View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by Ulster University's Research Portal

This article was downloaded by: [University of Ulster at Coleraine]
On: 16 April 2012, At: 02:56
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Journal of Peace Education

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cjpe20

Schools together: enhancing the citizenship curriculum through a non-formal education programme

Una O'Connor [a]

[a] UNESCO Centre, School of Education, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland

Available online: 12 Apr 2012

To cite this article: Una O'Connor (2012): Schools together: enhancing the citizenship curriculum through a non-formal education programme, Journal of Peace Education, 9:1, 31-48

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2012.657357

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Journal of Peace Education
Vol. 9, No. 1, April 2012, 31–48

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Schools together: enhancing the citizenship curriculum through a non-formal education programme

Una O'Connor*

UNESCO Centre, School of Education, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland

(*Received 10 July 2011; final version received 14 December 2011*)

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

In divided societies education for diversity, often introduced via the combined approaches of civic education, citizenship education and community-relations activity, is advocated as a core element of the school curriculum. Its delivery, through formal and non-formal educational approaches, has been routinely recognised as an opportunity for interactive learning, offering intellectual, social and emotional advantages to all involved. From its roots in the non-formal youth sector, the work of the Spirit of Enniskillen (SOE) Trust now encompasses formal partnerships with schools through a '*dealing with difference together*' programme involving groups of sixth-form students (17–18 years) in a programme for citizenship education as a complementary and/or supplementary option to the subject area of Local and Global Citizenship.

Based on a developmental evaluation of the *Schools Together* programme, this paper presents a case study of a collaborative schools-based programme for diversity in Northern Ireland. In particular, it outlines the unique characteristics of collaboration between the formal and non-formal education sectors; highlights the intrinsic value of such programmes for capacity-building and sustainability in schools; and identifies the contribution of such initiatives to educational reform and wider social change.

Keywords: Citizenship; formal and informal education; peer mediation; conflict resolution

Introduction

In the cultural and political landscape of Northern Ireland, the language of a *divided* society has, in recent years, been replaced by that of a *shared* society and *social cohesion* (OFMDFM 2005a; 2010). Linguistically, it is a shift that has been enacted through a series of educational and community initiatives (OFMDFM 2005a; CCEA 2007). For some, the lexicon of change is perceived to insufficiently address the legacy of the conflict; for example, where the terminology of 'a 'shared society' is shaded by ambiguity, referring equally to agreement on living apart as well as living together but differently (Graham and Nash 2006). For others, the prevalence of such vocabulary does not presume a ubiquitous commitment to peace, and it is acknowledged that vestiges of the conflict continue to filter through to the day-to-day life of Northern Ireland (NILT 2007, 2008; NIYLT 2007, 2008; PSNI 2007; CRC 2010).

*Email: ub.oconnor@ulster.ac.uk

ISSN 1740-0201 print/ISSN 1740-021X online
© 2012 Taylor & Francis
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2012.657357
http://www.tandfonline.com

Within the educational environment, curricular policy makers have continued to explore and address the causal and repercussive factors of more than 30 years of conflict. Developmentally, this has included strategic changes which build on the legacy of previous (for example, Education for Mutual Understanding and Cultural Heritage) and enduring (for example, the Schools Community Relations Programme) initiatives and that contribute to a wider socially inclusive agenda. Latterly, the most significant of these is the 2007 introduction to the curriculum of a new subject, Local and Global Citizenship (O'Connor et al. 2009), which is intended to reinforce the inherent responsibility of education to *prepare teachers and lecturers to educate children and young people for a shared society* (DE 2010: 26).

Complementary work of this nature in the non-formal sector is largely accessed via core funding, released from the Department of Education (DE) on application. This has been a valuable and necessary support mechanism for NGOs wishing to extend the statutory citizenship remit beyond traditional classroom pedagogy, but has been subject to stringent financial cutbacks of late: in 2010, the Minister for Education announced a 70% reduction in funding for community relations programmes in education, lowering funding from £3.6 to £1.1 million per annum (DE 2010), and a delay in the release of funding criteria impacted on organisational and institutional capacity for forward planning. Collectively, these constraints will have both immediate and long-term implications for education for diversity work within schools, and for the organisations that support such work.

