaches, skills, and values reported by other teacher educators in surveys and interviews in order to facilitate a cross-case comparison and demonstrate the exemplary nature of the cases selected.

“It is Important for Me to Hear Your Point of View”: Oleh Petrovych

Oleh Petrovych, a male instructor in his early thirties with over 4 years of teaching experience, conducted political science seminars at a pedagogical university in western Ukraine. Political science is a general studies core requirement course taught to all teacher candidates in elementary and secondary education at both classic and pedagogical universities. According to the course outline, one of its goals was to introduce teacher candidates to the fundamentals of political theory and practice, including topics such as political systems, political and social power, the legal state and civil society, political parties, political elites, political regimes, alternative political movements, interethnic policy, and international relations. Oleh Petrovych told me in an interview that he wanted to provide teacher candidates with basic, practical knowledge in his seminars rather than to have them recite theoretical content. As he said, “[I do not want] them to recite definitions [such as those of geopolitics]. We go beyond that” (TIntv, June 6, 2013). Although he felt pressured to cover theoretical content in order to prepare teacher candidates for examination, he chose to explore that content through its application to real life issues familiar to teacher candidates. I observed him teach, for example, international relations through an examination of the contested issue of whether Ukraine should sign a free trade agreement with the European Union or with Russia’s Customs Union, and political parties through a discussion of the Ukrainian ruling and opposition parties of the day.
In the second half of the academic year during which I attended Oleh Petrovych’s classes, he taught up to 15 seminars (the duration of the seminar was 1 hour and 20 minutes) a week working with teacher candidates with a variety of majors: elementary education, geography, psychology, and chemistry/biology among others. I closely observed five seminars attended by one group of elementary education teacher candidates. The group consisted of twenty-one female teacher candidates, of which nineteen to twenty were usually present. I also observed three seminars of two other groups of teacher candidates who majored in chemistry/biology and psychology. The seminars of the first group took place in a spacious refurbished classroom, with new windows, freshly painted walls, two rows of long, lecture-style immovable desks, an instructor’s table, and a chalkboard. There was no multimedia equipment in the classroom. Its spatial organization was ill-suited to the transactional teaching that Oleh Petrovych wanted to implement in his classes. He used a university meeting room with state of the art equipment when teacher candidates were going to prepare power point presentations. He also sometimes moved the class to a university conference room with a long oval desk when he was organizing roundtable discussions. Oleh Petrovych was able to access these facilities primarily because of an administrative role that he held in conjunction with his teaching position. Like the survey respondents, he mentioned that high teaching workload, along with a lack of multimedia equipment, was one of the main impediments to his work. He wanted to have an access to what he described as “a first-class classroom with a projector, smart board, and roundtable for discussion” (TIntv, June 6, 2013). Educational underfunding, manifested in shabby or non-existent technical equipment, had a negative impact on Oleh Petrovych’s teaching.
Pedagogical organization of seminars

In his seminars, Oleh Petrovych used open class discussion, debate, round table, group presentation, and lecturing in an attempt to involve teacher candidates in “a constant unveiling of reality,” although, as shown in the next section, he did not manage to expose all of his candidates to such pedagogies because of their reluctance (Freire, 2010, p. 81). Almost all of his seminars with a group of elementary education teacher candidates were “issues-rich discussion classes” (Hess & Avery, 2008); that is, they involved the examination and discussion of current Ukrainian social, political, and cultural issues. I observed teacher candidates disputing the quality of Ukrainian political elites, differences in the political platforms of Ukrainian majority and minority political parties, and the implications of nationalist groups and movements for ethnic tolerance in Ukraine. For example, during a seminar on political elites, Oleh Petrovych and the teacher candidates compared the characteristics of current Ukrainian political elites to those of elites described in a textbook. Some teacher candidates spoke about how politicians pursued their own interests while neglecting those of constituents, how old political elites had managed to remain in power without undergoing regeneration, and how politics had become mixed with business. I also observed them engaging with contrasting and conflictual viewpoints. In one instance, through group presentations and class debate, they discussed whether Ukraine should sign a free trade agreement with the European Union or with Russia’s Customs Union. In another instance, through a roundtable discussion, they considered the differences between living under a communist and a democratic regime, examining the advantages and disadvantages of living in the Soviet Union as compared to an independent Ukraine. These discussions created opportunities to link content with the lived experience of teacher candidates, to make sense of the complex issues of Ukrainian society, and to practice democratic citizenship through self-
expression and engagement with alternative viewpoints (Bickmore, 2014). As will be detailed in chapter six, through these discussions Oleh Petrovych taught teacher candidates about how the state and citizens ought to function in a democracy, and advocated personal change among them to enable a wider societal transformation. However, he sometimes pursued these ends in a transmissi onal manner, without engaging teacher candidates in a critical dialogic exploration of the issues raised, thereby possibly not attaining the results associated with the transformative orientation.

In seminars, Oleh Petrovych performed a facilitative rather than a traditional instructor’s role. He posed information-gathering, interpretive and value questions (Dull & Murrow, 2008), shared his own viewpoints, provided explanations, and summarized what teacher candidates had said. During two of my five observations, he delegated the facilitation of seminars to teacher candidates. In one instance, in preparation for a seminar on Ukraine’s integration into the European Union or Russia’s Customs Union, he asked teacher candidates to divide themselves into two groups and to put together group presentations to be delivered during a class debate facilitated by two group leaders. He also provided teacher candidates with certain, albeit limited, decision-making opportunities regarding the seminar structure, content, and viewpoints to be presented. He twice let them choose the format and topic of a seminar, from options suggested by him. In one instance, at the beginning of a seminar, the teacher candidates announced:

24 Dull and Murrow (2008) distinguish three types of questioning which, in their view, have different implications for sustaining dialogical classroom communication and the development of skills relevant to citizenship. These types are: information gathering (inquiring about factual information), interpretive (inviting interpretations of a problem or text), and values (inviting reflections on one’s beliefs, values or issues and the drawing of moral conclusions). For example, during one class discussion about alternative political movements, Oleh Petrovych asked the following interpretive questions: “Why are neofascists popular today? What caused the rise of neofascism?” During the same discussion, when talking about the Svoboda Party, an ultranationalist Ukrainian political party, he also asked a value question: “Is the Svoboda Party good or bad for society?” This question generated disagreement: four teacher candidates argued that this party had elements of neofascism while two others presented opposing views.
You told us to be creative in our decision about the format of the seminar. We divided ourselves into two groups: monarchical and republican. One will argue that it is better to live in a monarchy and the other in a republic. (SObs, May 13, 2013)

By adopting a facilitative role, Oleh Petrovych created space for the democratic agency of teacher candidates (Bickmore & Kovalchuk, 2012; Harber & Serf, 2006), allowing them the opportunity to influence the structure and content of seminars and to take a leadership role in them. As a result, he promoted aspects of maximal citizenship along the political dimension not only through his course content but also through his pedagogical task structures.

The seminars I observed displayed many elements of an open classroom environment. During discussions and debates, Oleh Petrovych encouraged teacher candidates to express their viewpoints and pose questions. In two instances, he explicitly reminded them to listen to opposing viewpoints and to comment respectfully on each other’s responses. In one seminar, before a round table debate began, he reminded them, “No disorder, no interruption, and no personal attacks,” and told debate leaders to ensure that everyone had the opportunity to voice their opinion (SObs, May 31, 2013). Through his emphasis on tolerance of divergent viewpoints and inclusion of everyone, Oleh Petrovych not only taught norms of dialogical communication and formed an open classroom environment but also promoted pluralistic, inclusive citizenship along the cultural dimension; that is, acceptance of and respect for multiple viewpoints. He also verbally encouraged teacher candidates not to feel inhibited in his classes. For example, in an early seminar, after watching one teacher candidate tremble while answering his question, he addressed the class, “Don’t be afraid to speak here,” thus promoting a non-repressive classroom atmosphere (SObs, May 20, 2013; Hemmings, 2000). One teacher candidate commented on the classroom environment:
[In traditional seminars], you sit and you are afraid [because] you can be called upon anytime. When you participate in discussion, you feel freer. You can say this or that. I do not have the feeling that someone is standing over me. (CIntv, June 4, 2013)

This teacher candidate’s comment suggests that Oleh Petrovych’s efforts to create an open classroom environment reduced the amount of pressure and inhibition this teacher candidate experienced in traditional seminars.

In an interview, Oleh Petrovych explained that he had chosen to adopt the teaching approaches outlined above in order to make his seminars interesting to teacher candidates and to cultivate their analytical and discussion skills. As he put it, “They should be able to analyze various events and phenomena and critically evaluate what takes place around them because politics is not advanced mathematics, but it is what surrounds us; it is something that we directly participate in” (TIntv, May 17, 2013). As shown in chapter four, a high number of survey respondents also reported that they had taught these skills, but only a limited number of them indicated using the problem-posing and other transactional teaching approaches that could facilitate the development and practice of such skills. Teacher candidate interviewees noted that, for Oleh Petrovych’s class, they had to prepare for discussions and search for facts to support their arguments, instead of merely learning answers to questions and later reciting them. They also mentioned that it was unusual for them to do this. One of them said:

It was not some ‘dry’ [content] knowledge … It was our own viewpoints. In this regard, his seminars were different in comparison to others. We have many seminars where we simply reproduce [information]. They give us [information] and we recreate it. (CIntv, May 29, 2013).

The pedagogical task structures adopted allowed the instructor to move beyond mere content recitation and hence the formation of maximal citizenship along the political dimension, although, as shown in the next section, this approach was not always successful. Oleh Petrovych
also chose his teaching approaches to establish a partnership with teacher candidates and to reduce their fear of speaking in front of an instructor. As he explained:

I do not like it when there is a barrier between us and when they sit across from me with their arms crossed … I would like them to be more uninhibited and freer to respond in the presence of an instructor, as if we were colleagues. (TIntv, June 6, 2013)

By establishing a non-repressive classroom environment, he also tried to rework traditional teacher-student relationships, basing them on equality and respect, something that teacher candidates reported to be lacking in other courses.

**Teacher candidates’ engagement with Oleh Petrovych’s pedagogy**

Teacher candidate interviewees reported liking discussions and other interactive activities more than the reproductive pedagogies of traditional seminars. However, as in traditional seminars, a majority of them continued to recite information, turning an intended discussion or debate into a mere exchange of narrated information. In early stages of seminars, not all teacher candidates synthesized the information they presented or expressed their own viewpoints. Nor did they support their arguments with evidence or ground them in theoretical content; some of them simply read aloud passages from newspapers and journals. As a result, they undermined Oleh Petrovych’s intent of developing analytical and discussion skills and thereby forming democratic citizens. He tried to counter this problem by modeling discussion skills. He taught them how to support statements with evidence, formulate arguments, and analyze information presented. Although more teacher candidates began to substantiate their arguments with evidence and to speak for themselves in later stages of seminars, many of them kept reading directly from their notes. Oleh Petrovych often stopped them, asking them to express their own viewpoint or to summarize what they had read. For example, in one seminar, he told the class, “You can quote
The engagement of teacher candidates varied. In early seminars, approximately six or seven out of nineteen or twenty of them were vocal most of the time, while others spoke much less or not at all. In later seminars, the number of teacher candidates who spoke generally increased to twelve or fourteen. This increase in engagement, as one teacher candidate explained to me, can be linked to them getting used to a new seminar structure as well as to their attempt to earn participation points in order successfully to pass a course. Oleh Petrovych attributed the reluctant attitude of some teacher candidates towards seminar discussions, and their lack of discussion skills, to a number of factors (TIntv, June 6, 2013). First, he believed that not all of them treated the course as seriously as they should because of its general studies status. According to him, teacher candidates were more preoccupied with academic studies courses that were geared towards their major than with the general studies courses.

Second, some of them lacked motivation for studying. This motivation problem was particularly evident when I attended seminars of other groups – psychology and chemistry/biology – taught by Oleh Petrovych, in which the vast majority of teacher candidates came unprepared to classes and did not engage with the transactional pedagogies being offered. They could not answer the questions posed. They chatted, laughed, and even spoke dismissively to an instructor. Even though he evaluated their participation at the end of each seminar, their engagement was extremely minimal. It often made Oleh Petrovych revert to a traditional seminar format: he called upon teacher candidates to provide definitions of terms and answer questions without the same level of interaction and engagement as observed in other classes. As a result of teacher candidates’ reluctant attitude towards his teaching approaches and unpreparedness, he
did not manage to expose all groups with which he worked to open classroom discussions of various issues of Ukrainian society through course content, or thereby to form democratically relevant skills and values among them.

Third, Oleh Petrovych believed that some of the teacher candidates viewed class discussions as something that they did not need to put much effort into (haliava), as opposed to the memorization required for other seminars which relied on content reproduction. They seemed to think that they could have a discussion without any substantial preparation. One teacher candidate confirmed this assessment in an interview:

At the beginning [of seminars], we did not stress ourselves much with facts. We did not have a complete understanding of how a discussion should unfold. Oleh Petrovych then explained it to us and we understood. Maybe at the beginning we did not treat discussions seriously ... we did not put much effort into preparing for them. We simply spoke about what we found. Maybe someone had some facts. Later we began to treat them more seriously. (CIntv, June 4, 2013)

This teacher candidate’s comment reveals an initial lack of knowledge about the procedures of discussion and a lack of serious engagement with it. Lastly, Oleh Petrovych attributed poor discussion skills to the transmissive and reproductive teaching practiced by most faculty members in his institution. As a result, teacher candidates did not have much experience with dialogically based instruction and therefore lacked the skills necessary to engage fully with it.

Through his facilitative role and informal communication with teacher candidates, his use of discussions and debates, his creation of an open classroom environment, and his issue-rich content, Oleh Petrovych attempted to ensure opportunities for the development of democratic citizenship along political and cultural dimensions in his political science course. He tried to do this through critically exploring social and political matters of Ukrainian society, encouraging teacher candidates to practice their agency, and cultivating respect for opposing viewpoints among them. However, as his case demonstrates, a deep-rooted institutional culture of
transmissional teaching and a lack of motivation for studying among teacher candidates can impede efforts to rework the learning process. As we will see in the next sections, these issues were not peculiar only to his case. Teacher candidates of other cases were also either unable or unwilling to engage productively with transactional pedagogies, although they claimed to favour them over traditional methods. Thus, it is not only teacher educators who can impede democratic citizenship education but also teacher candidates who might not be responsive to it.

“We were Able to ‘Enter’ a Situation … She Prompted Us to Think and Reflect”: Oksana Viktorivna

Oksana Viktorivna, a female instructor in her early fifties with over 20 years of teaching experience, taught an ethnopedagogy course at a pedagogical university in eastern Ukraine. Ethnopedagogy is a core pedagogical studies course that is taught to all teacher candidates only at pedagogical universities. The aim of ethnopedagogy is to introduce teacher candidates to the history and traditions of upbringing (vospitanie) and education in Ukraine in order to preserve national culture, values, and traditions. Oksana Viktorivna was critical of these goals in official course standards. She told me that she could not teach a monocultural, ethnocentric course while seeing people of different ethnicities on the streets of her city, hearing about attacks by radical nationalist groups on international students, and observing ethnic intolerance among school teachers and even her colleagues (TIntv, March 19, 2013). While still teaching some aspects of national traditions of upbringing and education, she modified the course focus by introducing perspectives of ethnocultural tolerance. According to the course document, the goals of the course included preparing teacher candidates to teach in an ethnically diverse society, developing
positive attitudes towards working with children of different ethnicities,\textsuperscript{25} learning about traditions of upbringing in different cultures, and presenting teaching approaches that would cultivate ethnic tolerance. Oksana Viktorivna reported that she wanted to promote interest in topics of ethnocultural tolerance and cultural diversity and to develop ethnocultural tolerance and intercultural communication skills among teacher candidates. She believed that these aspects were important to the development of democracy in Ukraine. Although she set out to cultivate ethnocultural tolerance in her course, she did not raise the issue of interethnic conflict between Ukrainian and Russian-speaking Ukrainians, or between Ukrainians and Russians, during the classes I observed.\textsuperscript{26}

Oksana Viktorivna taught the course to teacher candidates of early childhood and primary education. I observed five seminars of the group which consisted of twenty female teacher candidates, between nine and thirteen of whom were usually present on any given day. Seminars took place in a small classroom that could not fully fit even those teacher candidates attending them. The lack of space was felt especially when teacher candidates took part in group activities or exercises requiring lateral movement. The classroom seemed to be recently renovated. It had a new window, blinds and desks but old chairs, blackboard, and wallpaper. In one corner of the classroom, there was an old, semi-functional desktop computer. It did not have loudspeakers, which Oksana Viktorivna had to bring from a departmental office in order to show a video. Neither the speakers nor the computer were in reliable working order, so she sometimes

\textsuperscript{25} In the course, Oksana Viktorivna focused mainly on newly arrived immigrants from the Caucasus, East Asia, Middle East, and Africa rather than on ethnic minorities such as the Roma, Poles, Hungarians and other ones who have been residing in Ukraine for a significant period of time, or on ethno-linguistic differences between Ukrainian and Russian speakers.

\textsuperscript{26} In interviews, both Oksana Viktorivna and her teacher candidates reported that they had once discussed the controversial language law and its exacerbation of the linguistic polarization in their country. Oksana Viktorivna believed that the language law was a political measure and that language should not be a marker of ethnic identity. She herself conversed in Ukrainian in classes and in Russian outside the classroom at the pedagogical university in eastern Ukraine.
had to use her own very small netbook to show a video to the class. Although she did not cite either equipment issues or classroom size as impediments to her teaching, they did partially derail her instruction process, especially when she did not have her netbook with her. Like Oleh Petrovych, she faced the challenge of outdated infrastructure caused by educational underfunding.

**Pedagogical organization of seminars**

Oksana Viktorivna taught both lectures and seminars in ethnopedagogy. I observed only her seminars, as she had finished her series of lectures before I started fieldwork at her university. Four of the five seminars observed followed the same pattern. She started with a short test, the purpose of which was to check the teacher candidates’ preparation for class. She debriefed the test through information gathering and interpretive questions. She then involved the class in interactive activities to enhance their knowledge of the seminar topic. I observed them exploring issues of ethnic prejudice, xenophobia, social exclusion, and intercultural communication. Most activities were in the form of simulations that illustrated these issues from the perspectives of members of stigmatized ethnic minorities or newly arrived immigrants. In one instance, she divided teacher candidates into two groups, newly arrived immigrants and local inhabitants. The task of the immigrant group was to convince the local inhabitants to let them settle in their country and the task of inhabitants was to decide whether to accept them (SObs, April 2, 2013). One goal of the activity was to demonstrate the attitudes that local people might have towards immigrants and their possible exclusion on the basis of ethnic, cultural, and linguistic differences. Speaking of simulation activities, one interviewed teacher candidate said, “We were able to ‘enter’ a situation … She prompted us to think and reflect. We thought about how we would have acted in this or that situation” (Clntv, April 23, 2013). This somewhat
transformative pedagogy created opportunities to promote ethnocultural tolerance not only through the discussion of ethnic biases or social exclusion but also through their direct experience via simulated activities.

In addition to simulations, Oksana Viktorivna screened a cartoon and a short movie followed by discussion and essay writing, explored alternate perspectives on a moral dilemma through a two-corner activity, and organized group work and presentation activities. She also conducted a question-answer session with eight international students who rotated among tables of teacher candidates, making presentations about their countries and cultures and answering teacher candidates’ questions. The purpose of the activity was to raise the intercultural awareness of teacher candidates and to provide them with the space to practice intercultural communication skills through real rather than simulated encounters with difference. Almost every activity was followed by a debriefing discussion, during which teacher candidates shared what they had felt while participating in the activity or what they had thought of content presented through a cartoon or movie. Debriefs were usually short (two to five minutes). Although they presented opportunities for open class discussions, Oksana Viktorivna did not always develop and sustain these dialogic moments, as she rushed to conduct the next activity. Thus, a lack of time or time allocation priorities sometimes impeded a sustained discussion of the issues explored and hence democratic citizenship opportunities.

Oksana Viktorivna always tried to connect the content of learning to real life by talking about how each issue operated in the real world. For example, in one seminar, after debriefing a cartoon that illustrated social exclusion, she presented the class with a booklet entitled “At Home in Ukraine.” The booklet, based on true stories of newly arrived immigrants and international students in Ukraine, contained information about how these people had decided to come to
Ukraine, what attitudes Ukrainians had shown towards them, and how they had tried to adapt to local realities (SObs, March 26, 2013). Thus, Oksana Viktorivna tried to make course content personally and socially meaningful to teacher candidates. The teacher candidate interviewees liked Oksana Viktorivna’s teaching method because of its practical orientation. As one of them noted, “The most important thing is that [the course] was not conducted in a ‘dry’ manner. Memorize theory and that’s all. It would not be effective. Everything [in the course] was based on real life examples” (CIntv, April 16, 2013). The use of real life examples also helped teacher candidates to better understand the content taught.

Oksana Viktorivna also supported the development of pluralistic, inclusive citizenship by showing her own respect for the viewpoints of teacher candidates. Teacher candidate interviewees reported that many of their other instructors did not welcome their viewpoints and even rejected them. One of them said, “There are instructors … you express your viewpoint but they have a different one … and they say, ‘No, you are wrong’ … But she respects what you say … We have freedom of choice here” (CIntv, April 16, 2013). Another noted, “Some other instructors [act as if] their words were gospel. Even what you say is sometimes simply suppressed” (CIntv, April 23, 2013). These statements suggest that some teacher educators do not want to accept viewpoints that differ from their own or to deal with diverse viewpoints. In contrast, during Oksana Viktorivna’s seminars, when teacher candidates had finished speaking, I often heard her tell them, “I respect your thought.” At the same time, this does not mean that she accepted all viewpoints as legitimate (Bickmore, 2012). In one instance, after she had raised the contested issue of Ukrainian nation building, advocating the inclusion of ethnic minorities on the basis of civic membership, one teacher candidate openly disagreed with her (SObs, April 16, 2013). She expressed her discontent with male ethnic minorities from the Caucasus and the
Middle East in her city and rejected the idea of their inclusion. Her statements met with disagreement and objections from other teacher candidates. Oksana Viktorivna did not interrupt the exchange of comments in the class. At one point she raised her hand to be given a chance to counter a discriminatory statement. This situation demonstrates that the teacher candidates felt free to disagree with their instructor’s viewpoint, which in turn reflects an open, non-repressive classroom environment in which Oksana Viktorivna elected not to exercise an instructor’s traditional authority over value-laden content.

In an interview, Oksana Viktorivna explained that she had chosen to use a mix of traditional and interactive, dialogical teaching approaches in order to keep teacher candidates engaged, to help them examine their own ethnic biases, and to develop ethnocultural tolerance among them. As she put it, “Today’s students no longer accept monotonous lecturing by instructors as they can easily find information anywhere. Traditional teaching approaches aren’t working anymore and dialogue is needed” (TIntv, March 19, 2013). She also believed that the traditional seminar format, which required teacher candidates to be prepared to answer questions, was not effective because the candidates tended to study questions selectively and thus did not learn the entire content being presented. In contrast, she argued, interactive teaching approaches allowed her to engage them to work with the content and to ensure that they achieved at least some familiarity with it. Although she “gave preference to dialogical teaching forms and what is called interactive today,” she also had some reservations about such pedagogy. She explained:

[Interactive teaching approaches] are time-consuming. Everything depends on the goal. If the goal of the class is informational, then I don’t accept interactive teaching approaches which are supposedly aimed at broadening and deepening knowledge or forming skills. I try to influence the teacher candidates’ personality ... If I can influence their personal qualities, then this will also have an impact on their professional development. Interactive activities or games which influence the formation of one’s personal standpoint and change those standpoints appeal to me more. (TIntv, April 24, 2013)
On the one hand, this explanation reveals that limited instruction time, along with the need to cover a prescribed curriculum to prepare teacher candidates for a final examination, might have contributed to Oksana Viktorivna’s view of interactive teaching approaches as time-consuming. On the other hand, it shows that she considered interactive teaching approaches to be an appropriate way of influencing teacher candidates’ dispositions and beliefs, but not in themselves a useful means of scaffolding the formation of their knowledge and skills. This position might stem from the tradition of transmissional, content-based instruction that permeates the Ukrainian educational system and rejects constructivist approaches to knowledge formation. Like some Ukrainian teacher educators at one university in a study by Koshmanova and Ravchyna (2008), Oksana Viktorivna seemed to believe that students’ content knowledge was achieved by the acquisition of a precise body of knowledge delivered by an instructor and a text. However, in this interview, she also noted that she did not aim to provide teacher candidates with all information relevant to the course. Instead, she wanted to stimulate their interest in the topics studied, to motivate them to look for new information, and to develop knowledge independently. Thus, although her actual practice included some innovative transactional and transformational teaching approaches, there was also some continuity with traditional teaching philosophy, manifested in the reluctance to use interactive teaching approaches for the formation of knowledge and skills.

**Teacher candidates’ engagement with Oksana Viktorivna’s pedagogy**

Oksana Viktorivna managed to engage all teacher candidates in simulations and other activities, as her class was quite small: between nine and thirteen of them were usually present. All of those present participated actively in simulation activities and worked collaboratively on group presentations. A few of them spoke briefly during short activity debriefs, and almost all of
them, to varying degrees, spoke during the two disagreement discussions out of five observations. Not as many spoke, however, when Oksana Viktorivna was checking their content knowledge during test debriefs. Some of them might have remained silent because of their unpreparedness for class. For example, I observed two or three teacher candidates trying to cheat during a test, and I occasionally heard some of them asking their peers to tell them what an assigned reading was about before class. I once overheard a teacher candidate say to a peer, “I will just sit and listen [today],” suggesting that she had not prepared for the seminar (SObs, April 9, 2013). In contrast to Oleh Perovych’s class, the unpreparedness of some teacher candidates did not inhibit their participation because most of the activities observed did not require them “substantially” to ground their viewpoints in the “content” being taught. In other words, although the activities were built around the concepts being explored, familiarity with the theoretical content was not essential to participate in them. Teacher candidates could easily succeed by relying on their personal knowledge and experience.

Although Oksana Viktorivna maintained a non-repressive classroom environment by establishing unconstrained and respectful relations with candidates and provided them with opportunities to practice their agency, as in Oleh Petrovych’s classes, not all of them took advantage of this. For example, when she called for volunteers to perform certain roles in simulation activities, teacher candidates were usually reluctant to participate. As a result, she had to approach some of them and assign roles. Similarly, when she asked for comments and recommendations regarding the seminar format at the end of each class, the teacher candidates replied that they liked everything and would not be able to come up with anything better. They did not take advantage of the available decision-making opportunities regarding their learning process. Thus, even though the instructor created space to practice skills consistent with maximal
citizenship along the political dimension, the teacher candidates often did not rise to the occasion.

The teacher candidates interviewed seemed to enjoy Oksana Viktorivna’s pedagogy because she organized interactive activities that they did not always experience in other classes and she did not resort to monotonous lecturing and dictation as some other instructors did. However, while expressing satisfaction with the course pedagogy, one teacher candidate was ambivalent, partly wishing that the instructor would dictate core ideas during lectures:

We usually do not take notes. She does not dictate to us. She simply speaks and focuses on the main questions. I think that it is convenient, on the one hand, but not so much, on the other hand, because when you write, you already remember something … For us, students, if it is not written down, it is not anywhere. Therefore, it is not convenient [that she does not dictate] … I think that it is much better [to be dictated to] … Because then we know what we need to know and prepare. (CIntv, April 23, 2013)

Despite the fact that Oksana Viktorivna provided teacher candidates with an electronic summary of lecture notes so that they could have all the course information in written form, this teacher candidate wanted her to dictate the central ideas and concepts so that she would know what she needed to learn; she did not fully support a modified lecture format that excluded dictation. During my fieldwork, many teacher educators told me that some teacher candidates were incapable of synthesizing core ideas and taking their own notes during lectures, and therefore preferred to be dictated to. This situation perpetuated the traditional roles of instructors and teacher candidates, in which the latter were passive recipients of the information transmitted, and it hence reinforced minimal citizenship along the political dimension. It likely impeded the efforts of some instructors to actually implement modifications to a traditional lecture format.

Oksana Viktorivna exercised her professional agency to modify the course focus and content in response to the problem of ethnocultural intolerance that she observed in Ukrainian society. Her choice of simulations and other interactive activities provided opportunities to
engage with transformational content and practices, exploring topics of ethnic stereotypes, xenophobia, social exclusion, and intercultural communication and thereby promoting, as we will see in chapter six, maximal citizenship along the cultural dimension. She also created space for the development of maximal citizenship along the political dimension by inviting teacher candidates to express their viewpoints, although such opportunities were limited, and to make decisions regarding the learning process. However, as we have seen, teacher candidates did not always respond to these opportunities. Her case demonstrates both the enactment of, and a reservation about, transactional and transformational teaching approaches, as well as an instance of an instructor preserving a traditional teaching philosophy, one that entails knowledge given rather than constructed.

“If a Student Lacks the Knowledge Base … an Interactive Approach Will not Help”: Anna Dmytrivna

Anna Dmytrivna, a female instructor in her early fifties with over 20 years of teaching experience, taught a civic education course at a pedagogical university in central Ukraine. Civic education is an academic studies course offered only to teacher candidates who major in teaching social studies. Anna Dmytrivna’s department was among a few history departments in Ukraine that offered a specialization in social studies and a civic education course. This reflects a wider lack of systemic preparation of civic education teachers in Ukraine. Although civic education was introduced into the secondary school curriculum under the 2002 National Doctrine for the Development of Education, many instructors who had been teaching it did not have the appropriate training and lacked knowledge about its content and appropriate teaching methods (Ivaniuk, Ovcharuk, & Tereshchenko, 2013). According to the course outline, its goals included deepening the teacher candidates’ knowledge of democracy and civil society, presenting them
with examples of civic action and democratic behaviour, and introducing them to the fundamentals of civic education teaching. I observed Anna Dmytrivna and her assistant teaching about human rights, the rule of law, electoral systems, gender, racial and ethnic tolerance, active citizenship, and the purposes, content and challenges of teaching civic education. As will be detailed in chapter six, these topics were transformational in intent.

I observed three lectures and four seminars. There were twenty teacher candidates in the course, both male and female. On average, ten to twelve of them were present during each of the classes observed. Anna Dmytrivna conducted lectures and her teaching assistant, seminars. Anna Dmytrivna was always present during the seminars, sitting at the back of the classroom. Thus, both instructors are included in this case study. Lectures and seminars took place in the same classroom with its worn-out, school-style desks and chairs, chalkboard, instructor’s desk, and old wallpaper. A few portraits of Ukrainian state leaders from different historical periods hung on one of the walls. Anna Dmytrivna and her assistant had to bring a computer, projector, and screen from a departmental office when they wanted to show a video or presentation. Like Oleh Petrovych, Anna Dmytrivna wanted to have all this equipment installed in the classroom in order not to have to arrange it whenever it was needed. During seminars the instructors often gave teacher candidates poster paper and markers to prepare group presentations. Anna Dmytrivna noted that they had these stationery resources only because of the state- and non-governmental funded projects in which she and her department were involved. Teacher educators did not typically have such resources at their disposal. At another research site, a teacher educator with whom I worked but did not include in this dissertation had asked teacher candidates to bring their own poster paper and markers for one of the classes because her department did not supply them and she could not afford to provide them herself. Among the four teacher educator cases, Anna
Dmytrivna was the most vocal about issues of bureaucracy, poor remuneration, high teaching workload, and limited funding for attending professional conferences.

**Pedagogical organization of lectures**

The lectures that I observed consisted of transmisssional and transactional teaching approaches. Anna Dmytrivna usually dictated the topic of the lecture, its plan, and some main ideas (e.g., dates and names of legislative documents, names of philosophers and jurists, and definitions). To present the content she often drew graphs and tables, which some teacher candidates copied in their notebooks. Her dictation occupied one third or less of the lecture session time (the duration of the lecture was 1 hour and 20 minutes). The rest of the time she spoke, delivering the content, interacting with teacher candidates, and posing information-gathering questions. For example, in a lecture on the history of human rights, she solicited the candidates’ own ideas about when and how rights had originated and what groups of people initially possessed these rights, and she asked the names of various foreign and Ukrainian historical documents (LObs, March 6, 2013). Sometimes her questions generated brief open class discussions. For example, in another lecture, talking about citizenship as one attribute of an individual, she asked teacher candidates to raise their hands if they considered themselves citizens of Ukraine, and then if they considered themselves patriots of Ukraine (LObs, February 11, 2013). All teacher candidates indicated that they were citizens of Ukraine, but only a small number identified themselves as patriots. She then asked the class to explain the difference between a citizen and a patriot. A few teacher candidates shared their viewpoints, speaking about patriotism as a sense of national pride for one’s country and citizenship as a membership status. Her somewhat interactive lecture format created opportunities for teacher candidates to move
from a role of passive listeners to more active participation in the learning process and to express their beliefs and opinions.

In an interview, Anna Dmytrivna told me that she had refrained from monotonous lecturing in order to keep teacher candidates engaged. As she put it, “If you are going to simply come and read lecture notes to them, they will just look [out the window] or do something else” (TIntv, July 1, 2013). She preferred to pose questions to solicit their viewpoints, activate their previous knowledge, and check their understanding of the content taught. Her use of dialogical communication illustrates the adoption of elements of transactional pedagogy. Although Anna Dmytrivna changed her pedagogy to keep teacher candidates engaged, it did not always produce desirable outcomes. During the lectures I observed, most teacher candidates copied what she wrote on the blackboard, took notes, and responded to her questions, while a few of them chatted with their neighbours and played with digital devices. The teacher candidates interviewed noted that Anna Dmytrivna’s lectures were not tedious, as compared to other instructors. One of them remarked, “She presents content and asks us questions … It is not the type of lecture where [content] is narrated and dictated to us. We can discuss something here. We then better understand the content” (CIntv, March 13, 2013). This comment reveals that a modified lecture format not only created the space for teacher candidates to voice their opinions, but also facilitated interest in and understanding of the content.

**Pedagogical organization of seminars**

Most seminar activities involved a mix of transmis sional and transactional teaching approaches. As Anna Dmytrivna’s teaching assistant explained, “During seminars, we have more interactive classes. We use group work, discussion, and conversation because we cannot [teach] without them. We have also begun to use project-based approaches in recent years” (TIntv, April
Thus, like the other teacher educator cases, the instructors tried to transform a traditional seminar format. In two seminars, I saw the instructors inviting teacher candidates to take turns sharing their own understanding of civic education and freedom and their viewpoints regarding the knowledge, skills, and values that a democratic citizen should possess. I also observed them twice dividing the class into groups to prepare presentations. In one instance, teacher candidates prepared three presentations about the content and goals of civic education, its enactment through curricular and extra-curricular activities, and the challenges facing it in Ukraine along with recommendations for its improvement (SObs, March 6, 2013). The teacher candidates worked in groups, discussing what to include in their presentations and engaging with the content taught. Group work, presentation, and other transactional activities provided them with the space to exercise decision-making and communication skills and thereby practice skills indicative of maximal citizenship along the political dimension.

Although Anna Dmytrivna and her assistant reworked the traditional seminar format, they preserved the emphasis on content recitation. Group work activities that I observed, and many of the questions that Anna Dmytrivna or her assistant posed to the class, required teacher candidates to recreate the content taught in lectures. For example, in one seminar, after inviting teacher candidates to share and discuss their understanding of freedom and liberty, Anna Dmytrivna asked a number of information-gathering and interpretive questions to verify their knowledge of the content that she had presented in her lecture on the history of human rights (SObs, March 13, 2013). Similarly, in another seminar, the teaching assistant spent approximately one third of the time (about twenty minutes) asking the class to tell her, in recitation mode, about kinds of discrimination and the formation, classification, and use of
stereotypes (SObs, April 17, 2013). She then moved on to activities, showing how stereotypes operated in real life and how they could marginalize various groups of people.

This demonstrates both continuity and change in Anna Dmytrivna’s classroom. On the one hand, she and her assistant retained a traditional goal of content-based instruction, namely the presentation of content and the evaluation of its comprehension by teacher candidates. On the other hand, Anna Dmytrivna and her assistant infused seminars with transactional teaching approaches. Comparing their seminars with those of other instructors, the assistant said that they tried to teach teacher candidates to talk and to think by inviting them to express their thoughts instead of asking them merely to stand up and recite information. In an interview, one quiet teacher candidate told me that she had “learned to talk and express [her] own viewpoints” in Anna Dmytrivna’s class because she felt that she could speak rather than recite information (CIntv, April 18, 2013). Thus, a transformed seminar format created opportunities for some teacher candidates to improve their communication skills. Like the case of Oksana Viktorivna, that of Anna Dmytrivna and her assistant demonstrates that incorporating transactional teaching approaches does not necessarily lead to the modification of traditional teaching goals.

The content that Anna Dmytrivna presented was issues-rich, but it did not always translate into “issues-rich discussion classes” (Hess & Avery, 2008), even during seminars. I observed her talking about human rights, the rule of law, electoral system, ethnic and gender tolerance, and active citizenship. As she was presenting these topics, she drew parallels with Ukrainian realities and commented on the problems of a weak rule of law, the façade of democratic institutions, and citizenship disengagement. Although there were sometimes opportunities for discussion, Anna Dmytrivna and her assistant did not take up or sustain these potentially dialogic moments. For example, in one seminar, the assistant problematized the issue
of gender stereotypes and traditional gender roles through two activities. In one activity, she asked teacher candidates to place themselves on a ‘family-career’ continuum (SObs, April 17, 2013). The activity generated a brief discussion between female and male teacher candidates. One male teacher candidate noted that all females, except for one, wanted their husbands to be career rather than family-oriented. One female teacher candidate disagreed with him, stating that both husband and wives should participate in rearing children. The assistant then asked the class whether women could be more career-oriented and men more family-oriented. Although one teacher candidate spoke in response to the question, the assistant did not sustain the discussion, but rushed to the next activity. Thus, like in the case of Oksana Viktorivna, a lack of time or time allocation priorities appeared to impede the implementation of sustained open class discussions. One teacher candidate, commenting on this activity during an interview, said, “We do not have conflicts like those in our civic education course in other classes, namely confrontations where one expresses and defends one’s viewpoints. We would like to have more of that” (CIntv, March 13, 2013). Thus, even the limited and brief class discussions about contested issues – which teacher candidates did not experience in other classes – created some space for them to express and engage with diverse perspectives, thus practicing aspects of pluralistic and maximal citizenship.

During an interview, explaining her rationale for using interactive teaching approaches in seminars, Anna Dmytrivna told me:

I divide them into three groups because there are three seminar questions. Each group discussing a question either broadens their knowledge of the content presented in a lecture or at least reinforces it. They usually broaden their knowledge because each of them is a thinking individual and adds something from themselves. As a result, they both reinforce and broaden [knowledge]. They talk among themselves in a group and then each group shares with each other. (TIntv, July 1, 2013)
In a separate interview, her assistant spoke along similar lines. Thus, Anna Dmytrivna and her assistant adopted transactional pedagogy to facilitate the acquisition of content, fulfilling the goals of content-based instruction, although in a slightly different way. As shown above, they used transactional teaching approaches to review content, but usually not to discuss or apply that content to the analysis of issues. When asked whether they pursued any other goals such as the formation of communication or cooperative skills, Anna Dmytrivna said that these were generally secondary goals. She seemed to combine the goals of traditional and democratically oriented pedagogies. In his study of practices of civic education teachers in El Salvador, in the context of an educational reform that advocated the adoption of participatory instructional methods, Huff (2007) made a similar observation, namely that some teachers used interactive teaching approaches to fulfill the goals of traditional teaching. He argued that these instructional strategies were often participatory in name, but not in fact, because teachers continued to expect students to memorize and reproduce selected concepts and information. As a result, “much of what counted as learning in class continued to be organized around the rote forms that the new instructional techniques were supposed to replace” (Huff, 2007, p. 84).

Anna Dmytrivna also had some reservations about the use of transactional teaching approaches that she had learned during professional development programs on civic education sponsored by international non-governmental organizations. She explained to me:

I did not always agree with the professional development trainers regarding the use of interactive approaches. [I believe that] if a student lacks a knowledge base and does not know the theoretical content, an interactive approach will not help her acquire this material. Trainers told us not to cover the material in depth but instead simply to familiarize students with the content. On the one hand, I agreed with the use of interactive teaching approaches. On the other hand, I was saying that we needed to treat them with caution. (TIntv, July 1, 2013)
Like Oksana Viktorivna, Anna Dmytrivna did not necessarily support the idea of using transactional teaching to facilitate the construction of knowledge by teacher candidates. She seemed to believe that learners’ acquisition of content required an instructor’s initial transmission of it, and that instructors should provide detailed information in a specific content area before encouraging any interaction. Her perception of transactional pedagogies demonstrates how past pedagogical practices and beliefs may intersect with beliefs about new teaching approaches.

**Teacher candidates’ engagement with Anna Dmytrivna’s pedagogy**

Although the teacher candidates interviewed seemed to give preference to transactional pedagogy and to an open classroom environment on the grounds that these made classes more engaging and helped them better understand the content, not all of them supported such pedagogy in practice because of their unpreparedness for classes. For example, in one seminar, the nine teacher candidates who were present in class remained quiet when the assistant asked whether they had the seminar materials and had completed the assigned tasks. As it turned out, not all of them had prepared the assignments or even picked up the reading materials as required. Anna Dmytrivna chastised them for their irresponsibility, “I gave you assignments. I told you what to do and how to prepare for the seminar … If you cannot listen, then you need to change your occupation. Go and sweep the streets” (SObs, March 6, 2013). Although each group managed to deliver a presentation by the end of the class, the teacher candidates spoke superficially, briefly presenting information drawn during group work from their lecture notes and seminar materials. The unpreparedness of some teacher candidates impeded the work of Anna Dmytrivna and assistant, as some activities that they organized or questions that they posed required the teacher candidates to be familiar with the content.
As with Oleh Petrovych’s teacher candidates, those who did not always prepare for class seemed to be taking advantage of the non-repressive classroom environment. They appeared to think that they could get by in class without putting in much effort. Speaking of the problem of insufficient preparation, Anna Dmytrivna told me, “[If they] fear an instructor, then they write and prepare everything. [If they do not fear] an instructor, [they] become relaxed” (TIntv, July 1, 2013). An instructor’s authority and strict classroom environment, according to her, seemed to make teacher candidates treat learning more seriously than they would with a non-repressive classroom atmosphere. Like some of the teacher educators in Koshmanova and Ravchyna’s (2008) study, Anna Dmytrivna believed that a democratic transformation of the classroom led some teacher candidates to perceive her as more liberal and hence to act irresponsibly. As a result, she had reservations about being a ‘democratic’ instructor. She explained:

An instructor should have equal and respectful relations with students, but some authoritarianism is necessary as well so that students can feel the instructor’s authority. If there is no authority and respect, they will laugh and neglect their assignments. If an instructor is kind, then they can even climb on her head … Both democracy and authoritarianism should be used by an instructor. She should be both democratic and authoritarian. If an instructor is completely authoritarian, then she is a despot for her students. If an instructor is completely democratic, then she is a friend with whom one can have a beer and a chat, but one won’t remember [or learn] anything. (TIntv, July 1, 2013)

Her explanation shows that, although she believed that teacher-student relationships should be based on respect and equality, she also thought that democratic education could make teacher candidates treat an instructor poorly and result in limited learning. For her, therefore, instructors should be authoritarian to some extent. This explanation reveals an incomplete understanding of democratic instruction, for Anna Dmytrivna seemed to equate it with a laissez-faire, permissive approach. It also points to the continuity of traditional teacher-student relationships and reflects a belief common among some Ukrainian teacher educators that an instructor needs to maintain
distance and strictness with students in order to keep control over them and to facilitate their learning, ‘respect,’ and diligence (Koshmanova & Ravchyna, 2008). As a result, Anna Dmytrivna might have perpetuated rather than modified traditional teacher-student relationships, while slightly changing a traditional classroom atmosphere.

Like Oksana Viktorivna and Oleh Petrovych, Anna Dmytrivna combined elements of transmissive and transactional pedagogy. However, in comparison to them, her teaching was influenced not only by habits of transmissive, content-based instruction but also by traditional views of teacher-student relations. She had reservations about the effectiveness of using transactional teaching approaches to construct teacher candidates’ knowledge and she focused on recitation rather than discussion and application of information. She believed that an instructor should maintain strict relations with teacher candidates to keep them under control. Her case was also distinctive in that she used transactional teaching activities to ensure teacher candidates’ acquisition of theoretical content and thereby to fulfill the goals of traditional teaching, although she and her assistant also claimed to be teaching communication, thinking, and presentation skills through such activities. Thus, even though Anna Dmytrivna used transactional teaching approaches, she appeared either to have an incomplete understanding of their purposes or to actually disagree with their value, as shown above.

“We Felt that Someone Got Interested in Us and Our Ideas”: Maria Andriivna

Maria Andriivna, a female instructor in her fifties with over 20 years of teaching experience, worked at a classic university in western Ukraine. She taught a pedagogy course to students of a foreign languages department. (Upon the completion of a university degree, they could become secondary level foreign language teachers). Pedagogy is an educational studies course taught in both classic and pedagogical universities. However, unlike in pedagogical
universities, where the course is taught to all students, in classic universities it is offered only to students whose major has a teacher education component. The pedagogy course explored topics in child development, upbringing (vospitanie), didactics, and conflict resolution. According to the course outline, one of its goals was to promote humanistic and democratic teaching approaches based on student-centeredness, dialogue, and equitable relations between teachers and students. During the lectures and seminars that I attended, Maria Andriivna taught topics such as types of pedagogical communication, methods of upbringing, and the foundations of teaching and learning. There were from fifty to one hundred teacher candidates in Maria Andriivna’s lectures. In seminars, she worked with a smaller number of teacher candidates. The group that I observed consisted of thirty-one female students, of which fifteen to eighteen were present on average. I observed two lectures and two seminars of the pedagogy course. I also attended three seminars of another course, pedagogical mastery, taught by Maria Andriivna. My observation of her classes was interrupted by the Euromaidan protests. Students who took to the streets to protest stopped attending classes in late November of 2013.

Maria Andriivna’s lectures and seminars took place in two different spaces. She conducted her lectures in a large auditorium that could house three hundred or more students. The auditorium had dim lights, producing an effect that was intensified by the darkness from outside, as the lectures I observed took place in the late afternoon in November. It was not warm in the auditorium and some teacher candidates kept their jackets on during the lecture. The university slightly delayed the beginning of the heating season in an attempt to save money and the weather conditions somewhat permitted this economy. A large spot of mould was visible in one ceiling corner. There were four long rows of new, lecture-style desks, with places for four to five at each desk. At the front of the auditorium stood a lecture stand, instructor’s desk, and
blackboard with chalk not always provided. There was no microphone for Maria Andriivna to use in this large hall, so it was sometimes hard to hear her speaking, although she projected her voice quite well. Nor was there any multimedia equipment, though Maria Andriivna (unlike the other teacher educator cases) deemed it unnecessary. She believed that some teacher candidates were resorting to a mechanical copying of her power point slides, which she considered no different from the dictation that she tried to discourage. The seminars were held in a small classroom. The lack of space was felt especially during group work and role-play activities which required teacher candidates to move around. Distinctive features of the classroom included tables in a square configuration, chairs with padded seats, a carpet, and a whiteboard with a marker. Its spatial organization was better suited to dialogical communication than the classrooms of the other teacher educator cases. It was probably the most ‘modern’ classroom of the four research sites. Its refurbishment had been sponsored by a German center that rented classrooms for its language courses. Thus, it was only because of this private funding that the university was able to upgrade some of its classrooms.

**Pedagogical organization of lectures**

In lectures, Maria Andriivna usually dictated a topic and the plan of the lecture at the beginning of classes, and key ideas and definitions throughout them. Her dictation occupied in total one third or less of the total lecture class time (the duration of the lecture was 1 hour and 20 minutes). She told me that she dictated information that was not always available in textbooks, in order to simplify content that could be voluminous and convoluted. Most of the time she explained content, gave examples, and interacted with teacher candidates. She posed information-gathering and interpretive questions to activate their knowledge from previous lectures or personal experiences and to solicit their viewpoints. For example, during a lecture on
didactics, she inquired about the teacher candidates’ own understanding of learning, what role a
student could perform in learning, and how teachers could involve students in learning. Thus,
Maria Andriivna did not completely follow a traditional lecture format. Instead, while preserving
some elements of lecturing, she interacted dialogically with the class.

Both in lectures and seminars, Maria Andriivna used many real life classroom examples
that she either described herself or invited teacher candidates to share based on their personal
educational experiences. She did this to connect the content to the real life of teaching practices,
to mitigate a lack of practical examples in teacher education textbooks, and to shape the future
teaching practices of teacher candidates. As she explained to me, “[Teacher candidates]
abstractly say that a teacher should be kind, attentive, and respect students. Yet when I ask them
to model it, they often get lost” (TIntv, November 7, 2013). Thus, like Oleh Petrovych, she tried
to enable them to translate theory into practice. Maria Andriivna also modeled many pedagogical
elements and situations. For example, in one lecture, speaking about destructive and constructive
communication, she first modeled examples of how teachers communicated with students in a
destructive manner: “I am going to give bad grades to those who don’t work. Let’s work,” “Sit
down, everyone. And listen to me,” “I will call your parents if you misbehave,” or “Why can’t
you hear? Do you have poor ears?” She then modeled constructive communication: “Instead of
saying aggressively, ‘Why are you late?’, you could say, ‘I see that you are late. Could you
explain [the reason], please?’”, and asked the class whether they noticed any difference (LObs,
October 31, 2013). Commenting on Maria Andriivna’s pedagogy, one teacher candidate said,
“We had another pedagogical course where we just learned theoretical content. We learned it by
heart. It was not interesting … But here, she gives us examples. It is better” (CIntv, November
27, 2013). Thus, the use of examples helped to make learning more personally and socially
meaningful to teacher candidates, to generate their interest in the course content, and potentially to change their views about teaching.

In an interview, Maria Andriivna explained that she had tried to modify a traditional approach to teaching. As she put it, “Many instructors have content and they think that they need to deliver all of it” (TIntv, July 9, 2013). Instead, her goal was to introduce not all, but only some fundamental knowledge, and then to discuss and practice it through various activities, thus helping to form pedagogical skills and dispositions among teacher candidates. She told me that it would be ineffective merely to have teacher candidates narrate content and recite definitions, as this would likely have little impact on their future practice. She based her new teaching philosophy on a constructivist approach. She believed that the constructivist approach was a manifestation of democratic pedagogy because it put teacher candidates in the position of subject rather than object of the learning process, drew on their personal experiences, invited their viewpoints, and presupposed everyone’s inclusion in the learning process. Speaking of Maria Andriivna’s pedagogy, one teacher candidate interviewee said, “She came and began to ask us questions. She did not come and tell us [like other instructors] how bad we are and merely read her lecture notes. We felt that someone was interested in us and in our ideas” (CIntv, November 26, 2013). Thus, the use of a constructivist approach generated a sense of respect among teacher candidates for the importance of their prior knowledge and experience and created spaces for them to express their viewpoints. Maria Andriivna also believed that this approach allowed her to adopt a facilitative role. As she put it, “I perform the role of mediator between the subject matter and [the teacher candidates’] knowledge, experience, and skills” (TIntv, November 26, 2013).

Both in lectures and seminars, Maria Andriivna tried to maintain an open classroom environment. In addition to encouraging teacher candidates not to feel inhibited about speaking
up in class, inviting them to express their views, and, practicing unconstrained relations with them, she also addressed them as “colleagues”. In interviews, the teacher candidates said that they viewed this as a manifestation of respect. One of them explained, “[By using] ‘colleagues,’ she shows her equality with us and respect for us. She respects us and we respect her” (CIntv, November 28, 2013). The teacher candidates reported that they had not experienced respect from all of their instructors, some of whom would scream at them, humiliating and even insulting them. Maria Andriivna also asked teacher candidates to respect each other. For example, before the beginning of each role-play, she asked them not to laugh at the presentations of others but to take them seriously. In an interview, she reported that she encouraged them to listen attentively to each other even if they disagreed, thus promoting the democratic behaviour of tolerance for divergent viewpoints and thereby pluralistic citizenship. An open classroom environment allowed a reduction of the distance between Maria Andriivna and teacher candidates and the development of relationships of apparent partnership and respect.

**Pedagogical organization of seminars**

Maria Andriivna’s seminars usually started with a review and discussion of content and sometimes ended with group role-play activities in which teacher candidates were asked to prepare a skit reflecting the pedagogical phenomena they had studied. She spent most of the time checking knowledge of the content through both recitation and discussion. Recitation, which sometimes prevailed over discussion, consisted in teacher candidates reproducing content presented in the lecture and then applying it to practical pedagogical situations in the format of a whole-class conversation. Maria Andriivna referred to this exercise as dialogue, often saying to the class at the beginning of the seminar, “Let’s talk about this via dialogue … Everyone speaks. One person starts and another continues” (SObs, November 7 and 21, 2013). This approach
differed from the traditional seminar format which relies completely on content reproduction. It allowed Maria Andriivna simultaneously to engage a few teacher candidates in answering questions posed, to problematize their responses with additional questions, and to invite them to express their viewpoints. In one instance, during a discussion of classroom discipline management and conflict resolution, a teacher candidate commented, “If there is discipline [in the classroom], students will not be distracted.” Maria Andriivna challenged this viewpoint and asked the whole class whether it was appropriate to use a teacher’s authority and the students’ fear to maintain discipline (SObs, November 14, 2013). In another instance, she invited teacher candidates to share their personal visions of teaching and schooling and the kind of individuals they, as future teachers, felt they should rear. Although class discussions, along with role-play activities, were limited during the seminars observed, teacher candidate interviewees noted that they had more opportunities for expressing themselves and applying theory to practice in Maria Andriivna’s seminars than in other courses. Thus, as in the case of Anna Dmytrivna, even these limited opportunities provided space to practice democratically relevant skills, although most of the time teacher candidates were more physically than cognitively active and Maria Andriivna’s focus on recitation limited opportunities for the development of such skills.

Despite the fact that Maria Andriivna reported in an interview that her goal was to discuss and practice, rather than to narrate content in seminars, she did not move away from content transmission during the seminars I observed. This can be attributed to a number of factors. In an interview, Maria Andriivna said, “A [traditional] habit that we need to present and check content sometimes resurfaces. I even notice it in my practice” (TIntv, July 9, 2013). This shows that, even though she tried to transform her pedagogy, it continued to be influenced by past practices and beliefs that seemed to have an everlasting effect on it. Scarcity of time was another
impediment. Like Anna Dmytrivna and some survey respondents, Maria Andriivna felt that her teaching was undermined by the limited course instruction time. In one seminar, she said to the class, “Today, we will dialogically [discuss] content, [supporting] it with examples. Next time we will role-play certain situations. This takes a lot of time” (SObs, November 14, 2013). The limited time stood in the way of practicing pedagogical skills through the corresponding transactional activities. Lastly, another impediment to democratic pedagogy was the poor performance of some teacher candidates on tests. Like other teacher educators, Maria Andriivna was required to design and administer tests to measure the teacher candidates’ progress in mastering the course content. Her teacher candidates did not perform well on these tests, so she sometimes had to focus on the content rather than the practice of pedagogical skills. She attributed poor performances to the low attendance of teacher candidates at lectures, during which she introduced the content that was to be tested, and to their unpreparedness for seminars. I observed on a few occasions some of them being unable to answer questions or making mistakes in relation to the content presented in the lecture. As a result, Maria Andriivna spent time reiterating the content and thus had less time for practical activities. As in other teacher educator cases, some of Maria Andriivna’s teacher candidates that I interviewed seemed to believe that they did not need to ground their viewpoints in the content taught and that seminar discussions did not require solid preparation.

**Teacher candidates’ engagement with Maria Andriivna’s pedagogy**

During lectures, Maria Andriivna always tried to initiate dialogue with teacher candidates. However, only three to five out of the 50 to 100 present took up this opportunity and engaged in a dialogical conversation with her. Sometimes she had to repeat a question or ask specific teacher candidates to respond to it, as they seemed to be reluctant to speak up. When I
asked one teacher candidate in an interview why her peers did not always respond to questions during lectures, she explained:

We are not used to such an approach … You know, when you have been taught for 3 years to come to class, take notes, and [then] leave. And here she begins to approach you and ask something. You might know what to say, but you stay quiet. (CIntv, November 28, 2013)

Thus, previous habits of teacher candidates based on traditional lectures seemed to have obstructed their dialogical engagement in Maria Andriivna’s lectures. Both Maria Andriivna and the teacher candidates also mentioned that some other instructors would occasionally humiliate teacher candidates in front of the whole class for a wrong answer. As a result, some teacher candidates were not willing to answer questions or express their thoughts. Like other teacher educator cases, Maria Andriivna often said to them, “Don’t be afraid to speak” or “Don’t be shy [to speak],” to reduce their fear when they seemed to be reluctant to enter into discussion.

Similarly, not all teacher candidates were active in answering Maria Andriivna’s questions during seminars, especially when these pertained to their knowledge of content. This can be explained by their unpreparedness or unwillingness to speak in class.

The case of Maria Andriivna provides a perspective into how an instructor intended to depart from transmissive, content-based instruction while her past teaching experience, along with institutional factors, somewhat impeded that transformation of her pedagogy. In comparison to Oksana Viktorivna and Anna Dmytrivna, Maria Andriivna’s teaching philosophy did not contain substantial contradictions and reservations, especially as regards the effectiveness and appropriateness of using constructivist approaches in the formation of teacher candidates’ knowledge. Her choice to modify traditional lecture and seminar formats and teacher-student relationships created opportunities for dialogical communication and generated respect and equality between teacher candidates and herself. Her decision to support the content she
delivered with real life examples and to organize a few role-play activities created opportunities to apply theory to practice, especially in pedagogical courses characterized by a heavy emphasis on the presentation of content rather than the formation of practical skills. Along with the other cases, that of Maria Andriivna further reaffirms that teacher candidates’ minimal experience with transactional teaching approaches and their weak motivation for studying can obstruct an instructor’s efforts to modify her pedagogy.

**Cross-case Comparison of Pedagogies of Teacher Educators**

Like some survey respondents, the four profiled teacher educators, coming from different discipline areas and universities, felt that they could exercise their limited academic freedom and agency to bring changes into their courses. All of them modified the traditional seminar format, trying to refrain from mere content recitation and to infuse classes with transactional and transformational pedagogies. Oleh Petrovych and Oksana Viktorivna made somewhat more significant changes to their seminar formats than did Anna Dmytrivna and Maria Andriivna. Oleh Petrovych created opportunities to engage in discussion and application of the content he assigned and taught to the analysis of the political, social, and cultural issues of Ukraine. Oksana Viktorivna used simulations and other activities to have teacher candidates examine and personally encounter issues of ethnic prejudice, xenophobia, social exclusion, and intercultural miscommunication. Anna Dmytrivna’s and Maria Andriivna’s seminars included the recitation of content by teacher candidates in an interactive manner, some discussion and application of content (Anna Dmytrivna and Maria Andrrivna), and the practice of pedagogical skills through role-playing (Maria Andriivna). Thus, while the latter two teacher educators somewhat reordered the traditional seminar format, they preserved its traditional goal of content recitation and evaluation of its comprehension. Anna Dmytrivna and Maria Andriivna also modified the format
of lectures, interspersing them with dialogical communication with teacher candidates, which created some small spaces for their transformation. The four teacher educators employed, to varying degrees, teaching approaches such as debate, role-playing, presentation, round-table and problem-posing teaching. These pedagogies were the least frequently reported by survey respondents across the four universities, indicating the atypicality of these four cases. These four cases demonstrate how some teacher educators in contemporary Ukraine can and do exercise professional agency and autonomy over teaching, even amidst demanding and unfavourable conditions.

Along with the somewhat reworked lecture and seminar formats, the four teacher educators, to varying degrees, reordered traditional teacher-student relationships, which scholars consider to be important in order to implement dialogic pedagogies, establish equitable and respectful learning environments, and thereby attempt to empower students (Ross, 2008). All of them strove to form relationships based on respect and equality, reducing the distance between themselves and teacher candidates and thus moving away from traditional norms of instructor authority and student conformity. In these ways, they tried to overcome the problem which, as shown in chapter four, some survey respondents believed to be an impediment to the democratization of teacher education. In comparison to the other three profiled teacher educators, however, Anna Dmytrivna sometimes reinforced rather than modified the traditional teacher-student hierarchy. She resorted at times to her instructor’s power to chastise teacher candidates in order to control their behaviour and gain their compliance. As we have seen, these pedagogical choices were encouraged not only by her individual beliefs about managing teacher-student relationships, but also by the inability or unwillingness of some teacher candidates to engage responsibly with her non-oppressive classroom environment and the institutional culture of
traditional learning. Generally, modified teacher-student relationships created opportunities for teacher candidates to feel freer to interact with instructors and to have a sense of respect that they did not usually experience in all of their classes.

Through similar and divergent pedagogical task structures and classroom environments, summarized in Table 5, the four teacher educators created a range of opportunities to practice democratically relevant skills and values in addition to the democratically oriented content they taught.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Educator Cases: Comparison of Classroom Environments and Key Pedagogical Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleh Petrovych (political science course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oksana Viktorivna (ethnopedagogy course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Dmytrivna (civic education course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Andriivna (pedagogy course)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By creating open environments and inviting teacher candidates to feel free to speak, all the teacher educators provided space for them to practice their voice through the expression of their own viewpoints. To varying degrees, the four cases also enabled candidates to practice their agency by providing them with decision-making opportunities, albeit limited, regarding seminar topics and format, the format of presentations or skits, and viewpoints on the contested topics being explored. Through these pedagogical task structures, they created opportunities for the development of maximal citizenship along the political continuum. Among the four teacher educators, Oleh Petrovych provided the most opportunities for practicing the dispositions of maximal citizenship, as he was the most active in initiating and sustaining classroom discussions on the various political, economic, and social issues of Ukrainian society. However, teacher candidates did not always make the most of these opportunities across the four cases.

By teaching the democratic behaviour of tolerance and respect for diverse viewpoints and encouraging teacher candidates to listen to their peers, the four teacher educators also cultivated aspects of pluralistic, inclusive citizenship, thus developing dispositions of maximal citizenship along the cultural dimension. Because of the topics she taught, Oksana Viktorivna created the most opportunities for developing the cultural dimension of citizenship, not only through her content but also through her pedagogical task structures. Like the teacher educator cases, survey respondents claimed to cultivate communication and analytical skills and respect for opposing viewpoints in their classes. Yet the teaching approaches that the vast majority of them listed, as shown in chapter four, did not necessarily support the formation of such skills.

All four teacher educators supported the development of democratic citizenship by connecting the content they taught to various aspects of Ukrainian society as well as to the
personal lives of teacher candidates. Through their political science and civic education courses respectively, though to varying degrees, Oleh Petrovych and Anna Dmytrivna involved teacher candidates in the discussion and analysis of issues of Ukrainian society, ranging from political engagement and political accountability to patriotism and the political and linguistic division of the country. Oksana Viktorivna used activity debriefs to compare the content of simulations and other activities to the issues of ethnocultural tolerance in Ukraine. Maria Andriivna, lastly, modeled and gave examples of pedagogical situations revealing different issues of the Ukrainian educational system. By making connections to Ukrainian political and social realities through the content taught, the teacher educators attempted to promote personal change and engagement among teacher candidates, thus rendering their teaching transformative.

The four teacher educators offered both similar and divergent rationales for their pedagogical choices (see Table 6).
### Table 6
**Teacher Educator Cases: Rationales for Using Transactional Pedagogies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Oleh Petrovych (political science course)</th>
<th>Oksana Viktorivna (ethnopedagogy course)</th>
<th>Anna Dmytrivna (civic education course)</th>
<th>Maria Andriivna (pedagogy course)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making classes interesting and keeping teacher candidates (TCs) engaged</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting TCs with practical knowledge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refraining from recitation of “factual” information by TCs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing skills and values</td>
<td>Developing discussion and analytical skills</td>
<td>Influencing TCs’ beliefs and dispositions in relation to ethnocultural tolerance, through simulation and other interactive activities</td>
<td>Developing thinking, communication, and presentation skills</td>
<td>Developing pedagogical skills and dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rationales specific to each case</td>
<td>Developing partnership relationships with TCs</td>
<td>Involving all TCs in interactive activities to familiarize them with course content at least, since TCs were in the habit of studying content only selectively</td>
<td>More effective mastery of content</td>
<td>Adopting the constructivist approach to teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the four teacher educators, making classes interesting and useful to teacher candidates and keeping them engaged was one common rationale for choosing transactional teaching approaches, at least some of the time, over traditional ones. For example, Oksana Viktorivna and Anna Dmytrivna (along with her assistant) believed that traditional lecture and seminar formats were ineffective in keeping the attention of teacher candidates. In an interview, Oksana Viktorivna said, “I entertain them, we role play … so that it can be interesting for them” (TIntv, March 19, 2013). Another common rationale was to help teacher candidates better understand the subject matter and to present them more with practical knowledge than with only abstract content. Maria Andriivna and Oleh Petrovych particularly emphasized the adoption of transactional teaching approaches in order to refrain from mere content recitation and to help candidates to apply the content taught to practice. They also believed that, as compared to traditional pedagogies, such teaching approaches helped them to build more equitable and respectful relations with their teacher candidates. Anna Dmytrivna’s assistant and Oleh Petrovych adopted transactional teaching approaches, lastly, in order to promote thinking and communication skills among teacher candidates. As in Ginsburg’s study (2009) of the use of active-learning pedagogies across five developing countries, these rationales can be categorized into two groups: those aimed at getting students interested in studying and going beyond content recitation (motivational and cognitive dimension) and those aimed at helping students to learn to express their views and feel less inhibited (behavioural or democratic citizenship dimension). Although none of the four profiled teacher educators explicitly linked their pedagogical choices to the promotion of democratic citizenship, the pedagogical task structures that they established created opportunities to promote the political and cultural aspects of democratic citizenship, to varying degrees.
Like the teaching practice of some survey respondents and some faculty members that I interviewed, the pedagogy of the four teacher educator cases was characterized by change and continuity. Change from the Soviet-era status quo was manifested in their modification of traditional pedagogies, teacher-student relationships, and even course content, particularly in the case of Oksana Viktorivna. Continuity with earlier patterns of teaching was manifested in reservations about the appropriateness of using transactional pedagogy for the acquisition of content (Oksana Viktorivna and Anna Dmytrivna), the adoption of transactional pedagogy to meet the goals of traditional teaching (Anna Dmytrivna), and intermittent resorting to content recitation in seminars (Anna Dmytrivna and Maria Andriivna). The persistence of these various pedagogical continuities in the practice of the profiled cases is consistent with the findings of other studies conducted in rapidly transforming post-authoritarian contexts (Niyozov, 2008; Schweisfurth, 2002b). For example, in her study of Albanian teachers, Gardinier (2012) notes that “while attempting to introduce new paradigms and practices in their teaching, [teachers] nonetheless preserved some aspects of a more traditional role in the classroom” (p. 675). These continuities can be linked to the professional habits and beliefs of teacher educators. For example, reservations about transactional teaching could be an outcome of the prevalent belief that such teaching is “too playlike – not a serious method” (Niyozov, 2009). Or faculty members might carefully “reject everything ‘old’ (Soviet) and embrace everything ‘new’ (or Western)” (Silova, 2014, p. 188). They can also be linked to institutional factors – such as a reduction of course instruction time, a prescribed curriculum, and the need to prepare teacher candidates for tests – that reinforce content-based instruction and thereby impede democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates.
Another important impediment to democratic citizenship education, as the teacher educator cases revealed, was an inability or unwillingness of many teacher candidates to engage responsibly with transactional teaching approaches, despite their stated preference for them. This issue was particularly evident in the classes of Anna Dmytrivna, Maria Andriivna, and Oleh Petrovych, where some teacher candidates came unprepared for classes and viewed discussions and other transactional activities as pedagogies into which they did not need to put much effort. The issue was less noticeable in Oksana Viktorivna’s class, where the organized activities did not really require teacher candidates to use content knowledge. Overall, the issue of unpreparedness and irresponsible engagement with new pedagogies can stem from a general lack of motivation for studying among teacher candidates, as well as from their lack of skills and inclinations to engage with such pedagogies because of the institutional culture of transmissional teaching. (Teacher candidates across all four cases acknowledged that these instructors’ pedagogies were not typical.) Schweisfurth (2002a) makes a similar observation in her study of instructors and students of a teacher education program in the Gambia. She notes that the implementation of democratic teaching approaches was constrained not only by the syllabus and a lack of time and resources, but also by the attitudes of students “who were unused to such approaches and not trained in how to get the most from them in a democratic way” (p. 308). Thus, it is not only teacher educators but also teacher candidates who can obstruct democratically oriented pedagogical transformation. This aspect needs further investigation, as it is largely ignored in citizenship education literature, which tends to ‘blame’ mainly educators and institutional factors for impeding educational transformation.

The pedagogies of the four profiled teacher educator cases did not fully meet the criteria of transactional and transformational teaching approaches. However, a mere application of these
criteria in the assessment of teaching practice without the consideration of the wider context might be inappropriate. For example, Hess and Avery (2008) would describe the classes of the three profiled teacher educators (Anna Dmytrivna, Maria Andriivna, and Oksana Viktorivna) as ones “with student talk and tangential attention to issues” (p. 509) because most discussions in these classes were usually brief and sometimes spontaneous; they often took place between the instructor and teacher candidates rather than horizontally among participants, and were seldom taken up by the instructors, who were typically rushing to conduct other activities. They consider such classes less conducive to increasing tolerance, political knowledge, and political interest among students. Yet, in the context of contemporary Ukrainian teacher education, even these brief discussions constituted unique moments of democratic citizenship education because teacher candidates had not often experienced them in their classes. Furthermore, the four profiled teacher educators enacted changes in teaching approaches and teacher-student relations and taught transformative content, as will be shown in the next chapter, in the context of classroom, institutional, and societal environments that were not conducive to transactional and transformational pedagogies. As argued in chapter four, these contextual factors cannot be dismissed because that could result in an inadequate or distorted interpretation of democratic citizenship education. In light of this danger, it might be more appropriate to describe the work of democratically oriented teacher educators in contexts such as Ukraine in terms of contingent transformational pedagogy, which “adapts to the material conditions of teaching, the local traditions of teaching, and the cultural politics of teaching” (Vavrus, 2009, p. 310). This conceptualization allows us to recognize the existence of a broader range of pedagogical alternatives of transactional and transformational teaching, to move beyond judging teaching
only by methods and content, and to account for a range of transformational challenges (Niyozov, 2009; Vavrus, 2009).

In short, in terms of pedagogy, teacher education for democracy, as the analysis of the four profiled teacher educators revealed, meant refraining from a mere reliance on transmisional teaching, reordering traditional teacher-student relations, connecting course content to the personal lives of teacher candidates and social realities of Ukraine, and encouraging them to practice their voice and agency by speaking up in classes, expressing their viewpoints, and making decisions about course format and topics, group presentations, and articulated viewpoints. In the following chapter, I build on this pedagogical foundation to demonstrate what democratically oriented content the four teacher educators communicated to teacher candidates as a further and central component of their democratic citizenship education.
Democratic citizenship education requires not only particular kinds of pedagogical practices, as shown in the previous chapter, but also democratically oriented content, if it is to create a foundation for forming the necessary knowledge, skills, and values. The purpose of this chapter is to further shed light on the second and third research questions – how the selected teacher educator cases conceptualize democratic citizenship and how and why they actually enact it in their practice – using the four case studies. In this chapter, I will describe the political, cultural, and pedagogical components of democratic citizenship education that the four teacher educators taught through curricular content in their courses, to varying degrees. These are: citizenship responsibility; a non-fearful mentality; ethnic, racial, gender, and interregional tolerance; national pride and patriotism; and student-centered pedagogy. Citizenship responsibility and non-fearful mentality fall under the political dimension of citizenship; ethnic, racial, gender, and interregional tolerance are part of the cultural dimension; national pride and patriotism belong to both the political and cultural dimensions; and student-centered pedagogy associates with the pedagogical. These components constitute possible approaches to teacher education for democracy in terms of content in the context of post-Soviet Ukraine. I analyze these components by drawing on characteristics of minimal and maximal citizenship from the political and cultural dimensions of the conceptual framework. I also draw on elements from the pedagogical dimension of the framework, particularly the distinction between transmissional, transactional, and transformational pedagogies, in order to illustrate the transformative nature of the content taught.
I use one teacher educator case study to illustrate each of these components of democratic citizenship education in the context of Ukraine: Oleh Petrovych, citizenship responsibility and a non-fearful attitude; Oksana Viktorivna, tolerance and cultural diversity; Anna Dmytrivna, inclusive national pride and patriotism, and Maria Andriivna, student-centered pedagogy. I chose a teacher educator to foreground a particular component of citizenship on the basis of its prominence in his or her teaching. I will then present and compare the ways in which each component was reflected in the practice of the other teacher educators. I will also consider the interpretation of each aspect of democratic citizenship in the case study classrooms in the light of responses to the survey described in chapter four. I will conclude this chapter with a summary of the findings and outstanding issues of my analysis of these political and cultural dimensions of democratic citizenship. A central argument of this chapter is that, in the context of Ukraine, some of these components of political and cultural democratic citizenship have meanings and significance distinct from those that they have acquired in established Western democracies.

**Citizenship Responsibility: Oleh Petrovych**

**Developing personal responsibility to influence state and society**

Citizenship responsibility was a dominant theme in the political science course of Oleh Petrovych (pedagogical university, western Ukraine). In an interview, he conceptualized democratic citizens as conscious individuals who understand their rights and responsibilities, carry responsibility for themselves and others, and contribute to society through their actions (TInv, May 17, 2013). In the classes I observed, Oleh Petrovych spoke about citizenship responsibility in terms of how citizens ought to act in a democracy, emphasizing particularly the potential influence of voters and taxpayers on elected officials and the state and the role of each individual in bringing about change. Oleh Petrovych believed that, along with creating strong
democratic institutions and implementing reforms, there was a need for personal change among people to effect societal transformation. It was necessary to adopt roles and dispositions different than those common during the Soviet period: for example, citizens should cultivate a non-fearful mentality and non-paternalistic relations with the state. Oleh Petrovych did not explicitly organize classes to explore these themes but alluded to them in the context of broader course topics such as political systems, parties and elites, alternative political movements, and international relations.

In one seminar, which explored Ukrainian political parties, Oleh Petrovych presented the idea of voters’ and taxpayers’ influence on elected officials and the state. During the seminar, while debating the effectiveness of the Ukrainian political parties of the day, some vocal teacher candidates complained that both ruling and opposition elected officials pursued their own interests instead of those of the people and the state. Throughout the debate, one could sense the participants’ feeling of powerlessness and dissatisfaction with the current political and economic conditions in the country. For example, referring to the passing of the controversial language law and the unsuccessful protests that followed, one teacher candidate said, “People saw that there were no results [of their protests] and they lost confidence. It is not the first time that strikes and protests have not led to anything [new]” (SObs, May 20, 2013). After listening to some

---

28 A new language law adopted by the Ukrainian parliament in July 2012 allowed local governments to pass legislation that would give any minority language the status of an official language if 10% or more of the population in that area spoke it as a native language. Although the law was presented as a response to the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, it was preoccupied primarily with the Russian language. Ukrainian ethnic elites were concerned that this law could potentially make Russian, already freely used by many in their daily communication, an official regional language in 13 out of 27 oblasts, thus marginalizing the status of Ukrainian as the language of the state. They worried that Russian would henceforth be used instead of the official state language in the predominantly Russian-speaking regions of Ukraine. They were also concerned by an attempt by some politicians to eliminate their own obligation and that of other Russian-speakers to use Ukrainian, which they feared would polarize an already divided society. The proposed law was challenged by the opposition party in Parliament and by numerous public activists. However, then president Viktor Yanukovych instructed his party, which enjoyed a majority in parliament, to adopt the law in order to appease his constituents in the eastern and southern regions of Ukraine prior to the parliamentary elections in the fall of 2012. Hundreds of Ukrainians took the streets of Kyiv to protest the law (Kulyk, 2013; Olszański, 2012).
teacher candidates talking about the failure of elected officials to fulfill their promises to voters, Oleh Petrovych developed the idea that citizens needed to voice their demands openly and control elected officials by holding them accountable to the electorate. He taught teacher candidates that citizens as voters could improve their lives and influence the development of the state through such ‘control.’ He suggested that this control should be ongoing rather than temporary; that citizens needed to be constantly critical of government actions, and that elected officials should communicate with voters not only before the elections but also during their tenure in office.

Later in the same seminar, Oleh Petrovych explained that taxpayer money could be used as leverage, over and beyond voting, to influence the state. He articulated this idea in response to two teacher candidates who had expressed uncertainty as to why people had to pay a portion of their salaries to the state. After elucidating the purpose of taxes to the class, Oleh Petrovych spoke of how they could be used to demand better services from public institutions because people supported the functioning of these institutions through their taxes. As he put it, “We see clearly how many things are wrong. We pay taxes, but we drive on roads of poor quality. How is this possible? Why is neighbouring Poland able to have normal roads?” (SObS, May 20, 2013). In an interview, he mentioned that he often asked teacher candidates whether they paid taxes and whether they knew that they had the right to determine how their tax money was spent, but found that they seemed to be unaware of this (TIntv, June 6, 2013). The teacher candidates in Oleh Petrovych’s course appeared to lack basic knowledge about government structures and the instruments that citizens could use to influence the state.

Through his explanation of the citizenship roles of voters and taxpayers, Oleh Petrovych was articulating a possible new social compact between citizens and the state. As Nikolayenko
(2011) notes, “[In the Soviet Union], although students learned about rights and obligations of Soviet citizens, it was ideologically unacceptable to challenge the superiority of the communist system or expose the shortcomings of a planned economy” (p. 88). In established democracies, teaching about the operation of the political system and citizen obligations is generally viewed as a form of minimal citizenship education, since it is aimed at reproducing and adjusting citizens to the existing socio-political order rather than at transforming that order (Biesta, 2011). However, in the context of a society in transition such as Ukraine, such knowledge can be transformative and hence reflective of maximal citizenship along the political dimension. It can provide an alternative view of citizenship roles, demonstrating how citizens can engage with elected officials and the state to ensure that these do not go unchecked. This particular aspect of citizenship responsibility is consistent with the articulation of maximal citizenship in Western scholarship because it goes beyond mere voting and taxpaying to emphasize critical engagement with the state. In the context of Ukraine, knowledge of the political system and citizen obligations can help to challenge traditional views of citizenship responsibility. As Fournier (2010) notes in her study of the Orange Revolution protestors, for many Ukrainians the sense of citizenship responsibility is limited to working and voting.

Throughout the seminars I observed, Oleh Petrovych further advocated citizenship responsibility, especially in the sense of individual agency and personal change, by encouraging teacher candidates to personally contribute to societal transformation rather than completely rely on someone else. In one instance, when teacher candidates debated the contested issues of whether Ukraine should sign a free trade agreement with the European Union or with Russia’s Customs Union, many of them expressed a longing for changes that they hoped would follow the signing of a European Union agreement. However, they seemed to think that those changes
would come about by themselves as soon as the government had conducted the necessary reforms. It did not seem to occur to them that they could personally contribute to the success of those reforms. At the end of the seminar, Oleh Petrovych addressed this issue:

Those who want [to integrate with] the EU hope that good men [sic] will come and then everything will be great … as if we do not need to make any efforts ourselves … It is one of the biggest mistakes [to think in this way]. Nobody will just give us everything … If we want better standards of living, we must sacrifice something … [we need to] change social consciousness. (SObs, June 6, 2013)

Through his remark, he challenged the paternalistic mindset that expects change to be brought about by others by teaching the need for participation in achieving desired ends. He did not downplay the role of government in the reform process, but viewed the personal change and personal responsibility of citizens as instrumental to social and political transformation. He pointed out that people typically condemned corruption while failing to combat it, and even practicing it, themselves. Throughout the classes I observed, he gave teacher candidates examples of how they could facilitate change by refraining from participation in paid political protests, by being accountable for their actions, and by demanding systemic reforms from the state as opposed to limiting their demands to the provision of basic material goods and services.

Through his pedagogy and the content of his course, Oleh Petrovych also challenged a traditional disposition of fear among teacher candidates, which he viewed as a further impediment to participation in political and civic processes and thereby to social change. In one instance, at the end of one seminar, he said to teacher candidates, “You have become more uninhibited [in this class] … You are losing the fear of speaking out which exists on a generic level in our society” (SObs, May 31, 2013). He explained the reticence of teacher candidates not only by the authoritarian institutional environment but also by the deeper culture of fear cultivated during the Soviet era:
[Your] fear comes from the Soviet times, when everyone was afraid to [publicly] say or do something wrong [in relation to the regime]. When you talk to your parents, they may still say to you, ‘Do not speak up. Rather be patient.’ You were born in an independent Ukraine, but you still have that fear. (SObs, May 31, 2013)

As Wanner (1998) notes, the patterns of thinking and behaviour of Soviet citizens were shaped by repression, lack of dignity, shortages, and feelings of inferiority. Fournier (2007) points out that even the current state authorities “often portray[sic] the Ukrainian people as ‘patient’ … or willing to bear or endure a lot, perhaps hoping to delay any active opposition to the abuses of the state” (p. 104). Oleh Petrovych instead encouraged teacher candidates to overcome citizenship passivity rooted in obedience, conformity, and fear:

You have been placed within certain boundaries… and you do not even try to go beyond them ... Wherever you work, you will manage to bring about some change if you start to get rid of unnecessary things, including fear. (SObs, May 31, 2013)

Although he presented what can be viewed as transformative content, he did not go so far as to engage teacher candidates in a critical exploration of the culture of fear, but simply introduced the concept to them. As Freire (2010) contends, “attempting to liberate the oppressed without their reflective participation in the act of liberation is to treat them as objects which must be saved from a burning building; it is to lead them in the populist pitfall and transform them into masses which can be manipulated” (p. 65). Oleh Petrovych’s transmissional approach may not have facilitated personal change and liberation in Freire’s sense. However, by raising the issue of the culture of fear, and attempting to counter it through modified pedagogical task structures and teacher-student relations, as described in chapter five, he took important step towards combating a negative disposition present among many Ukrainians.

Through his advocacy of citizenship responsibility and personal change, Oleh Petrovych tried to disturb traditional dispositions and patterns of thinking that he believed would obstruct country’s transformation. In the context of the United States, Westheimer and Kahne (2004)
argue that personally responsible citizenship, which aligns with minimal citizenship along the political dimension, is inadequate to democracy because “the emphasis placed on individual character and behaviour obscures the need for collective and public sector initiatives … [it] distracts attention from analysis of the causes of social problems and from systematic solutions” (p. 243). In the context of Ukraine, however, where socially oriented behaviour is disrespected (Korzhov, 2009), where citizens tend to maintain paternalistic relations with the state, and where few are willing to take personal responsibility to practice democratic values (LvBS & ProMova, 2014), modifying individual character and behaviour is indispensable, even if it is not fully sufficient for democracy. Oleh Petrovych’s call for personal change resonates with other studies on citizenship identities in post-communist and post-authoritarian contexts. For example, the Romanian students in Obenchain et al.’s study (2013) also emphasized the necessity for citizens to modify their values and dispositions in order to enable change in the country: “If we don’t gather the power inside to change ourselves, we can’t change our country” (p. 43).

Furthermore, although Oleh Petrovych emphasized personal change and personal responsibility and did not talk about “collective political deliberation, contestation, and action”, he did not necessarily promote individualistic, depoliticized, neoliberal citizenship, as some scholars might argue (Biesta, 2011, p. 40; Brown, 2005). He did not downplay the responsibility of the government in the reform process. Neither did he place the full blame for societal failures on individuals or promote self-reliance as a response to the challenge of paternalistic state-citizen relations. He encouraged personal change not for the sake of private interests and motivations but for that of bettering the country and achieving the public good; he cultivated collective rather than individualistic dispositions.
The case of Oleh Petrovych demonstrates how a teacher educator could promote a political dimension of citizenship, especially its maximal orientation, in the context of Ukraine. His case shows that Western definitions of minimal and maximal citizenship along the political dimension can change their meanings in contexts such as Ukraine. Oleh Petrovych’s teaching about a critical ‘control’ of elected officials and the state was consistent with maximal citizenship education as conceived in Western scholarship. However, his teaching about the operation of the political system and citizen obligations and his promotion of personally responsible citizenship, which would be categorized under minimal citizenship education in Western democracies, was not minimal in Ukraine. These aspects of citizenship, especially personal responsibility, are not prominent among many Ukrainians and embracing them could contribute to democratic transformation rather than to preservation of the status-quo. Thus, in contexts such as Ukraine, the minimal-maximal political continuum differs from its description in Western scholarship; it acquires new meanings and relevance.

**Citizenship responsibility in other teacher educator cases**

The three other teacher educators also called for personal responsibility among teacher candidates in the courses they taught. Like Oleh Petrovych, Oksana Viktorivna and Anna Dmytrivna advocated responsibility when the opportunity arose; for example, when responding to viewpoints raised by teacher candidates. Maria Andriivna taught personal responsibility as a part of the course topic on upbringing.

Oksana Viktorivna (ethnopedagogy, pedagogical university, eastern Ukraine) taught her teacher candidates not to be passive or indifferent in regards the world around them, but to take action to enable change instead of expecting it to be implemented by others. In an interview, she spoke of the lack of responsibility for oneself and others among Ukrainians and their
unwillingness to engage in resolving outstanding issues. She maintained that this problem stemmed from the mentality cultivated during the Soviet period: “We were taught that the state would solve all problems and provide us with everything. A large number of people still subscribe to such notions, and maybe this is an obstacle to Ukrainian democracy” (TIntv, April 24, 2013). Like Oleh Petrovych, she viewed a paternalistic mindset as an impediment to civic and political engagement and as a reason for low levels of citizenship responsibility. She addressed this issue in one seminar when the class had watched a short movie depicting silent enmity between an Arab and a Jew during a subway ride, followed by their eventual bonding to rescue each other from an attack by skinheads. Two teacher candidates commented on the unwillingness of people to help each other in difficult situations. Another teacher candidate told of her successful defense of a disabled child after a bus driver had requested a fare even though the law allowed him to ride public transit at no cost. No one on the bus had supported her. Oksana Viktorivna asked the class what they could learn from the latter example. While most teacher candidates agreed that it was important to defend rights, and that people could become victims of their own indifference, some also noted that not every citizen was willing to speak out. As one put it, “Most people simply do not want to do anything.” In response, Oksana Viktorivna asked, “Who if not us? If we do not start with ourselves, everything will stay the same. Act according to … the way it should be” (SObs, April 9, 2013). She added that, in the case of the disabled child, one could write a complaint to the transit company or appeal to a consumer rights protection agency. Like Oleh Petrovych, she looked to personal responsibility and individual agency to bring about desirable change.

Similarly, in her course, Anna Dmytriva (civic education, pedagogical university, central Ukraine) often argued that social change required a transformation of the values and dispositions
constituting social consciousness. In one seminar on civic education, a teacher candidate commented, “If we want changes in society, we need to make them within ourselves. We must realize that we can contribute to the development of our country … We should not expect the government to implement all changes” (SObs, March 6, 2013). The teaching assistant supported this position with a real life example, telling how citizens had spent a whole night safeguarding polling stations in some Ukrainian cities to prevent the falsification of results during the parliamentary elections in 2012. Through this example, which she called an instance of active citizenship initiated from the grassroots, she taught about the potential of individual agency and collective action to overcome the problems facing Ukrainian society. Like Oleh Petrovych, Anna Dmytrivna also spoke briefly about the historical roots of fear in the context of Ukraine. She tried to explain how fear instilled by oppressive regimes could inhibit citizens from speaking up against injustice, as they might assume that “if one says something, one will get punished” (LObs, March 6, 2013). Like Freire (2010), she spoke about how the struggle of people for freedom and transformation can be obstructed by their fear of freedom and of increased oppression. However, like Oleh Petrovych, she did not attempt to involve teacher candidates in a critical exploration of the historical roots of the mentality of oppression, thus potentially impeding the promotion of personal change and active citizenship.

Maria Andriivna (pedagogy, classic university, western Ukraine) focused much of her course on promoting personal responsibility, conceived as being merely a good person rather than a good citizen in the democratic sense. For example, in a lecture on methods of upbringing, she noted that upbringing entails forming human, civic, and democratic values among students and she emphasized in particular the cultivation of “responsibility, love, respect, trust, fairness, and honesty” because these were “values without which life [was] impossible” (LObs, October
As mentioned in chapter four, such an emphasis owes much to the long-standing tradition, cultivated during the Soviet era, that moral education is the basis of all education (Sukhomlinska, 2010). Maria Andriivna’s approach also reflects the current national philosophy of pedagogy, which foregrounds the formation of personal qualities (character or moral) over political qualities (democratic citizenship; Bogachenko & Perry, 2013), although pedagogy textbooks emphasize forming civic and political competence among students (see, for example, Volkova, 2007). Like Maria Andriivna, the other three teacher educators, Oleh Petrovych, Oksana Viktorivna, and Anna Dmytrivna, promoted the modification of personal values and behaviour; however, in contrast to her, they connected this to developing political qualities and thereby went beyond mere character education, which does not emerge from, or relate to, social and political frameworks (Davies, Gorard, & McQuinn, 2005). Although Maria Andriivna’s emphasis on personal responsibility could assist with battling low social morale in Ukraine, her teaching fell short of maximal citizenship along the political dimension, as compared to that of the other teacher educator cases, because of its focus on cultivating apolitical personal qualities.

Like the four profiled teacher educators, other teacher educators surveyed and interviewed in the four universities included personal responsibility, active citizenship, and individual qualities in their conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship. They also reported teaching these aspects of citizenship in their courses; however, they did not emphasize them highly in their survey responses. For example, only approximately 10% of survey respondents indicated that they promoted personal responsibility among teacher candidates, and only 20% reported promoting active citizenship. Thus, the teacher educator cases, especially Oleh Petrovych, Oksana Viktorivna, and Anna Dmytrivna, appeared to cultivate democratic
values and dispositions that were relatively uncommon among the broader population of the faculty members. To varying degrees, these three case studies demonstrate possibilities for promoting political democratic citizenship in contemporary Ukrainian teacher education programs.

**Tolerance and Cultural Diversity: Oksana Viktorivna**

**Combating ethnic prejudice and forming pluralist citizenship identity**

The promotion of tolerance was a prominent theme in the ethnopedagogy course of Oksana Viktorivna. Her teaching, in contrast to that of Oleh Petrovych, underscored the formation of the cultural aspect of democratic citizenship. During the classes I observed, she conducted a number of activities to problematize ethnic stereotyping, social exclusion, and cultural intolerance and to illustrate their implications for human interactions. Through these activities, she promoted various aspects of multicultural citizenship and nation building. In one seminar, an activity examined negative attitudes towards the Roma, a traditionally stigmatized ethnic minority in Ukraine. Oksana Viktorivna asked for one volunteer to represent the Roma and the others to list the negative and positive stereotypes that they held about this ethnic group. At the end of the activity, Oksana Viktorivna asked the volunteer to share what she had felt while listening to the negative stereotypes. She said, “I felt uncomfortable and dejected. What I heard was rough.” Oksana Viktorivna commented, “This simulation is a very unpleasant activity. But it feels much worse in real life.” After the activity, she cited a local study which showed how the negative attitudes of parents towards the Roma population shaped those of their children, and she encouraged teacher candidates to break this cycle by challenging the negative ethnic stereotypes of their future students (SObs, March 26, 2013). Through this activity, Oksana Viktorivna tried to reduce ethnic prejudice against the Roma and to cultivate ethnic tolerance and empathy by
showing how the ethnic stereotypes that people use in their daily lives can make others feel oppressed. The activity created space to confront the prejudice of teacher candidates by inviting them to express both negative and positive stereotypes about a marginalized ethnic group.

The Roma exercise reflects a human relations approach to multicultural education (Sleeter & Grant, 2007). In Western scholarship, this approach falls under minimal rather than maximal citizenship along the cultural dimension because of its failure to address structural inequalities while encouraging positive attitudes and relationships among ethnic and other cultural groups (Sleeter & Grant, 2007). For example, in the context of the United States, Gorski (2008) argues that activities in which the primary goal is to increase cultural awareness and improve cross-group relationships do not usually lead to examining the privileges of dominant groups, or to eliminating or mitigating systemic inequities. As mentioned in chapter one, in the context of Ukraine, however, where many citizens harbour moderately alienated or hidden xenophobic attitudes towards such ethnic minorities as Asians, Arabs, Caucasus people, and Africans (KIIS, 2012), where many school teachers are carriers of ethnic prejudices and biases (Sereda, 2013), and where teacher candidates do not receive formal instruction in multiculturalism (Koshmanova, 2006), it would be more challenging to examine issues of privilege and justice and advocate equal opportunities between dominant and minority groups without first developing basic ethnic tolerance and comfort with cultural difference. Through her classroom activities, Oksana Viktorivna tried to counterbalance negative attitudes towards specific ethnic groups, to advocate essential acceptance and openness to cultural difference, and to promote ethnic tolerance. Thus, multicultural education activities viewed as problematic and inadequate in contexts such as the United States may acquire a different significance in contexts such as Ukraine.
Social exclusion was another problem that Oksana Viktorivna addressed in the seminars I observed. In one activity, designed to promote inclusivity and acceptance, Oksana Viktorivna invited teacher candidates to stand in a circle. She attached stickers of different colors to their backs and asked them to form groups based on the same color without talking to each other. At the end of the activity, two teacher candidates remained alone because their colors did not match any of the others. These individuals were asked to share how they had felt about not being included in any group. One stated, “I felt alone. I felt like an outcast.” Another added, “[I felt] confused. I saw no one taking me into their group.” Oksana Viktorivna asked, “How would it feel in real life?” (SOb, April 2, 2013). In another activity, teacher candidates were divided into two groups, newly arrived immigrants and local inhabitants. As mentioned in chapter five, the task of the ‘immigrant’ group was to convince the ‘local inhabitants’ to let them settle in their country, while that of the ‘inhabitants’ was to decide whether to accept them. During the activity debrief, one teacher candidate commented, “If one puts oneself in an immigrant’s position, one can understand how difficult it would be to communicate with representatives of another nation [and] win their trust.” Another, drawing parallels with Ukrainian realities, added:

Now, imagine how those who arrive from another countries feel … for example, international students who come to study: it can be difficult for them because sometimes we reject them … [As a result,] they can also act towards us with animosity. (SOb, April 2, 2013)

The activity allowed the teacher candidates to articulate the tension and hostility that people often feel towards immigrant groups and to experience and reflect on social exclusion based on difference.

These activities further illustrate Oksana Viktorivna’s human relations approach to multicultural education. She taught inclusion and respect for those who differ from oneself, for example through the activity requiring teacher candidates to form groups on the basis of sticker
colors, by showing the negative consequences of social exclusion. She encouraged sensitivity and empathy towards newly arrived immigrants by demonstrating the often negative attitudes of local inhabitants and the difficulties of integration in a new country. As mentioned in chapter five, Oksana Viktorivna also showed teacher candidates a booklet, “At Home in Ukraine,” containing information about how new immigrants and international students had decided to come to Ukraine, the attitudes Ukrainians had shown to them, and the difficulties they had encountered integrating into Ukrainian society. As the number of immigrants, especially foreign students, continues to grow in Ukraine and some Ukrainians describe their attitude towards ethnic minorities as “conflicted” or “tense,” especially towards those who seek citizenship rather than guest worker status (IOM, 2011; MPC, 2013; NISC, 2010; Rachkevych, 2010), Oksana Viktorivna’s approach to teaching can provide an opportunity to counteract negative attitudes and promote empathy for new ethnic minorities.

Finally, Oksana Viktorivna promoted pluralistic citizenship and national identity. In one instance, she conducted a simulation activity to demonstrate that communication rules are not universal but vary across cultures, and that a lack of knowledge of such norms could contribute to miscommunication and misrepresentation. She recommended teacher candidates not to impose their cultural norms in their interactions with members of other cultures. By means of activities such as code switching and approaching reality from different perspectives (SObs, March 26, 2013), she taught teacher candidates to recognize the existence of cultural differences and she encouraged appreciation for cultural diversity, thus enacting a multicultural approach to multicultural education. She specifically promoted cultural pluralism; that is, “honouring the diverse cultural, linguistics, and historic traditions that exist in a country rather than promoting mainstream life as superior or most desirable” (Sleeter & Grant, 2007, p. 153). In Western
scholarship, this approach to multicultural education, unlike the human relations approach, is consistent with maximal citizenship along the cultural dimension.

In another instance, referring to ethnic and civic conceptions of the nation, she spoke about how ethnic minorities could become victims of aggressive xenophobic attitudes and behaviour by ethnically dominant members of society. She referred to physical attacks on international students by ultranationalist groups in her city and elsewhere in Ukraine, and she screened a short movie, “Strangers,” depicting an attack by skinheads on two members of minority groups during a subway ride. She assigned teacher candidates to write reflective essays from the standpoint of one of the characters in the movie as part of their preparation for the next seminar (SObs, April 9, 2013). Commenting on one essay, written from the standpoint of the skinheads, Oksana Viktorivna reiterated how the ethnic conception of the nation adopted by skinheads could escalate into xenophobia and assaults on ethnic minorities. She then applied the comparison between ethnic and civic conceptions of the nation to the context of Ukraine:

We do not have a unified view of the type of nation we want to build. Some draw us in the direction of an ethnic concept of the nation, but that is already impossible today ... According to the 2001 census, representatives of 134 ethnic groups reside [in Ukraine] ... If we are going to build an ethnic nation, then [ethnic] Ukrainians will be a privileged group. But what about other [ethnic] groups? How would they feel here? ... This is my view. You may think differently. (SObs, April 16, 2013)

Oksana Viktorivna taught a multicultural-civic approach to nation building, one that rejects an ethnocentric approach in favour of interethnic equality and a pluralistic society; she thus cultivated a pluralistic rather than ethnocentric national identity (Korostelina, 2013). By highlighting a civic conception of the nation, Oksana Viktorivna also presented an alternative to two dominant narratives of nation building in Ukraine. One of these, the fight for Ukrainian identity, is ethnocentric and nationalistic, while the other, the recognition of Ukrainian identity, is assimilationist in its view of Ukraine as a homogeneous culture of ethnic Ukrainians with
small ethnic minority groups which should be integrated into Ukrainian culture (Korostelina, 2013).

The case of Oksana Viktorivna shows how a teacher educator can promote pluralistic and inclusive citizenship along the cultural dimension of citizenship. As argued in chapter two, democratic citizenship education should include not only the development of critical thinking, public agency and citizen action to advance civic and political participation, but also the formation of pluralistic cultural identity to deal effectively with issues of unity and difference (Parker, 2003). In contexts such as Ukraine, attention to the cultural dimension of citizenship is especially pressing, because of emerging nation-building processes that sometimes seem to exacerbate the apparent lack of ethnocultural and other inter-group tolerance. The case of Oksana Viktorivna shows possible approaches to dealing with these issues. Lastly, like the case of Oleh Petrovych, her case also reveals that some approaches to multicultural citizenship education, such as the human relations approach, may function differently in a politically transitioning context such as Ukraine, whose cultural traditions historically have been fairly homogeneous, as compared to more ethnically diverse settler society contexts such as the United States or Canada. It further indicates the limits of using the approaches of multicultural citizenship education to analyze the cultural dimension of citizenship, as they do not directly address the issues of nation building and national identity.

**Tolerance in other teacher educator cases**

Both Oleh Petrovych (political science, pedagogical university, western Ukraine) and Anna Dmytrivna (civic education, pedagogical university, central Ukraine) taught ethnic and racial tolerance in their courses, but they emphasized it to a lesser degree than did Oksana Viktorivna, whose course was organized around promoting this democratic value. Anna
Dmytrivna and her teaching assistant also touched upon gender tolerance, challenging traditional patriarchal gender roles and underscoring gender equality. Maria Andriivna (pedagogy, classic university, western Ukraine) spoke of tolerance in her interview, but I did not observe her teaching or talking about it in her course. Maria Andriivna conceptualized tolerance as “accepting everyone despite their gender, nationality and other aspects” and respecting everyone’s viewpoints even when one disagrees with them (TIntv, July 9, 2013). While her conception required the inclusion of others, it did not necessarily engage with prejudice and discrimination against those others, and it could thus be interpreted as minimal citizenship on the cultural dimension.

Oleh Petrovych approached the formation of ethnic tolerance by discussing issues of ethnic discrimination and ethnic nationalism through an open classroom discussion of neo-fascism and its manifestation in Ukraine during a seminar on alternative political movements. In the seminar, the class reflected on the chauvinistic character of popular slogans such as “Thank God, I am not a Russian (moskal)” or “Hang a communist on a tree.” Two teacher candidates noted how the slogans of some nationalist groups, such as “Ukraine is for Ukrainians,” “Nationalists are true patriots of Ukraine,” and “Titular nation,” reinforced ethnic and racial exclusion. One teacher candidate mentioned the Svoboda Party, a controversial right-wing political party popular in western Ukraine at that time. She said, “Its slogan, ‘Beat a Russian (moskal)’ is a form of racism. It is an exaggerated kind of nationalism, which encourages the use of violence. [Therefore, the Svoboda Party] can be referred to as neo-fascists” (SObs, May 27, 2013). By exploring these nationalistic slogans, Oleh Petrovych created space to critically examine ethnic prejudices and exclusionary views embedded in them, expose their discriminatory character, and problematize the likely outcomes of ethnocentrism and ethnic
nationalism. Furthermore, he explored these slogans in the context of western Ukraine where many use them uncritically in their daily communication and exhibit exclusionary views, particularly towards Russians and Russian-speaking Ukrainians. He thereby challenged their uncritical use and promoted tolerant attitudes in this particular region.

During the same seminar, Oleh Petrovych also encouraged teacher candidates to exhibit racial tolerance. Touching briefly on the issue of racism in Ukraine, he noted that many Ukrainians had low levels of racial tolerance, stating to the class:

Democracy presupposes tolerance, equality, impartiality, and no discrimination on any basis. This is what is meant by multiculturalism. The whole world is changing and it no longer reacts sharply to people of color. Such things are normal [in other countries]… [In contrast], we turn our heads and stare when we see black males or females [walking down the street] … We Ukrainians do not have racial tolerance. We lack the kind of consciousness that would accept them into our environment. You show intolerance when you see a black guy with a Ukrainian girl. You say right away, ‘What is this?’ (SObs, May 27, 2013)

Like Oksana Viktorivna, Oleh Petrovych taught inclusion and respect for those who differ from oneself and promoted an inclusive and pluralistic view of society which he believed to be a characteristic of democracy. His teaching reflects both the human relations and multicultural approaches to multicultural education in that he challenged negative attitudes towards people of color and advocated a view of society based on cultural pluralism (Sleeter & Grant, 2007).

Among the four profiled teacher educators, Anna Dmytrivna was the only one to address, albeit briefly, the issue of regional division and prejudice in Ukraine in her civic education course. In one lecture, while talking about a Ukrainian philosopher and his vision of an independent and united country, she shared her opinion of the situation in Ukraine, which she characterized as a regionally divided society. She spoke of how different parts of Ukraine had historically come under distinct political and cultural influences: eastern Ukraine, for example, had been under the control of the Russian empire and western Ukraine under that of the Austro-
Hungarian Empire. She said that, despite its legal independence, Ukraine was still regionally divided and that some politicians tended to reinforce this division. As she put it, “They say that Ukraine is big and that the Donetsk region is completely different to Zaporizhia or Lviv. Although there are some local differences, I still believe that there will be more unity in the country one day.” She then spoke of how the media perpetuated regional divisions and prejudices, citing in particular western Ukrainian nationalistic stereotypes of Russians and Russian-speaking Ukrainians. She said, “Bad things are being told about western Ukraine in the east, and vice versa.” She also mentioned, but did not dwell on, nationalism and its implications for the country’s unity (LObs, March 13, 2013). Thus, Anna Dmytrivna promoted what one might call interregional and intergroup tolerance. She tried to disrupt what Tereshchenko (2013) describes as a socially constructed binary of ‘bad’ and ‘good’ regions which has been exacerbated by stereotypical representations of western and eastern Ukraine.

In another instance, during a seminar on stereotypes and discrimination, Anna Dmytrivna and her teaching assistant approached the topic of gender tolerance and equality through two activities that problematized traditional gender stereotypes and roles. One activity required teacher candidates to take turns writing birthday wishes for a female and a male volunteer in one or two words. When the wishes were read out, the assistant noted that some of them were gender-specific, and she asked whether they would still be fitting if the two volunteers exchanged them. She suggested that one should be able to give the same wishes to male and females since they had equal status. In another activity, she asked teacher candidates to place themselves on a ‘family-career’ priorities continuum. All the male teacher candidates focused on career, and all the females, but one, on family. A male candidate claimed that females wanted their husbands to be careerists and a female candidate disagreed, arguing that both husband and
wife should participate in rearing a child. The assistant then asked the class whether women might be more career-oriented and men more family-oriented, though she did not sustain the discussion. Anna Dmytrivna and her assistant also showed a presentation that exemplified how the media perpetuated gender stereotypes and discrimination (SObs, April 17, 2013). By means of these activities, they exposed teacher candidates to the issue of gender prejudice and attempted to promote gender equality in a traditionally patriarchal society. Their teaching reflects a multicultural approach to multicultural education (Sleeter & Grant, 2007), since it advocated a reduction of gender prejudice, particularly towards females, and equal opportunities for males and females.

The cases of Oksana Viktorivna, Anna Dmytrivna, and Oleh Petrovych demonstrate that, in contexts such as Ukraine, teacher education for democracy in relation to the cultural dimension of citizenship can involve promoting ethnic, racial, interregional, and gender tolerance; pluralist rather than ethnocentric citizenship; and a multicultural-civic approach to nation building. In the context of Ukraine, their teaching was transformational, as they tried to promote personal change among teacher candidates by disrupting their ethnic, racial, interregional, and gender prejudices and presenting alternative perspectives on nation building and gender relations. The three of them went beyond vague notions of tolerance that avoid acknowledging difference or conflict, such “accepting everyone as they are,” notions that I often heard from other Ukrainian teacher educators during my fieldwork in Ukraine. They fostered the aspects of tolerance that the survey respondents mentioned the least in their conceptions of democratic citizenship and in their self-reports of the values they claimed to promote in their classes. Unlike Oksana Viktorivna (pedagogical university, eastern Ukraine), Oleh Petrovych and Anna Dmytrivna addressed, albeit briefly, interregional and interethnic conflicts of
Ukrainian society by countering regional prejudice and Ukrainocentrism in western and central Ukraine. These instructors showed that multiple discourses and open discussions on national identity can take place even in these regions, which are traditionally considered to be Ukrainocentric and nationalistic. Lastly, through teaching various aspects of tolerance, all three teacher educators attempted to overcome a cultural gap. As Stepanenko (1998) explains, Ukraine is caught between modernity, which is characterized by the discovery of a unique national identity and socio-cultural identity following decades of its suppression, and post-modernity, which is marked by hybridity and multiculturalism. The three of them tried to move their teacher candidates towards maximal, pluralist, and civic rather than minimal, exclusive, and ethnocentric citizenship along the cultural dimension.

**National Pride: Anna Dmytrivna**

*Forging inclusive national pride and patriotism*

Cultivating a sense of national belonging and pride was one aspect of Anna Dmytrivna’s teaching, along with forming personal responsibility, active citizenship, and tolerance. Anna Dmytrivna (civic education, pedagogical university, central Ukraine) defined democratic citizenship in terms of practicing one’s rights and obligations, showing solidarity with others, exhibiting morality and national pride, living without fear, and working towards the betterment of one’s country (TIntv, March 6, 2013). She wanted her teacher candidates to practice what she called “daily patriotism” (*povsiakdenyi patriotsizm*), which manifests in respect and pride for one’s country and in readiness to defend and improve it. She promoted this disposition in a context of widely divergent levels of national attachment and patriotic loyalty: many young Ukrainians were not proud of their country and held a negative attitude towards Ukrainian citizenship (Diuk, 2012; Nikolayenko, 2011). Anna Dmytrivna explained this position by their
conflation of negative opinions of state authorities with attitudes towards the country. As she put it:

They do not like state authorities [and the state of affairs in the country]. They are citizens of Ukraine but not patriots. What solution do they seek? They want to leave for abroad. Theirs is not active citizenship because they don’t want to stay here and defend their rights. They all learn a foreign language and submit their resumes to foreign companies. Many of them dream of leaving the country in search of a better life. (TIntv, July 1, 2013)

As Diuk (2012) argues, the negative feelings of young Ukrainians towards their country may be an outcome not only of their dissatisfaction with political and economic conditions, but also of the lack of a definite sense of national identity. This weak sense of national identity stems partially from Soviet policies that resulted in the limited exposure of Ukrainians to their national culture, constraints on dissemination and use of Ukrainian history and language, and the imposition of a Soviet identity (Rapoport, 2012).

In the classes that I observed, Anna Dmytrivna tried to cultivate positive feelings about Ukraine, and thereby national pride, by highlighting the richness of the Ukrainian cultural and historical heritage, especially in relation to democracy. In one lecture, after surveying the evolution of human rights in ancient Greece and medieval Europe, she explored this topic in the context of Ukraine. Using the Legal Code Russkaya Pravda of 1280 as an example, she told the class that the Kievan Rus’, from which Ukraine originated, did not lag behind European countries in terms of the protection of rights and freedoms. She introduced numerous Ukrainian philosophers who had addressed the topic of rights and freedoms in their works. She also talked about the Constitution of Pylyp Orlyk of 1710, one of the first state constitutions in Europe. As she explained to me, her goal was to show teacher candidates that Ukrainian society had historically not been backward but had featured elements of a democratic culture (TIntv, March 6, 2013). As she said to the class:
I want you to understand that Ukraine could have been a developed democratic country... In the sixteenth century, [Ukrainian] philosophers had already articulated that individuals should [have the right to] a happy [life]... [and to] live and work according to their own wisdom. Yet many interventionist powers destroyed freedom in Ukraine. Whatever authorities we have had here, they have always been afraid of Ukrainian freedom and liberty. (LObs, March 6, 2013)

Anna Dmytrivna referred to the history of Ukraine, its prominent philosophers and its natural resources, as sources of pride. During the same lecture, she stated:

In my civic education course, I want to show you the true Ukraine, [namely] how it used to be and how it should be. It is a rich land. It is rich in [fertile] soil and in philosophers, but somehow we have been told all our lives that Ukrainians are poor. Remember what you read in Ukrainian literature courses. (LObs, March 6, 2013)

Anna Dmytrivna’s conception of patriotism reflected its traditional meaning of a “sense of positive identification with and feelings of affective attachment to one’s country” (Rapoport, 2012, p. 91). Her approach to patriotic education was congruent with an emphasis in Ukrainian educational discourse on “the articulation of the nation in terms of a glorious Ukrainian past, folklore and culture rather than in political terms” (Tereshchenko, 2013, p. 135). Such an approach, as Fournier (2007) notes, can result in developing “a domesticated Ukrainian patriotism associated with the concepts of order, obedience, and spectatorship … [rather than] national self-assertiveness, initiative, and active participation” (p. 108). In the terms of this study, it can result in minimal citizenship along the political dimension. Although Anna Dmytrivna adopted a cultural-historical approach to cultivating national pride, she also encouraged active political dispositions in her classes, which suggests that she potentially conceived the nation in political terms too. In one instance, a teacher candidate cynically suggested that it was useless to try to defend one’s rights, as the state institutions did not pay attention to citizens. Anna Dmytrivna countered this viewpoint by providing an example of how students could petition the dormitory administration to cancel curfew hours – a policy about which many of them, especially
those who worked overnight, had complained (LObs, February 20, 2013). In another instance, when commenting on a group poster in which teacher candidates depicted the role of civic education in upbringing of citizens, she spoke critically about how some citizens confined their citizenship engagement to expressing patriotic slogans and wearing Ukrainian national clothes (SObs, February 27, 2013). Anna Dmytrivna seemed to combine a sense of love of and loyalty to one’s country with active citizenship participation, although she did not necessarily teach them simultaneously. She thereby promoted active patriotism, which is consistent with maximal citizenship along the political dimension.

Furthermore, Anna Dmytrivna did not reduce national pride and patriotism to ethnocentrism and chauvinism; in fact, she promoted ethnocultural tolerance and hence inclusive national identity and citizenship along the cultural dimension by teaching respect of other nations and cultures. In one seminar, for example, her teaching assistant invited teacher candidates to share their views on the knowledge, values, and skills that they believed citizens needed to live in a democracy. Some teacher candidates mentioned proficiency in Ukrainian history, culture and language, along with such characteristics as knowledge of rights and responsibilities, critical engagement in the affairs of the state, and tolerance of diverse cultures and viewpoints (SObs, March 6, 2013). Commenting on their responses, the teaching assistant stated that it was important to have one’s own national identity and to know one’s own history and culture, but that it was also crucial to respect the cultures and traditions of those from other countries. (She did, however, fall short of acknowledging the existence of “two Ukraines” [Riabchuk, 2003] or recognizing cultural hybridity within the country and a lack of tolerance towards it). Similarly, some survey respondents included respect for other nations, cultures and religions in addition to national pride and patriotism in their conceptions of democratic citizenship. One specifically
distinguished patriotism from radical and ethnic nationalism. Thus, as Anna Dmytrivna and the
surveyed teacher educators demonstrate, promoting national pride and patriotism is not
necessarily tantamount to forming ethnocentrism and other exclusionary views. Kulyk (2014)
makes a similar observation in his study of Ukrainian nationalism during and after the
Euromaidan protests. He argues that the patriotic feelings of the masses were rooted in a civic
and inclusive orientation of nationalism rather than in ethnonational superiority and exclusivity.

The case of Anna Dmytrivna reveals the importance of patriotic education that is not
ethnically and nationalistically based and not confined to passive, blind patriotism, especially in
contexts such as Ukraine where young people exhibit varying levels of national attachment and
pride and are unwilling to sacrifice material benefits over civic freedoms (Diuk, 2012). Under
these conditions, patriotic education becomes a means of overcoming a weak sense of national
identity and promoting participation in nation and state building processes. As Anna Dmytrivna’s
case shows, in contexts such as Ukraine, where patriotism becomes synonymous with national
culture and identity (Rapoport, 2012), one needs to consider not only its political dimension, the
types and levels of the citizens’ political participation and relations with the state (Kahne &
Middaugh, 2006), but also its cultural dimensions, which shed light on the types of national
identity promoted. As mentioned in chapter two, one can construct either an ethnocentric,
chauvinistic, and exclusive national identity or one that is pluralist and inclusive of different
ethnic groups while being rooted in national affinity.

**National pride in other teacher educator cases**

Oleh Petrovych (political science, pedagogical university, western Ukraine) was the
second of the four teacher educator cases to touch on patriotism, albeit briefly, during the classes
I observed. Like Anna Dmytrivna, he sought to promote patriotism conceived as personal
responsibility and actions aimed at contributing to the common good, and like her he was critical of those whose patriotism consisted merely of pronouncing nationalistic slogans and wearing national outfits. In an interview, he referred to football fans who used popular nationalistic slogans and littered stadiums during football matches, and he commented:

I explain to them that patriotism is not about shouting, ‘Hail to Ukraine. Hail to heroes.’ It is about putting the husks of sunflower seeds into a bag and throwing them into a trash can [instead of spitting them out where you sit] … It is about behaving in a decent way. (TIntv, May 17, 2013)

Like Anna Dmytriva, he went beyond a passive version of patriotism along the political dimension. He also went beyond its ethnocentric version along the cultural dimension by challenging the teacher candidates’ exclusively linguistic views of patriotism.

For example, in one of his seminars, during a brief discussion of Ukrainian patriotism, a teacher candidate asserted that she was a patriot because she “obeyed laws, spoke Ukrainian, and was proud of her country.” One of her peers countered that she was not a true patriot because she had switched to the Russian language during a summer internship at a camp located in the Russian-speaking part of Ukraine. This comment reflected a belief common in Ukrainian society, particularly in the western and central regions, that language is one of the main markers of national identity. As Stepanenko (1998) notes, “Partly because of … historical circumstances, the Ukrainian language has acquired a special symbolic meaning which is associated with a sense of ethnic identity” (p. 123). In response to the second teacher candidate, Oleh Petrovych said, “Knowledge of, and speaking in, the Ukrainian language is not a characteristic of patriotism for me” (SObs, May 13, 2013). He challenged the traditional view of national identity and patriotism by teaching that Ukrainians could be considered patriots whether they spoke Ukrainian or Russian. He attempted to mitigate ethnic prejudice based on Ukrainian linguistic identity by articulating an inclusive notion of patriotism. Like the case of Anna Dmytrivna, his case shows
that patriotic education should not be equated with promoting exclusionary ethnic and linguistic identities.

Both Anna Dmytrivna and Oleh Petrovych cultivated an aspect of citizenship that survey respondents did not highly emphasize in their conceptions of democratic citizenship or in their self-reports of the values they promoted in their classes. Only about 15% of survey respondents underscored patriotism in their conceptions of democratic citizenship, and only 10% claimed to teach it in their classes. As these two teacher educator cases indicate, patriotic education that is not confined to a “tame, folklore-influenced national culture” (Fournier, 2007, p. 106) and not ethnically or linguistically based, can be a potential aspect of democratic citizenship education in teacher preparation programs. Such an education can strengthen national attachment, challenge traditional views of national identity and patriotism, and promote active citizenship participation.

**Student-centered Pedagogy: Maria Andriivna**

Student-centered pedagogy was a dominant theme in the pedagogy course of Maria Andriivna (classic university, western Ukraine). Her course content underscores a pedagogical dimension of democratic citizenship education. She specifically taught democratically relevant pedagogies, unlike the other teacher educators, who only somewhat modelled them through their own teaching. In Western scholarship, student-centered pedagogy has been associated with promoting democratic citizenship, as it is viewed as challenging traditional teacher-student relations, cultivating critical thinking skills and other democratically oriented behaviours, and thereby as contributing to a more equitable social order and the reduction of oppression (Ginsburg, 2009; Schweisfurth, 2012). In Ukraine, student-centered pedagogy was declared an alternative to authoritarian didactics and teacher-student relations when the country turned to educational democratization (abandoning teacher-centered pedagogy and relations and
promoting freedom of choice and cooperation in classrooms) and humanization (treating students with trust and showing respect for their personality and dignity) after the collapse of the Soviet Union (Bogachenko & Perry, 2013). However, as mentioned in chapter one, many Ukrainian schools have not managed yet to establish democratic classroom structures and continue to use teacher-centred pedagogy, thus impeding opportunities for democratic citizenship education (Bekh, 2008). The teaching of student-centered pedagogy in teacher education programs therefore becomes particularly significant

**Promoting educational democratization and humanization**

During the classes I observed, Maria Andriivna promoted student-centered pedagogy by means of teaching methods, classroom management, and teacher-student communication. Through these means she underscored various aspects of educational democratization and humanization. Unlike other pedagogy instructors whom I encountered during my fieldwork, she not only adopted and conveyed ideas about student-centered pedagogy, but, as shown in chapter five, also enacted them in her teaching.

Maria Andriivna often criticized teacher-centered pedagogy for its transmissional nature, its reinforcement of student passivity and authoritarian teacher-student relationships. She encouraged teacher candidates to adopt transactional pedagogy instead so that their students could be active participants in the learning process, capable of thinking, expressing viewpoints and making decisions, rather than passive listeners and recipients of information. For example, during a lecture on didactics, when she solicited viewpoints on the purposes of learning, two teacher candidates provided contrasting responses. One said that learning was about the transmission of knowledge, and the other that learning consisted in gaining and forming
knowledge. Maria Andriivna asked the class whether they perceived any differences between these responses, and then explained:

Today, there is still a traditional approach to learning, which is viewed as the transmission and reproduction of knowledge … It is the most primitive approach to learning … The teacher is considered to be the ‘boss’ and transmits knowledge to a student who in turn reproduces it… A student is a passive object … It still exists in schools. (LObs, November 14, 2013)

She problematized learning limited to the mere transmission of knowledge and its mechanical reproduction through rote memorization and narration. She rejected what Freire (2010) calls the “banking concept of education,” that is, the top-down transmission of fixed knowledge from teacher to student. Similarly, in a seminar on didactics, after inviting teacher candidates to share their visions of the organization of learning and schooling, Maria Andriivna reiterated to the class:

I want you to understand that a problem with our schooling is that the student is not active … [he or she] is active only in the reproduction of information, specifically in its memorization and repetition. [He or she] is not active in thinking, guessing, searching, making conclusions, and creating [knowledge]. (SObs, November 21, 2013)

In lectures and seminars, she suggested using transactional teaching approaches such as dialogue, debate, discussion, and group work in order to create opportunities for students to construct their knowledge, to express their viewpoints, and to learn to cooperate with each other. Maria Andriivna further underscored the importance of creating opportunities for students to have input into the educational process in order to make them active participants in it. By way of illustration, she said “We can suggest to students various approaches to working on an assigned text … and they can choose between them” (LObs, November 14, 2013). Lastly, she highlighted the need for equal teacher-student relations to facilitate democratic learning:

The democratization of learning means that a student is a subject of the learning process. A student is a partner of a teacher [in learning] … There should be equal relationships
between them. Today, some of you said that we should ‘force or pressure a student to study.’ We cannot teach that way. (LObs, November 14, 2013)

The teaching approaches and teacher-student relations that Maria Andriivna presented to candidates reflect a transactional orientation to teaching, which, as argued in chapter two, is associated with developing maximal citizenship along the political dimension. Through these approaches and relations, she also highlighted both cognitive aspects (engaging students in various forms of thinking) and behavioural aspects (engaging students in verbal and physical behaviours) of student-centered pedagogy (Ginsburg, 2009). Although I did not observe her explicitly connect these democratically oriented approaches and relations to the formation of democratic citizenship, she encouraged candidates to create learning opportunities that would enable their students to express their viewpoints, practice decision making, and make up their own minds. Such opportunities, as the results of the IEA Civics and Citizenship Education Study show, are strongly correlated with cultivating political engagement and learning democratic principles (Schulz et al., 2010).

Maria Andriivna further promoted a non-oppressive classroom environment by teaching a non-authoritarian approach to classroom management and conflict resolution. In one seminar on resolving discipline issues and conflicts, a teacher candidate argued that teachers could keep students engaged and facilitate their learning by maintaining strict discipline in the classroom: “If there is discipline,” she said, “students will not be distracted.” In response, after gathering viewpoints from other candidates, Maria Andriivna suggested focusing on the organization of engaging learning activities rather than on discipline in itself. She explained that if lessons were organized in such a way that they were interesting to students, and various activities were available to keep them occupied and focused, disciplinary problems would be reduced. As she put it:
If our main goal is to maintain discipline, then we will be looking for instruments to achieve it … I remember hearing about one teacher who came to her class and said, “Everyone be quiet. If anyone turns their head or moves, I will pose more questions to that person.” Discipline becomes an instrument. If it is an instrument, then it is an authoritarian approach because we maintain discipline by using our authority… Discipline should be an outcome of the organization of the learning process. (SObs, November 14, 2013)

She encouraged teacher candidates to refrain from using their authority and pressure as means of maintaining control in the classroom because this approach would result in reproducing an authoritarian classroom environment and teacher-student relations. On another occasion, Maria Andriivna suggested that candidates work with their students to define and establish classroom rules, instead of merely imposing rules on them, so that students could learn to be responsible and accountable for their behaviour. As she put it:

You can discuss rules with students when you meet them for the first time. Through these rules, you can talk about various discipline issues … Teachers sometimes forget about this and enact an authoritarian style of [discipline] management by pressuring and screaming at students. This style is prevalent in schools today. (SObs, November 7, 2013)

Maria Andriivna also presented conflict resolution approaches such as facilitation, mediation, and arbitration as alternatives to traditional authoritarian approaches. In an interview, she explained that a democratic component of such approaches consisted in the ability of teachers to listen to students and not to act aggressively when addressing conflicts (TIntv, November 26, 2013). By emphasizing democratically oriented approaches to classroom management and conflict resolution, Maria Andriivna tried to move teacher candidates away from traditional norms of instructor authority and student conformity, towards a democratic organization of the classroom environment.

Maria Andriivna challenged traditional teacher-student relations, finally, by advocating to ground the learning process and relations with students in trust, care, and respect. For example,
while explaining pedagogical and psychological aspects of the organization of learning during a lecture on didactics, she pointed out:

> Since we are building a democratic and civil society, a human being is the highest value [in this process] … Learning must be based on respect and trust. If a student feels respect and trust, then he will be exhibiting the same attitude towards a teacher. If a student sees that [a teacher] screams at him and does not listen to his ideas, then there will eventually be a consequence of this. (LObs, October 31, 2013)

She taught that in a democracy students become a primary value and a subject rather than an object of the educational process, and that teachers should treat students with respect, avoiding the use of humiliation and other measures likely to undermine their dignity. Maria Andriivna modeled disrespect and respect for students through examples of destructive commands (“I am going to give bad grades to those who don’t work. So let’s work,” “Sit down, everyone, and listen to me,” or “I will call your parents if you misbehave”) and constructive communication (“Instead of saying aggressively, ‘Why you are late?’, you can cay, ‘I see that you are late. Could you explain the reason, please?’). She taught that by practicing communication based on “trust, respect, and equitable attitude,” teacher candidates could make “a student feel that [he or she] is a human being” (LObs, October 31, 2013). By emphasizing respect towards students, Maria Andriivna promoted educational humanization among teacher candidates, offering an alternative to relations prevalent in Ukrainian schools. As Tereshchenko (2010) and Fournier (2007) note in their studies of citizenship education in Ukraine, many teachers show little, if any, respect for the viewpoints of students and consider viewpoints differing from their own as threat to their authority. They do little to facilitate democratic dialogue or establish an open classroom environment.

The case of Maria Andriivna demonstrates how one could lay a foundation for the further development of the political and cultural capacities of democratic citizenship by teaching and
practicing student-centered pedagogy. As noted in the section on citizenship responsibility, her teaching fell short of promoting maximal citizenship along the political dimension because she tended to emphasize the formation of apolitical personal qualities (that is, ignoring public political dynamics) during her classes on upbringing. However, the transactional teaching approaches and the equitable and respectful teacher-student relations that she advocated in her other classes could potentially facilitate the formation of maximal citizenship. This discrepancy between the apolitical nature of upbringing that fosters minimal citizenship and the teaching approaches that promote maximal citizenship can be explained in part by the prevalence of ideas of developmental psychology in Ukraine pedagogical discourse. This field prioritizes the moral, physical, and aesthetic aspects of upbringing over the (explicit and/or democratic) civic and political socialization of children and young people. Maria Andriivna’s promotion of student-centered pedagogy can be considered transformational, as she tried to resocialize teacher candidates who had emerged from traditional, authoritarian schools so that they could introduce student-centered practices into their own teaching and thereby create opportunities for development of democratically relevant skills and values.

**Student-centered pedagogy in other teacher educator cases**

Unlike Maria Andriivna who taught pedagogy explicitly, the other three teacher educators only modeled, to varying degrees, what student-centered pedagogy might look like through their mixed use of transmisisonal, transactional, and transformational teaching approaches, reordered teacher-student relations, and open classroom environment. In interviews, most teacher candidates said that they preferred the approaches of these four teacher educators over more traditional teaching approaches, and that they hoped to adopt them in their own teaching careers. Thus, through their pedagogical practice, the four teacher educators influenced the professional
socialization of teacher candidates. Oksana Viktorivna and Anna Dmytrivna also briefly spoke about teachers’ roles and practices in their classes.

In one of her classes, Oksana Viktorivna addressed the professional autonomy of teachers, encouraging teacher candidates to follow their own judgment and practice agency in their professional lives. After hearing group presentations on overcoming ethnic stereotypes in educational settings, she expressed a concern with how one group had phrased its recommendations about the measures that teachers could take to reduce ethnic stereotypes among students. All of its recommendations had started with the phrase “a teacher must.” Asked why she had this notion of obligation, one teacher candidate replied, “We are taught that way. We are used to the idea that a teacher is obliged” (SObs, April 2, 2013). Oksana Viktorivna told them how state authorities in the Soviet era had imposed a passive attitude of obligation and submission on teachers. She tried to resocialize teacher candidates away from the professional culture of conformity cultivated under the Soviet Union by encouraging them to exercise their own reasoning and to develop autonomous professional judgement and agency.

Anna Dmytrivna and her teaching assistant addressed the practice of civic education in their course. In one seminar, they divided teacher candidates into groups to prepare presentations on the goals, content, and methods of civic education. One group suggested that the ideal civic education teacher should possess civic experience and knowledge about democracy. She should use real-life examples and interactive teaching approaches to make the subject matter accessible and comprehensible to students. The teaching assistant responded that civic education teachers should embody the principles of democracy and model them to students through their own behaviour: “A teacher should have an active citizenship position as well as just content knowledge. She can preach about many things in a declarative manner, but she should practice
what she preaches” (SObs, March 6, 2013). Through their presentation, the teacher candidates articulated some of the main features of student-centered pedagogy such as the use of transactional teaching approaches, the connection of content to the lives and experiences of students, and the enactment of democratic values in the classroom. The four teacher educators thus presented and modeled, through their teaching practice and the content they delivered, alternatives to traditional teaching approaches and teacher-student relationships.

**Democratic Curricular Content: Meanings and Challenges of Interpretation**

As the case studies of the four teacher educators demonstrate, in terms of content, teacher education for democracy in the context of Ukraine means promoting citizenship responsibility; a non-fearful mentality; ethnic, racial, gender, and interregional tolerance; national pride and patriotism; and student-centered pedagogy. Embodying political, cultural, and pedagogical dimensions, these approaches address various aspects of citizenship and national identity such as individual agency, active participation, equality, civic patriotism, inclusivity, and cultural pluralism. They also address various issues of Ukrainian society, ranging from a lack of citizenship responsibility and ethnocultural tolerance to a weak sense of national identity and the prevalence of traditional schooling, which the four profiled teacher educators tried to counter, to varying degrees, through their teaching. They believed that a solution to these issues was important to societal transformation. Thus, as mentioned in chapter four and as these case studies confirm, the immediate issues that societies face during their democratic transformation can ultimately shape the content of teacher education for democracy. Lastly, the democratically oriented values and dispositions that the four teacher educators tried to promote in their courses were cited by the survey respondents, to varying degrees, in their conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenships. However, the respondents underscored them the least among values and
dispositions that they claimed to teach in their classes, which further corroborates the survey data findings regarding low levels of democratic socialization and preparation of teacher candidates to deal with pressing issues of Ukrainian society across the universities surveyed.

The analysis of three out of the four profiled teacher educators revealed that Western-based typologies of democratic citizenship education along the political and cultural dimensions acquire different meanings, relevance, and significance in contexts such as Ukraine because of their distinct societal issues and priorities of democratic development. Along the political dimension, such aspects of citizenship as knowledge of the political system, obeying the law, personal responsibility, and modifying individual character and behaviour are not minimal in the context of Ukraine as they are widely taken to be in established democracies. When these dispositions are not prominent in a society, their practice can facilitate political and social change, and they should therefore be considered maximal. Similarly, along the cultural dimension, Western-based approaches to multicultural citizenship educational, particularly the human relations approach, acquires different significance in the context of Ukraine. I have interpreted this approach to multicultural citizenship as maximal rather than minimal because it can challenge ethnic, regional, and other prejudices and biases and promote more inclusive and pluralistic citizenship in a context characterized by a lack of instruction in multicultural education, alienated and xenophobic attitudes towards ethnic minority groups, and regional division. The analysis of these cases also points out that is inadequate to interpret democratic citizenship education along political and cultural dimensions in minimal rather than maximal terms merely because they do not align with the typologies and characteristics of democratic citizenship established in Western scholarship. It also indicates the importance of considering the historical, political, and social context in the interpretation of democratic citizenship education,
as it can help to explain variations in the meanings and relevance of the political and cultural characteristics of citizenship between a society in transition and established Western democracies.

Furthermore, the analysis of three cases revealed that Western conceptual frameworks can inadequately shed light on the political and cultural dimensions of citizenship in contexts such as Ukraine, in particular because of the deeply-rooted dominant ethno-linguistic identity, and the way it may be conflated with national identity by some parties in the polarized political tradition. As mentioned in chapter two, while multicultural citizenship education literature provides tools to analyze education for equitable and tolerant relations among different cultural groups, it does not directly engage with exploring national identity, nation building, or political transition. As the cases of Oksana Viktorivna, Anna Dmytrivna, and Oleh Petrovych showed, these aspects are important to consider, especially in contexts where people are engaged in a search for their unique national and cultural identity and the society is undergoing nation building, as they also influence the formation of the cultural dimension of citizenship. Similarly, the analysis of Anna Dmytrivna’s and Oleh Petrovych’s cases revealed that it is insufficient to interpret patriotism only in political terms; that is, by the levels of citizens’ loyalty to the state, their critique and control of the government, and their engagement in civic and political life. In contexts such as Ukraine, patriotism is linked not only to a political but also to a linguistic, ethnic, and national identity. Therefore, it is important to interpret it both in political and cultural terms because, for example, a rabidly ethnonational patriotism can manifest itself in active political engagement, yet encompass exclusionary attitudes towards ethnic minorities and other cultural groups.
The content that the four teacher educators communicated to teacher candidates was, to varying degrees, transformational in that they promoted citizenship responsibility and a non-fearful mentality instead of paternalism and culture of fear; ethnic, racial, gender, and interregional tolerance instead of exclusionary and homogeneous views; civically rather than ethnically oriented national pride and active rather than passive patriotism; and student-centered instead of solely teacher-centered pedagogies. As noted in chapter five, the pedagogies of the four teacher educator cases did not fully meet the criteria of transactional and transformational pedagogies. Some of them at times communicated transformational content in a transmissional manner, which would not necessarily assist in forming critical dispositions of citizenship and enabling personal change among teacher candidates. However, despite these shortcomings, the pedagogies they employed and the content they presented were quite distinct and untypical and had transformational potential in the context of contemporary Ukrainian teacher education. This chapter, along with the discussion of pedagogical approaches in chapter five, sheds light on possible contextually relevant approaches to teacher education for democracy in a post-authoritarian society transitioning to democracy such as Ukraine.
Chapter 7
Conclusion

This study aimed to inform the theory and practice of democratic citizenship education – the cultivation of democratic identity and training for democratic teaching – from comparative and international perspectives. It examined the meanings, possibilities, and challenges of teacher education for democracy in the context of Ukraine, a post-authoritarian society transitioning to democracy. Specifically, it explored the factors that impede and enable teacher education for democracy in Ukraine, how selected Ukrainian teacher educators understood democracy and citizenship in relation to education, and how and why they enacted these concepts in their practice. It also assessed the current capacity and potential of selected Ukrainian teacher education programs, in relation to the democratic citizenship education of teacher candidates, and provided context-specific examples of such education. The study field work was conducted at four universities located in western, central, and eastern Ukraine between February and November of 2013. The mixed methods multiple-case study methodology consisted of surveying a large number of teacher educators across selected departments; interviewing university administrators, department heads, and teacher educators; and interviewing and observing a smaller group of purposively selected teacher educators at each university. Despite the pervasive discourse of educational democratization and democratic citizen formation in contemporary Ukrainian educational policy documents, the study found little evidence of preparing democratic teacher candidates across the four universities. However, as the four teacher educator cases demonstrate, such education is possible despite formidable obstacles. In what follows, I first summarize the findings of this study along with research contributions and implications. I then
reflect on its strengths and limitations and outline possible areas for future research. I conclude by discussing the findings of this study in relation to the Euromaidan protests.

**Teacher Education for Democracy: Findings and Implications**

**Challenges and meanings of teacher education for democracy**

Teacher education for democracy, as this study demonstrates, was possible, although by no means common, at the four selected universities. As other studies have found, especially those conducted in developing contexts (Quaynor, 2011; Schweisfurth, 2011), its implementation was complicated by multiple societal, institutional, and personal factors. These factors included the weak status of democracy in the country, educational underfunding, an undemocratic institutional environment, institutional apathy and inertia, limited course instruction time, and a tradition of teacher-centered pedagogical practices. However, along with these widely documented factors, this study also shed light on lesser known impediments to democratic citizenship education such as educational corruption, educational politicization, and societal devaluation of knowledge. This study also identified factors that enable teacher education for democracy in Ukraine. For example, relative professional autonomy to determine the content of courses and choose the modes of instruction, along with innovative professional development, allowed the profiled teacher educators to exercise their agency in modifying their curricula and pedagogies. As argued in chapter four, these impeding and enabling factors cannot not be dismissed when examining teacher education for democracy in non-Western, transforming countries, as they allow us to understand the challenges of its implementation and to avoid an inadequate or distorted interpretation of it. An analysis of teacher education for democracy needs, therefore, to explore curricula and methods of instruction and also the societal, institutional, and personal factors that shape them.
Amidst unfavorable societal and institutional conditions, the four profiled teacher educators demonstrated that democratic socialization of teacher candidates was possible, and their cases shed light on what education for democracy can mean in content and pedagogy. In terms of content, this study argues, teacher education for democracy in contemporary Ukraine involves promoting citizenship responsibility and a non-fearful mentality instead of paternalism and culture of fear; ethnic, racial, gender, and interregional tolerance instead of exclusionary and homogeneous views; civically rather than ethnically oriented national pride manifested in active rather than passive patriotism; and student-centered instead of purely teacher-centered pedagogies. These qualities correspond to distinct aspects of citizenship. Personal responsibility, a non-fearful mentality, and active patriotism belong to the political dimension of citizenship. Ethnocultural, gender, and interregional tolerance, along with civically oriented national pride, are parts of the cultural dimension of citizenship. Student-centered and dialogic teaching methods are aspects of the pedagogical dimension of citizenship education. These qualities were apparent, to varying degrees, in the conceptions of democracy and citizenship of the teacher educators profiled and the faculty members surveyed. They can be linked, as well, to broader transformational processes and issues of Ukrainian society which include overcoming passive citizenship and paternalistic state-citizen relations, a mentality of fear and inferiority, low levels of responsibility for oneself and others, a weak sense of national identity and national attachment, intolerance towards cultural minorities, interregional conflict, and the remnants of authoritarian education. The four profiled teacher educators believed that, through teaching the above aspects of democratic citizenship, they could counter the structures, values, and habits that impede democratic change in Ukrainian society and so contribute to societal transformation.
Their cases illustrate how the context-specific needs of democratic development can shape the content of teacher education for democracy.

In terms of pedagogy, teacher education for democracy in Ukraine involved a departure from the dominant reliance on transmissive teaching and a reordering of hierarchical teacher-student relations. To varying degrees, the four teacher educators adopted pedagogical approaches designed to promote democratic citizenship among teacher candidates. They mixed transmissive and transactional pedagogies, modified traditional lecture and seminar formats, explored contested and non-contested issues of Ukrainian society, connected course content to the personal lives of teacher candidates, formed equitable and respectful relations with them, and encouraged them to speak up in their classes. They created opportunities, albeit often limited, for candidates to learn tolerance and respect by engaging with diverse viewpoints (Hess, 2009), to develop an interest in social and political matters by discussing issues of Ukrainian society (Kahne et al., 2013; Schulz et al., 2010), and to practice voice and agency by expressing their viewpoints on these issues and making decisions during the learning process (Bickmore & Kovalchuk, 2012; Evans, 2006). Although the teacher educators tried to modify their pedagogies to ensure these opportunities, their efforts were sometimes undermined by their traditional professional habits and beliefs. These manifested in reservations about the use of transactional pedagogies for relaying knowledge, occasional reversions to content transmission and recitation, and a tendency to preserve a teacher-student hierarchy. The teacher educators’ efforts to use more transactional pedagogies were also thwarted by the inability or unwillingness of many teacher candidates to engage productively with them. Thus, democratic citizenship education can be impeded not only by educators and educational institutions, as much of the current
citizenship literature seems to assume (see, for example, Harber & Mncube, 2012), but also by reluctant students.

Across the four universities, there was little evidence of teacher candidates undergoing democratic citizenship education. The initiatives of the four profiled teacher educators were individual rather than institutional – a finding consistent with other studies in post-authoritarian contexts, where inexperience and inertia along with other challenges typically impede a systemic reform process (Harber & Serf, 2006; Lopes Cardozo, 2012). Despite some cosmetic changes in recent years, teaching approaches have remained predominantly transmissional; few new opportunities have arisen for teacher candidates to develop and practice democratically relevant skills and values. Furthermore, although the faculty members surveyed underscored many ideas of liberal and participatory democracy (along the political and cultural dimensions) in their conceptions of citizenship, they did not always report teaching them in their classes, or employ teaching approaches that could support the learning of such ideas. The finding that the beliefs of faculty members about democracy and citizenship do not necessarily shape their practice raises a question about the influence of beliefs on practice that is too often uncritically assumed by commentators (Patterson et al., 2012). This discrepancy between conceptual beliefs and actual practice may be attributed in part to a lack of understanding of ways to promote democracy through teaching, as well as to the view that politically relevant education would amount to political indoctrination. However, as the survey data revealed, faculty members did not usually teach even less explicit politically oriented skills and values such as personal responsibility, patriotism, or tolerance of diverse viewpoints, nations and cultures.

In light of Ukraine’s ideological division along a western-eastern axis (Riabchuk, 2003), this study aimed to test whether and how there might be any differences in teacher educators’
conceptions of democracy and citizenship and the skills and values they claimed to teach. The survey and case study data revealed no significant divergence between the four universities, especially between those from western and eastern Ukraine. For example, faculty members from eastern and western Ukraine gave almost equal emphasis to active citizenship, personal responsibility, generic tolerance, and patriotism in their conceptions of democracy and citizenship. Similarly, they almost identically reported teaching active citizenship and personal responsibility, though faculty members from western Ukraine claimed to teach tolerance more than did those from eastern Ukraine. The survey data produced mixed results about the promotion of patriotism in these two regions despite the perception that they differ significantly in their levels of national attachment. Generally, a very small number reported that they taught patriotism, but those from central and western Ukraine claimed to promote it more than did those from eastern Ukraine. However, when prompted, faculty members from eastern Ukraine claimed to form patriotism as frequently as did those from western and central Ukraine. Overall, faculty members from the classic university in western Ukraine tended to report teaching democratically relevant skills and values, particularly active citizenship, respect for diverse viewpoints, tolerance of cultural diversity, and critical thinking and communication skills, more than did those from the three pedagogical universities. Although this study does not confirm the existence of a western-eastern Ukraine binary among the higher education faculty members that it surveyed, its findings reflect views of individuals from specific geographic locales in western and eastern Ukraine. Since these regions are ideologically heterogeneous within themselves (Riabchuk, 2003), it would be inappropriate to generalize these findings to other parts of these regions. Furthermore, while this study showed no significant differences by region in faculty members’ conceptions of democracy and citizenship, there may have been differences in their
conceptions of Ukrainian identity – non/anti-Soviet or post/neo-Soviet, ethnic Ukrainian or eastern Slavic identity, and Western or Eastern orientation – around which the regional division has taken place (Shulman, 2005). The survey did not test these dimensions of identity, nor did most faculty members mention them in their answers to open-ended survey questions.

**Democratic citizenship education: Contested meaning and practices**

One of the rationales of this study was to examine from comparative and international perspectives the contested concepts of democracy, citizenship, and citizenship education in light of particular local circumstances, in order to understand what they might mean and what implications they might have for democratic development. McLaughlin (1992) notes that these concepts are contested even in Western democratic societies. Verdery (1996) adds that, because these conceptions are taken as symbols of Western identity, “their real content becomes ever more elusive as we inspect how they are supposedly taking shape in the former Soviet bloc” (p. 16). This study found that Western-based typologies of democratic citizenship work differently in contexts such as Ukraine; they acquire distinct meanings and significance. Adopting such typologies for research in non-Western regions without considering local context can result in a reductionist and distorted interpretation of reality. As Williams (2013) concluded based on research in Jamaica, and this study has confirmed, what is considered minimal citizenship along the political and cultural dimensions in established Western democracies is not necessarily minimal in non-Western and/or transforming countries such as Ukraine. A consideration of context can help to explain the extent of this variation. Similarly, citizenship education practices which are approached with suspicion in Western scholarship – such as promoting ethnocultural tolerance without critically examining structural inequalities, or promoting national pride and patriotism – acquire different significance in contexts such as Ukraine. Lastly, in line with the
work of Vavrus (2009) and others, this study suggests that simply applying a transmissional, transactional, and transformational framework to the analysis of pedagogies, without considering broader factors that affect teaching, is inadequate.

In this study, I began to explore the political dimension of citizenship using a typology of minimal and maximal citizenship. Both the survey respondents and the profiled teacher educators articulated characteristics of citizenship that would fall into the Western-based categories of minimal as well as maximal citizenship. For example, in accordance with McLaughlin’s (1992), Westheimer and Kahne’s (2004), and Sears’ (1996) typologies of citizenship education, characteristics such as taking responsibility for oneself, others, and the conduct of the state; knowledge of the political system; obeying the law; and possessing individual rights and freedoms would be taken to signify minimal approaches to citizenship. In contrast, characteristics mentioned by survey respondents and teacher educator cases such as holding elected officials accountable, demanding systemic reforms, participating in the affairs of the state beyond voting, having a collective mindset, and demanding equal rights for all would be understood as maximal approaches to citizenship. While the characteristics of maximal citizenship articulated by Ukrainian participants in this study aligned with those in Western scholarship, I came to understand those characteristics considered to be minimal by Western scholars as pertaining to maximal citizenship in the context of Ukraine. Although these ‘minimal’ characteristics were not necessarily rooted in active political participation, social justice, or critical analysis of social, economic, and political issues, as Western typologies stipulate, they were change-oriented in the context of Ukraine because few individuals practiced them, and embracing them would likely facilitate democratic transformation. Thus, one should be wary of interpreting the political characteristics of democratic citizenship in minimal or
maximal terms on the grounds of assumptions embedded in Western scholarship. As this study has shown, the Western typology of minimal and maximal citizenship, which is based on the extent of critical understanding and questioning of social realities, may be inadequate to the analysis of democratic citizenship education in other regions because political characteristics are not static but acquire different relevance in different contexts.

In rapidly changing, post-authoritarian contexts such as Ukraine, it might be more appropriate to use broad conceptual categories like citizenship as practice instead of the narrower categories of minimal and maximal citizenship in analyzing the political dimension of citizenship. Osler and Starkey (2005) define citizenship as practice in terms of “an awareness of oneself as an individual living in relationship with others, participating freely in society and combining with others for political, social, cultural or economic purposes” (p. 14). They believe that individuals can use their sense of agency and practice citizenship either individually or with others to change current realities. They give examples of citizenship as practice such as consumer citizenship (acting as a responsible consumer), political citizenship (voting, staying informed, and keeping politicians accountable), and active citizenship (working with others to promote or defend human rights). Their approach to citizenship allows one to blend the characteristics of minimal and maximal citizenship into a broad whole, without confining oneself to predetermined categories. It also allows scholars and educators to be sensitive to specific contexts that can help to explain the relevance and importance of citizenship practices. Western typologies are rooted in a specific social and political history, and they do not provide space to readjust their emphasis on characteristics that are relevant only in that context.

In my analysis of the cultural dimension of citizenship education, I used five approaches to multicultural education (Sleeter & Grant, 2007), five narratives of national identity
(Korostelina, 2013), and the notions of ethnic and civic nationalism, which I also considered in minimal and maximal terms. The five narratives of national identity, along with the related notions of ethnic and civic nationalism, worked quite well when exploring the national and cultural identities promoted in case study classrooms. However, the five approaches to multicultural education, like the typology of minimal and maximal citizenship, were limited in comprehending Ukrainian realities. Three of the profiled teacher educators enacted mainly a human relations approach to multicultural education in their classes. Western scholars critique this approach, which they locate at the minimal rather than the maximal end of the cultural continuum, for its potentially assimilationist nature and for ignoring the structural inequalities which, by marginalizing cultural minorities, reproduce the status quo of the dominant ethnic group. They consider this method of multicultural education to be “not good enough” (Gorski, 2008; Sleeter & Grant, 2007). In the context of Ukraine, however, the human relations approach acquires a different significance. It constitutes an alternative to traditional ethnocentric education (Janmaat, 2008; Tereshchenko, 2014) and promotes acceptance, openness, empathy, and comfort with cultural difference, especially in relation to traditional and new ethnic minorities, sensibilities that are currently underdeveloped in Ukrainian society. This study argues that typologies of multicultural education are insufficient to analyze the cultural dimension of citizenship education, because they do not engage directly with the nation building and national identity that also shape the cultural dimension generally, and the possibilities for pluralism in particular. Notions of assimilation and pluralism adopted by multicultural scholars do not explicitly examine ethnic (narrow) or civic (inclusive) nationalism or the various approaches to nation building. In countries such as Ukraine that are undergoing a nation building process, one
needs to consider nationalism and national identities in order to further expand and clarify one’s understanding of the cultural dimension of citizenship.

This study also shows that promoting (civic) patriotism, meaning positive identification with one’s country, along with active and inclusive citizenship, can help to advance democracy in contexts such as Ukraine. In Western scholarship, patriotic education tends to be regarded with suspicion because of its association with indoctrination and coercion, an uncritical acceptance and support of the state, and an ethnocentric and nationalistic ideology (Peterson, 2012; Rowe, 2012). Some scholars recommend that citizenship education in culturally heterogeneous societies go beyond the “inculcation of traditional patriotism or conventional nationalist ideology” (Ichilov, 1998). Others go so far as to advocate cosmopolitan or world citizenship education in order to avoid encouraging nationalism (Golmohamad, 2009; Osler & Starkey, 2005). Instead of rooting a sense of citizenship in allegiance to a state or a nation, they suggest extending it beyond national boundaries by grounding it in allegiance to justice and humanity. In the context of Ukraine, however, patriotic education can serve as a means of overcoming a weak sense of national identity, countering negative attitudes toward the country and low levels of national pride among young people, and encouraging them to take responsibility to work towards the country’s betterment. As Kuzio (1998) notes, “national identities … are indispensable for political reform because only in nation states have democracies been traditionally created” (p. 144). Patriotic education is one means of facilitating the development of such identities. The formation of national and patriotic identities, as the survey results and teacher educator cases of this study demonstrated, should not necessarily be equated with promoting blind patriotism, ethnocentrism, or other exclusionary views. Like many practices of citizenship education, patriotic education acquires different significance in the
context of a post-authoritarian nation, such as Ukraine, that is attempting to transition to democracy.

Lastly, this study found that the transmissional, transactional, transformational framework for analyzing pedagogies is insufficient, without incorporating consideration of broader factors that affect teaching practices. Building on other studies of teaching that look beyond method and content (Niyozov, 2009; Schweisfurth, 2002; Vavrus, 2009), I argue that it would be more appropriate to talk about contingent transformational pedagogy in contexts such as Ukraine. This concept would allow scholars and educators to account for challenges that reform-oriented educators, such as the four teacher educators profiled in this study, encounter in their practice. The four teacher educators, especially the older ones, were undergoing a radical professional change, as they tried to refrain from relying on transmissional teaching and to reorder traditional teacher-student relations. None of them had experienced transactional and transformational pedagogies during their own schooling or teacher preparation. Three of them had received limited training in active-learning pedagogical techniques through professional development programs offered by international non-governmental organizations. All four tried to enact new pedagogies and teacher-student relations in highly demanding and unfavorable institutional environments. Despite some pedagogical shortcomings, their instructional methods presented an alternative to the transmissional teaching prevalent in their institutions and created opportunities, albeit limited, for teacher candidates to practise democratically relevant skills and values. The content that the teacher educators articulated also encouraged personal and political change. By strictly following the criteria of transactional and transformational teaching, and failing to recognize contextual factors, one risks presenting an oversimplified and distorted understanding of teaching practice in contexts such as Ukraine where educators are caught
between declared educational democratization, traditional professional habits, and societal and institutional conditions unfavorable to pedagogical reform.

Research contributions and implications

In terms of theory, this study has three main implications that contribute to comparative and international education scholarship. First, it provides a detailed description of the practical meanings, possibilities, and challenges of teacher education for democracy in a post-authoritarian context. Most studies of teacher education in such contexts limit their investigation of the democratic socialization of teacher candidates to exploring pedagogical practices and learning environments, quite often at a distance from those environments (such as in surveys). They fall short of examining content dimensions that could be relevant to teacher education for democracy. This study extended its investigation beyond teaching methods to include various subject areas that could promote democratic socialization of teacher candidates, illuminating four content approaches distinct from teaching methods. These approaches, which are also distinct from those that exist in Western established democracies, can contribute to the international discussion on the meanings and possibilities of teacher education practice for democracy.

Second, the study adds to the international discussion of democratic citizenship education by showing that Western-based types of democratic citizenship education can acquire different meanings and relevance in post-authoritarian contexts, and that adopting them without considering these contexts may result in an inadequate interpretation of local realities. This study questions the viability of analyzing democratic citizenship education in non-Western, transitioning contexts based on assumptions embedded in Western typologies. The study further adds to the international discussion by identifying factors impeding democratic citizenship education – such as educational corruption, educational politicization, and societal devaluation of
knowledge – that have been largely overlooked in the literature. These factors, which need to be considered in any analysis of citizenship education, are not unique to Ukraine, for issues of educational corruption and educational politicization are common across many developing and ‘developed’ countries. Lastly, the study shows that it is insufficient to explore only the political dimension of democratic citizenship education, with which most studies have been preoccupied (Veugelers, 2007; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). It is equally important to examine its cultural dimension in the context of increasingly ethnically, nationally, and culturally diverse societies, especially those post-authoritarian societies, such as Ukraine, that are undergoing nation building processes.

Third, this study shows that a consideration of context is necessary for the analysis of democratic citizenship and the education that promotes it, as well as for the analysis of teaching practice. This position contributes to the work of comparative scholars who emphasize the significance of context in research (Sobe & Kowalczyk, 2012). In this study, context helped to explain variations between transitioning societies and established democracies, for example, in the characteristics of minimal and maximal citizenship, which can help us to avoid a mechanical transfer of Western typologies and a reductionist interpretation of data. As compared to Western democracies, Ukraine has embarked on its democratic transformation relatively recently. Weak democratic institutions, weak adherence to the rule of law and civil freedoms, a prevalent paternalistic mindset among citizens, low levels of tolerance, and an ideological polarization of society have impeded its transformation. The priorities and needs of Ukraine’s democratic education and development are therefore different from those of established democracies. This study showed that democratic citizenship education is contingent upon historical, political and social contexts and that these contexts should be taken not as “a matter of fact” but as “a matter
of concern” during analysis (Sobe & Kowalczyk, 2012). Similarly, in line with other studies (Schweisfurth, 2002, Niyozov, 2001), this study confirms that one risks producing an oversimplified understanding of teaching in non-Western, transforming contexts if one neglects to consider the societal, institutional, and personal contextual forces that affect it. Across the four universities in this study, teaching practices, especially the teaching of democratically oriented skills and values to teacher candidates, were impeded by educational underfunding, undemocratic governance, high teaching workloads, unmotivated teacher candidates, a lack of innovative professional development programs, and even by educational politicization.

In terms of practice, this study showed that enacting teacher education for democracy depends upon a number of factors. First, one needs to create working conditions that encourage educators to practice democratic pedagogies and to teach democratic political and cultural content. As the survey and case study data revealed, low salaries, poor equipment, excessive paperwork, and high teaching workloads were among main impediments to educational change. One cannot expect reform initiatives to be implemented in an environment where the basic issues and needs of teacher educators are not addressed and they are not motivated financially, professionally, or morally to embrace them. Second, any educational reform needs to be accompanied by the proper training of teacher educators. Three of the four profiled teacher educators were able to introduce changes into their teaching partly because of the professional development that they had received through international non-governmental organizations. They found this professional training more innovative, and hence more useful, than any offered by their institutions. Teacher educators who were themselves immersed in the culture of traditional learning during their schooling and teacher preparation cannot be expected to implement democratically relevant pedagogies and relations without knowing what these mean and how
they can be practiced. Lastly, the issue of educational politicization, along with educational corruption, needs to be recognized as an impediment to the practice of teacher education for democracy. Universities should stop political elites from using their administrative resources and invading their educational spaces during election campaigns. Teacher educators need to be taught that education is not an apolitical endeavor, and that politically oriented education need not be equated with government politics or with political indoctrination. They also need access to knowledge and skills so that they can enact such education by promoting democracy through their teaching.

In terms of methodology, this study sheds light on the difficulties of conducting qualitative research in contexts such as Ukraine. My qualitative inquiry, which consisted of semi-structured interviews, participant classroom observations, and open-ended surveys, was not a common research approach in a society dominated by the positivist psychological quasi-experimental paradigm. Like other researchers who have conducted qualitative educational research in Ukraine (Korzh, 2013), I found that faculty members were not used to being interviewed or observed during their instruction. The ‘political’ nature of the research topic further complicated its investigation to some extent, as some faculty members, being suspicious of the questions examined, were hesitant to complete the survey. Despite the fact that the survey was anonymous, they were concerned that their responses could be shared with the university administration or other parties and used against them. These concerns may have influenced their responses. I also found that faculty members tended to open up about sensitive issues such as educational corruption and undemocratic institutional governance more readily in oral interviews than in written surveys. Thus, in the culture of fear and self-censorship in Ukraine, oral interviews can be a useful alternative to written surveys, providing more reliable data. (What is
written is evidence that can be used against one, while what is said is less risky because one cannot prove that it was said, especially if it was not audio recorded.)

**Study Strengths and Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

One of the strengths of this study is that, by using multiple sources of data, such as surveys, classroom observations, interviews, and document analysis, it simultaneously studied contextual factors that impeded and enabled teacher education practice for democracy, the conceptions of democracy and citizenship held by teacher educators, and the enactment of these conceptions in teacher education courses (including both breadth in surveys and in-depth case studies). Most studies select just one of these areas and thus do not always provide a comprehensive understanding of teacher education for democracy. Further, the use of multiple sources of data not only increased the credibility of findings but also allowed us to consider the perspectives of different stakeholders (teacher educators, teacher candidates, department heads, and university administrators), and thereby to obtain a more complete understanding of the phenomena explored. Another strength of the study is that it went beyond an analysis of educational policy documents to inquire into the practice of teacher educators, which permitted a view of what was actually occurring in Ukrainian teacher education institutions. As noted in the previous section, unlike other works on teacher education in post-authoritarian contexts, this study did not limit its investigation of education for democracy to exploring teaching beliefs, methods and learning environments. It extended its investigation to relevant content areas, such as political science, civic education, and ethnopedagogy, thus providing insight into additional spaces of democratic socialization of teacher candidates. A final strength of this study was that it considered the historical, political, and social context of Ukraine in the course of interpreting its data. While many citizenship education studies provide a general understanding of context (see,
for example, Obenchain et al., 2013), they do not always scrutinize their data in the light of context-specific social and political realities and thereby run the risk of painting a simplistic picture of the phenomena under investigation.

One limitation of this study is that the four approaches to teacher education for democracy generated by the case study analyses are not nearly representative of all possible directions for such education in the context of Ukraine. As I prepared for and journeyed through my fieldwork, I came across a few teacher educators who taught democratically oriented courses in the areas of gender, history, national memory, and civics. Had I become familiar with their work earlier and decided to work with them, I could have illustrated other perspectives on teacher education for democracy. Future research could include these other perspectives in order to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of education for democracy in Ukraine. Another limitation of this study is that, although it collected a large amount of data, some evidence proved to be thin and in need of further investigation. For example, while many survey respondents used terms such as interactive teaching, critical thinking, active citizenship, tolerance, and responsibility, only a few elaborated on their understanding of them. As a result, it was not always clear what Ukrainian teacher educators meant by these terms. As mentioned in chapter four, while using the language of interactive teaching, some teacher educators may not necessarily employ teaching methods that others would consider interactive. Furthermore, as the survey data demonstrated, many faculty members claimed to teach critical thinking,

29 For example, in their study of the citizenship identities of Romanian youth, Obenchain and her colleagues apply Westheimer and Kahne’s (2004) typology of personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented citizenship. They conclude: “While participants noted problems in the community and nation that they deeply cared about, none suggested what they could do to organize others or an interest in exploring the systemic or institutional causes of a problem or issue, both of which would have incorporated a different type of civic engagement characterized by more leadership and/ or a disposition of social justice” (p. 40). Such an analysis is quite simplistic, as it does not try to understand why Romanian youth acted in such a way or whether they had any prior experience of taking collective actions and critically analyzing the root causes of societal issues. The authors mechanically apply Western analytical tools without attending to the context of Romania.
communication skills, and active citizenship, yet only a few of them listed teaching approaches congruent with the development of such skills and dispositions. Future research could inquire into how faculty members reconcile the disjunction between institutionally dominant transmissive teaching and their claims to be developing critical thinking and other related skills.

Another limitation of the study pertains to sampling. Across the four universities, I administered the survey only in selected departments, such as Ukrainian language and literature, history, philosophy, sociology, geography, primary education, and pedagogy, which seemed to provide faculty members with the best opportunities to promote democratically oriented knowledge, skills, and values in their work with teacher candidates. As a result, I omitted from my sample departments such as biology, physics and computer science, and thus could not capture a complete institutional picture of teacher education for democracy even within the four universities. Future studies could consider extending their sample to include all departments, especially in pedagogical universities where they are all involved in teacher preparation. Furthermore, I conducted this study only at one classic and three pedagogical universities while there are 26 pedagogical and more than 90 classic universities in Ukraine. It would therefore be inappropriate to use its findings to build a comprehensive national picture of the state of democratic preparation of teacher candidates. Another issue that pertains to sampling is that, while my study did not confirm a western-eastern Ukraine contrast, my ‘eastern Ukraine’ research site was not in the Donbas region.

Had I worked with teacher educators from that region, I might have obtained different results. Furthermore, as mentioned in the previous

---

30 Located in eastern Ukraine, the Donbas region consists of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts. The region is often contrasted with the Galicia region located in western Ukraine, as they are considered to embody distinct aspects of Ukrainian identity and views on Ukraine’s development. Riabchuk (2003, 2015) refers to these two regions as the “two Ukraines” and contrasts them in terms of “the anti-Western and pro-Western; the Sovietophile and anti-Soviet; paternalistic and civic; concerned primarily with survival and concerned with self-realization” (p. 151).
section, although there were no apparent differences between western and eastern Ukraine in the conceptions of democracy and citizenship held by faculty members, there might be differences in their conceptions of Ukrainian identity. Future studies could try to ascertain whether faculty members from western and eastern Ukraine have similar or divergent views on Ukrainian identity, as these views would likely have implications for the socialization of teacher candidates as well as for the future unification or polarization of the society.

This study focused only on aspects of citizenship education enacted through the formal curricula of teacher education courses. Future studies could explore informal and non-formal citizenship education that can be available to teacher candidates through extra-curricular activities in the university, their membership in various organizations, or through the academic and professional programs delivered by non-governmental organizations. For example, one faculty member from a pedagogical university in western Ukraine conducted an extra-curricular activity in which teacher candidates interested in special education could receive practical experience of interacting with disabled children. One purpose of this activity was to reduce the social stigma of disability. Some teacher candidates that I interviewed reported volunteering with local charitable organizations. They spoke of fundraising for various charitable causes, working with children in orphanages, and preparing and delivering presents to those from needy backgrounds during the winter holidays. An investigation of such formal, non-formal and informal opportunities could help to paint a multidimensional picture of the citizenship education of teacher candidates.

In this study, I examined education for democracy only in pre-service teacher education programs. Future research could explore any opportunities for such education provided by in-service teacher education initiatives, in which teachers can participate throughout their
professional career. (The Ministry of Education requires in-service teachers to undergo professional development every five years in state-run teacher training institutes). In the context of Ukraine, such research would be particularly useful, as it could shed light on whether and how in-service programs contribute to the democratic resocialization of in-service teachers who have emerged from traditional schools and teacher preparation courses. Moreover, many in-service teachers have begun to participate in training sessions and programs organized by domestic and international non-governmental organizations. These organizations have become alternative venues of professional development where teachers can receive more innovative training than in state-run in-service training institutions. Some of these organizations provide professional development in inclusive and student-centered education, sustainable development, and history and civic education. They constitute potential spaces for the democratic socialization of in-service teachers.

As shown throughout this study, the Western-based conceptual framework that I initially used to analyze data sometimes fell short of facilitating comprehension of Ukrainian social and political realities. Although scholars warn against viewing education for democratic citizenship in non-Western contexts through Western lenses, many studies continue to use them, often while pointing to their limitations in data interpretation, because of the absence of alternative contextually relevant frameworks (Williams, 2011). Some studies also point to the difficulties of implementing student-centered pedagogy, which underpins democratic citizenship education, in countries where models of teacher-student relationships and the material conditions of teaching differ from those in the West (Schweisfurth, 2012; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2012). In light of this caveat, future research could focus on developing alternative conceptual frameworks based on the findings of studies from transforming non-Western areas. In her multinational study on youth
experiences, Nilan (2011) proposes a revision of existing, Western-based paradigms, noting that “the future of youth sociology must … incorporate conceptual and interpretive frameworks that can cross cultures, rather than be locked into assumptions and logical belonging to just one set of culturally linked nations” (p. 20). Similarly, in the field of democratic citizenship education, new citizenship and pedagogical paradigms need to be developed to account for local and global nuances, as democratic citizenship education is no longer confined to Western societies and its practices vary according to context.

**Study Findings in Light of the Euromaidan Protests**

In early June 2013, I sat in Oleh Petrovych’s classroom and observed a seminar in which teacher candidates debated the contested issue of whether Ukraine should sign a free trade agreement with the European Union or with Russia’s Customs Union. Six months after observing this seminar, I witnessed students taking to the streets to protest the government’s decision not to sign the agreement with the European Union in which the students had invested their hopes for a better future. One month later, as I began to analyze the data of this study, newscasts reported the first deaths of demonstrators on the Maidan in Kyiv. While I was examining my survey and case study data and following the Euromaidan events, I came to realize that many issues raised by the survey respondents in their conceptions of democracy and democratic citizenship, and discussed by the teacher educator cases with teacher candidates in the classroom, had surfaced during the protests.

For example, some survey respondents conceptualized democracy in terms of the state respecting the human dignity of citizens, protecting them socially and economically, considering their needs and interests, and ensuring the accountability of all citizens to the law. These principles appeared to be among the main demands of the protestors. Some commentators
referred to the Euromaidan protests as a revolution of dignity and decency, as protestors demanded elected officials to be accountable, to respect the needs of their electorate, and to work towards the political and economic betterment of the country. Both survey respondents and teacher educator cases also underscored the importance of personal responsibility and personal change. Many Ukrainians began to talk about change of this type during and after the protests. In social media posts, they expressed sentiments such as these: “From now, any type of bribe to a policeman, judge, state official or anyone else will be considered a betrayal of the Maidan and the heroes who lost their lives,” “Where were we when the members of parliament passed unfavourable decrees and laws? … We complain to our friends and colleagues. We do not take initiative into our hands,” or “We do not have the moral right to sit and wait for someone to do something for us. We should join the process of transformation and create a new society together.” These posts could be taken as signifying the transformation of social consciousness that the teacher educator cases, to varying degrees, advocated during the classes I observed.

Issues of national identity and societal division addressed by Anna Dmytrivna and Oleh Petrovykh in their classes also surfaced during the Euromaidan protests. Both Ukrainian and Russian-speaking Ukrainians from the western and eastern regions, along with those of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, took part in the protests, a phenomenon which, some scholars believe, prompted a reassessment of Ukrainian ethnocentric nationalism. For example, in his study of nationalism since the outbreak of the protests, Kulyk (2014) notes that many citizens reconsidered the notion of traditional Ukrainian nationalism as rooted in proficiency in the Ukrainian language; they developed a more tolerant attitude toward Russian-speakers as a way of uniting a linguistically divided country and opposing Russian aggression. As Kulyk argues, “the new post-Maidan Ukrainian nationalism has accepted the more-than-minority presence of the
Russian language in Ukrainian society as unavoidable and legitimate” (p. 116). The connection between the issues that emerged during the Euromaidan protests and the political and cultural aspects of democratic citizenship taught by the four teacher educator cases further confirms that their teaching reflected the most pressing matters of Ukrainian society and politics and that it was transformational in as much as it encouraged social and political change.

Conclusion

This study sheds light on teacher education for democracy along political, cultural, and pedagogical dimensions in contemporary Ukraine, a post-authoritarian society transitioning to democracy. In contexts such as Ukraine, as the four profiled teacher educators demonstrated, this type of education, if practiced systemically, can help to facilitate educational democratization, address the immediate issues of democratic transition, and thereby contribute to societal transformation. It can also contribute to the formation of peaceful and cohesive communities by avoiding or mitigating interregional, intergroup, and other types of conflicts that are common to many post-authoritarian societies. This study also shows that teacher education for democracy in transforming non-Western contexts is a difficult, yet possible undertaking, as it is both impeded and enabled by multiple societal, institutional, and personal factors. The study reveals, finally, that Western typologies of democratic citizenship and of the education that promotes it do not apply fully to rapidly transforming countries such as Ukraine; that political and cultural characteristics are not static but acquire meaning and significance according to context. This study contributes to the limited body of comparative and international research on the democratic socialization of teacher candidates and extends the conversation about democratic citizenship education beyond the Western context.
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Appendix A
Recruitment and Consent Letters for Teacher Educators

(Translated into Ukrainian, printed on OISE letterhead or sent from a utoronto e-mail address)

Recruitment Letter
(Used to recruit teacher educator cases)

Dear (teacher educator’s name),

My name is Serhiy Kovalchuk. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Toronto, Canada. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study, which aims to explore how Ukrainian teacher educators understand democracy and citizenship in relation to education, and how they prepare new generations of teachers in the context of Ukraine’s transition to democracy.

My research project is a qualitative, exploratory study and it will not evaluate you or your practice in any way. Its goal is to learn from you and to apply your expertise to an understanding of how teacher candidates can be prepared to assist with the democratization of the Ukrainian educational system, and by extension that of the wider society. There is currently a lack of empirical research on this topic, you can help to fill this gap by participating in this study.

If you agree to participate in the study, I would like to interview you twice (about 45 minutes each time); to observe you teaching about five times (if possible, each with a five-minute interview about your class plans that day), and to request copies of your course materials. I would also like to interview 2-4 teacher candidates from the course(s) that I observe. Participation in the study is voluntary. You retain the right to choose not to share any of the above information, and I would take measures to protect your confidentiality and anonymity.

If you are interested in taking part in this study, I would be delighted to discuss it with you in detail, to answer any of your questions, and to provide you with an informed consent form. You can contact me via e-mail (serhiy.kovalchuk@utoronto.ca) or phone (096.616.5682). I am attaching a document that will give you more details about how to go about participating in the study.

Sincerely,

Serhiy Kovalchuk, Ph.D. Candidate
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
Appendix A (continued)

Consent Letter
(Translated into Ukrainian, printed on OISE letterhead, double-sided)

Dear Teacher Educator,

My name is Serhiy Kovalchuk. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Toronto, Canada. I am conducting a research study aimed at exploring how Ukrainian teacher educators understand democracy and citizenship in relation to education, and how they prepare new generations of teachers in the context of Ukraine’s transition to democracy. This study will not evaluate you and your practice in any way. Instead, its goal is to learn from you and to apply your expertise to an understanding of how teacher candidates can be prepared to assist with the democratization of the Ukrainian educational system, and by extension that of the wider society. There is currently a lack of empirical research on this topic, and you can help to fill this gap by participating in this study.

This document describes how you might participate in the study and requests your agreement in relation to participation. If you decide to participate in this study:

(1) I would like to interview you twice (about 45 minutes each time). In the first interview, I would like to ask you about the teaching approaches that you use in your courses, the topics that you discuss with your students, as well as the factors that enable and hinder your teaching practice. In the second interview, I would like to ask questions that arise from observing you teaching in a classroom setting. If you consent, both interviews will be audio-recorded.

(2) I would like to observe you teaching in a classroom setting, at least four-five times. Each observation will be followed by a 5-minute interview. The point of the interview will be to ask you questions about the content that you taught and the teaching approaches that you used.

(3) I would like to ask you to share your course materials (e.g., course syllabus or outline, book titles, and any other materials that you use in your course).

Your participation in this study will be voluntary. The only direct cost of participation for you would be the time spent in individual interviews. You would retain the right not to share any of the above information, and to withdraw from the study without any consequences. You can do this by informing me of your decision in oral or written form. Your privacy will be protected in compliance with the requirements of the Ethics Review Board of the University of Toronto. In order to protect the confidentiality of your identity and such information as you provide, I will assign you a pseudonym, make your institution anonymous, and encrypt data collected from you. Nobody, except for me, will have access to information collected from you via interviews or classroom observations. Your name and any other data that might point to you will not appear when the study results are presented or published.

If you agree to participate in this study, please signify your consent to me orally and (if possible) by signing in the space provided on the reverse side of this document. I am providing you with two copies of this document so that you can keep one copy for your own records and return the other to me.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me via e-mail (serhiy.kovalchuk@utoronto.ca) or phone (096.616.5682). You can also contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Kathy Bickmore (k.bickmore@utoronto.ca) and/or the University of Toronto’s Office of Research Ethics (ethics.review@utoronto.ca).

I greatly value and appreciate your participation in this study.

Serhiy Kovalchuk, Ph.D. Candidate
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
Consent Form

I agree to participate in the Teacher Education for Democracy research study, following the expectations outlined above.

___________________________________________________ ______
(Study participant’s signature and date)

Would you like to receive a summary of the study’s results?  _____ Yes  _____ No

If you would like to receive a summary of the study’s results, please provide contact information where it can be sent (e.g., e-mail or mailing address).

___________________________________________________ ______
___________________________________________________ ______
___________________________________________________ ______
___________________________________________________ ______
Appendix B

Information and Consent Letter for University Administrators

(Translated into Ukrainian, printed on OISE letterhead, double-sided, or sent from a utoronto e-mail address)

Dear (university administrator’s name),

My name is Serhiy Kovalchuk. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Toronto, Canada. I am seeking permission to conduct research at your institution [insert a university’s name]. My research project aims to explore how Ukrainian teacher educators understand democracy and citizenship in relation to education, and how they prepare new generations of teachers in the context of Ukraine’s transition to democracy. The study does not involve any evaluation of your faculty members and institution. It aims only to learn from teacher educators of your institution and to apply their expertise to an understanding of how teacher candidates can be prepared to assist with the democratization of the Ukrainian educational system, and by extension that of the wider society. There is currently a lack of empirical research on this topic, and researching the work of teacher educators of your institution can help to fill this gap.

If permission is granted, I would like to interview and observe the practice of two purposively selected teacher educators from your institution, collect their course and program documents, interview 2-4 teacher candidates enrolled in their courses, and administer a survey to teacher educators at such departments as Ukrainian language and literature, history, sociology, philosophy, primary education, and pedagogy. I am interested in studying closely the practice of reform-oriented teacher educators who support educational democratization, use innovative teaching approaches, and infuse elements of democracy into their courses (e.g., multicultural education, human rights, civic education, human rights, and social justice). The participation of teacher educators, teacher candidates and survey respondents in my study will be voluntary. The study would require little time from participants: two 45-minute individual interviews with the selected teacher educators, one 45-minute interview with teacher candidates, and 40-50 minutes for completing a survey. All participants retain the right to refuse to share any information, and to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences. I will take measures to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of all participants, as well as of your institution, following the requirements of the Ethics Review Board of the University of Toronto.

I would also like to conduct a 30-40 minute interview with you at the end of my study at your institution.

If you do not mind me conducting research at your institution and recruiting teacher educators and teacher candidates for participation in the study, please signify your consent to me orally, and (if possible) by signing in the space provided on the reverse side of this document.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me via e-mail (serhiy.kovalchuk@utoronto.ca) or phone (096.616.5682). You can also contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Kathy Bickmore (k.bickmore@utoronto.ca) and/or the University of Toronto’s Office of Research Ethics (ethics.review@utoronto.ca).

Sincerely,

Serhiy Kovalchuk, Ph.D. Candidate
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
**Consent Form**

I grant permission to Serhiy Kovalchuk to conduct his *Teacher Education for Democracy* research study at ______________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(university’s name)

________________________________________________________________________

(university administrator’s signature and date)

Would you like to receive a summary of the study’s results?  ______ Yes  ______ No

If you would like to receive a summary of the study’s results, please provide contact information where it can be sent (e.g., e-mail or mailing address).

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix C
Information and Consent Letter for Teacher Candidates

(Translated into Ukrainian, printed on OISE letterhead, double-sided)

Dear Teacher Candidate,

My name is Serhiy Kovalchuk. I am a student at the University of Toronto, Canada. Currently, I am conducting a study which aims to explore how Ukrainian teacher educators understand democracy and citizenship in relation to education, and how they prepare new generations of teachers in the context of Ukraine’s transition to democracy. As part of this study, I am also interviewing teacher candidates and would like to invite you to participate in a 45-minute interview. In the interview, I will ask you questions, ranging from what you have learned in your teacher education courses and what teaching approaches your instructors use in classes to whether you plan on working as a teacher after graduation and how you understand terms such as democracy and democratic citizenship.

Your participation in this study will be voluntary. The only direct cost of participation for you would be the time spent in one individual interview. You may withdraw from participating in the interview at any time without any negative consequences. You can do this by informing me directly of your decision in oral or written form. You may also stop the interview or refuse to answer the questions posed. If you consent, the interview will be audio-recorded.

In order to protect the confidentiality of your identity and the information that you provide, I will assign you a pseudonym, make your institution anonymous, and encrypt data collected from you. Your name and any other data that might point to you will not appear when study results are presented or published. Your privacy will be protected in compliance with the requirements of the Ethics Review Board of the University of Toronto.

If you agree to participate in this study, please signify your consent to me orally and (if possible) by signing in the space provided on the reverse side of the document. I am providing you with the two copies of this document so that you can keep one copy for your own records and return the other to me.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me via e-mail (serhiy.kovalchuk@utoronto.ca) or phone (096.616.5682). You can also contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Kathy Bickmore (k.bickmore@utoronto.ca) and/or the University of Toronto’s Office of Research Ethics (ethics.review@utoronto.ca).

I greatly value and appreciate your participation in this study.

Serhiy Kovalchuk, Ph.D. Candidate
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
Consent Form

I agree to participate in the Teacher Education for Democracy research study, following the expectations set out above.

_______________________________________________________________________________
(Study participant’s signature and date)

Would you like to receive a summary of the study’s results? _____ Yes _____ No

If you would like to receive a summary of the study’s results, please provide contact information where it can be sent (e.g., e-mail or mailing address).

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D

Semi-structured Interview Protocol: Teacher Educators

(Translated into Ukrainian)

1. How long have you been a teacher educator? What courses do you teach?

2. What teaching approaches do you use in your classes?
   
   **Probe:** Do you involve teacher candidates in discussions, allow them to voice their opinions, and provide them with decision-making opportunities? Do you involve them in any extra-curricular activities?

   **Prompt:** What made you decide to use these teaching approaches in your classes?

3. What topics do you explore in (insert a course’s name)?
   
   **Probe:** Do you relate the content of your courses to the broader political, economic, and social issues of Ukrainian society?

4. What skills and values do you generally promote among teacher candidates in your courses? Are there any particular skills and values that you teach in (insert a course’s name)?

5. Do you talk about democracy in (insert a course’s name)?

6. What does democracy mean to you? What skills and values characterize a democratic citizen, from your perspective?

7. How do you promote democracy among teacher candidates in your courses?

8. How do you think an educational system can contribute to democracy in Ukraine?
   
   **Probe:** What role should teachers play in democratic development?

9. What factors enable and hinder your teaching practice?

   *Questions for a short interview following classroom observations* (used only with the purposively selected teacher educator case studies)

   1. What were your goals for the class that I observed?

   2. What made you decide to use (insert a teaching approach observed) in the class?

   3. What skills and values did you try to teach in the class?
Appendix E
Semi-Structured Interview Protocol: University Administrators and Department Heads

(Transcribed into Ukrainian)

1. Can you please tell me briefly about your institution/department? What is your average enrollment? How many faculty members are employed?

2. What have been the main changes in teacher education programs in recent years? How do teacher educators respond to these changes?

3. How have you been promoting educational democratization in your university/department? What have been the main issues?

   **Prompt:** What teaching approaches are you currently encouraging teacher educators to use during instruction?

   **Prompt:** From your perspective as a university administrator/department head, what are the main impediments to the implementation of student-centered pedagogies in teacher education programs?

4. Do you as an institution/department take any action to promote democratic values and ideals among teacher candidates? What does this look like in practice?

5. What university-wide/department-wide extra-curricular activities do you organize? Do teacher candidates actively participate in these activities? Do they suggest any activities themselves?

6. What main issues do you face as an institution/department?

   **Probe:** What has been the level of academic quality of students entering your university/department in recent years?
Appendix F

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol: Teacher Candidates

(Translated into Ukrainian)

1. In what year of studies are you? What made you decide to enter a pedagogical university? (When interviewing students at a classic university, I asked them whether they knew at the time of their admission that they could potentially become teachers)

2. What topics have you been studying in (insert a course) taught by the purposively selected teacher educator? Do you find these topics interesting?

3. What teaching approaches does (insert an instructor’s name) usually use in the course? What approaches do you like and why? What teaching approaches do instructors usually use in most of your courses?

4. Do you feel that you have learned any skills and values in (insert a course’s name)?

5. Do you talk about democracy in (insert a course’s name)?

   Prompt: Do you feel that the topics that you studied in the course are in any way relevant to democracy?

6. What does democracy mean to you? What skills and values characterize a democratic citizen, from your perspective?

7. How do you think an educational system can contribute to democracy in Ukraine?

8. Do you take part in any extra-curricular activities inside or outside the university?

9. Do you plan on working as a teacher after graduation?

10. What impedes your preparation for classes? What makes other students fail to prepare for classes? (This question was added to the interview protocol on the basis of classroom observations at the first research site.)
Appendix G

Classroom Observation Protocol

Date:
Course name:
TE (teacher educator):
TI (teacher educator’s institution):
Start time:
End time:

Context (number of teacher candidates [TCs], gender distribution, year of study, conditions of classroom’s physical space and its set-up)

Learning resources (describe whether TE uses any resources such as books, articles, presentations, videos, etc. during lectures and seminars)

Observation content:

Content (describe what topic(s) TE introduces to TCs. Does TE connect the topic introduced to ‘practical’ realities and to the broader political and social issues of Ukrainian society? Does the topic involve any elements relevant to democratic citizenship education in terms of knowledge, skills, and values?)

Pedagogy (describe how TE introduces content to TCs and organizes the process of learning, i.e., lecture, group work, whole class discussion. Does TE invite students to raise questions or participate in the discussion of the content introduced? Do the teaching approaches used provide any opportunities to practice democratically relevant skills and values [e.g., practicing agency via expressing one’s own viewpoints and making decisions, respectful listening to diverse viewpoints, critical thinking skills]?)

‘Political’ socialization (describe whether TE encourages TCs to adopt any specific citizenship and professional roles)

TCs’ (dis)engagement (describe how TCs verbally and non-verbally respond to the content presented and the teaching approaches used. How many and which students take part if the TE issues an invitation to participate?)

Observer questions, concerns, or insights for follow-up:
Appendix H

Information Letter and Teacher Educator Survey

(Translated into Ukrainian, printed on OISE letterhead)

Dear respondent,

My name is Serhiy Kovalchuk. I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Toronto, Canada. Currently, I am conducting a research project aimed at exploring how Ukrainian teacher educators understand democracy and citizenship in relation to education, and how they prepare new generations of teachers in the context of Ukraine’s transition to democracy. As a part of this study, I would like to invite you to complete an anonymous survey on a voluntary basis. There is a lack of empirical research on this topic, you can contribute to filling this gap by completing this survey.

My research project is a qualitative, exploratory study and it does not intend to evaluate you and your practice in any way. The information collected through this survey will be used only by me. By making this survey anonymous and by not sharing it with anybody else, I will ensure your confidentiality.

If you agree to complete this survey, please check this box:

☐ Yes, I agree to complete a survey

Upon completion of the survey, please enclose it in the attached envelope and return it to a departmental secretary or to me in person when I am at your department. If you decide not to complete the survey, please enclose it in the envelope and return it to a departmental secretary or me.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me via e-mail (serhiy.kovalchuk@utoronto.ca) or phone (096.616.5682). You can also contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Kathy Bickmore (k.bickmore@utoronto.ca) and/or the University of Toronto’s Office of Research Ethics (ethics.review@utoronto.ca).

I greatly value and appreciate your completion of this survey.

Serhiy Kovalchuk, Ph.D. Candidate
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto
Survey

Please check an appropriate box or insert an answer

1. Age: ☐ up to 29 ☐ 30-39 ☐ 40-49 ☐ 50 and up

2. Gender: ☐ female ☐ male

3. What is your highest degree attained? ☐ bachelor ☐ master’s ☐ kandydat nauk ☐ doctorate

4. What is your specialization? __________________________________________________________

5. How many years have you been teaching at the university?

☐ up to 4 ☐ 5-10 ☐ 11-15 ☐ 16-20 ☐ 21-30 ☐ 31 and up

6. What courses do you teach? __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

While answering questions, please provide as much detail as possible. Feel free to use the reverse side of the page if more space is required for your answers. You are free to refuse to answer any question (explain if possible).

7. What teaching approaches do you use in your courses? (For example, lecture, seminar, group work, discussion, etc.)

8. What skills and values do you promote among teacher candidates in your courses? (For example, developing lesson plans, using different teaching approaches, life-long learning, critical thinking, active citizenship, tolerance, etc.)
9. What academic, social, or other goals do you try to achieve in your courses? (For example, developing content knowledge and its practical application, developing “good person” qualities, developing national and political consciousness, developing professionalism in line with market needs, etc.)

10. Do you touch upon political, economic, and social issues of Ukrainian society in your courses? Choose only one answer

☐ No, never  ☐ Sometimes  ☐ Often  ☐ Very often  ☐ Yes, always

Please explain your choice:

11. In your view, how important is it for teacher educators to promote democratic values and ideas among teacher candidates? Choose only one answer

☐ Not important at all  ☐ Not very important  ☐ Important, but not the first priority  ☐ Important  ☐ Very important

Please explain your choice:
12. In your view, can the current system of teacher education contribute to the development of democracy in Ukraine? Choose only one answer

☐ Not at all able  ☐ Almost unable  ☐ Partially able  ☐ Able  ☐ Completely able

Please explain your choice:

13. List factors that impede and enable your teaching practice (for example, the introduction of the Bologna process, high teaching workloads, etc.)

14. In your view, how democratic is Ukraine? Choose only one answer

☐ Not democratic at all  ☐ Not democratic, but some signs of democracy are present  ☐ Unstable democracy (democracy is in the process of development)  ☐ Democratic  ☐ Very democratic

Please explain your choice:
15. What does democracy mean to you?

16. In your view, what skills and values characterize a democratic citizen?

17. In your view, can an overall system of education contribute to the development of democracy in Ukraine? *Choose only one answer*

☐ Not at all able  ☐ Almost unable  ☐ Partially able  ☐ Able  ☐ Completely able

Please explain your choice:

Please feel free to add any further comments if you wish:

Thank you for completing this survey!