The functional role of NGOs and other voluntary organisations in terms of their potential strategic contribution to school and classroom practice has been noted previously (O'Connor et al. 2009; DE 2010). It is within this educational infrastructure that the Spirit of Enniskillen sought to develop a capacity-building, schools-based initiative that would complement the Local and Global Citizenship curriculum through a programme based on the principles of peer mediation and collaborative learning.

The developing profile of citizenship

The contours of the global landscape, re-drawn in recent years by shifting social, economic, political and cultural demographics, have prompted a corresponding interest in education for democratic citizenship (Lockyer et al. 2003). Undoubtedly, the effects of globalisation have been enduring and far-reaching. The pace of population mobility, changes in familial, societal, ethnic and community infrastructures, and a trend towards individualised consumerism are perceived to routinely undermine core values such as rights, solidarity, active participation and inclusion (Kymlicka and Norman 2000; Modood 2000; Banks 2001; Bottery 2003; Jeffers and O'Connor 2008; Crabtree and Field 2009). The decline of democratically accepted activity such as individual, public and social participation, particularly among young people (Pattie et al. 2004; Andrews and Mycock 2007) has led to a *crisis of legitimacy* (Brodie et al. 2009: 8), to the extent that enhancing active citizenship has become a national priority in many countries (Kerr et al. 2002; Council of Europe 2002).

The challenge of engaging young people in civic or citizenship education has been addressed primarily through the introduction of such education to the school curricula of many democratic societies. It is essentially characterised by a core aim to equip young people with the knowledge, values and skills that will enable them

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

to take their place in, and contribute to, an increasingly diverse society (Patrick 1999; Tourney-Purta et al. 2001; Council of Europe 2002; CCEA 2007; DfES 2002). Notwithstanding these functional and philosophical aspirations, the development of a conceptually acceptable model of citizenship education has proven somewhat problematic, particularly where definitions of 'common citizenship' are juxtaposed with recognition of the different identities and backgrounds that make up many pluralist societies (Schell-Faucon 2000; Smith 2003). Equally, personal and group identities – whether these are religious, cultural or political – can inhibit common citizenship as much as they promote it, since they impact on the way in which people see themselves as individuals and as members of a community (Kymlicka and Norman 2000; Waldron 2000; McAuley 2004; Banks 2008). This suggests, then, the need for a model of citizenship education (Smith 2003) that has sufficient relevance and meaning, and that does not engender in young people what Crabtree and Field (2009: 34) describe as 'a thin conception of citizenship, sceptical about whether there is such a thing as society and, even if there is, what it's got to do with them'. It also highlights the particular challenge of creating a curricular model of citizenship that transcends utilitarian functionality to represent something altogether more dynamic, 'moving from a passive and minimal citizenry to a proactive, ethical, responsible citizenship with actual involvement and commitment in society' (Salema 2006: 9, citing Council of Europe 2005).

Citizenship in the curriculum

On the historical continuum of educational change in Northern Ireland, successive educational initiatives have sought to promote the contributory role of community relations, integrated education and citizenship education towards social capital and societal cohesion (DE 1998, 1999, 2004, 2006a; OFMDFM 2005a; ETI, 2006). It is a commitment that extends beyond traditional utilitarian interpretations of education so that community relations and citizenship education are presented as tools for change that give 'due emphasis to whole school relationships … relationships beyond the school … promoting an ethos in the school which contributes to understanding and mutual respect for diversity in all its forms' (DE 1999: x) and promote a philosophy and practice of collaboration, co-operation and shared expertise within and between schools (DE 2006a).

In September 2007, Local and Global Citizenship was introduced as a core statutory element of the revised Northern Ireland curriculum. In the post-primary sector, Local and Global Citizenship is addressed through four key concepts: Diversity and Inclusion, Equality and Social Justice, Democracy and Active Participation, and Human Rights and Social Responsibility. In the light of disputed cultural and political allegiances, the premise of a conceptual framework for citizenship education defined in terms of rights and responsibilities has emerged as a non-partisan alternative (Arlow 2001). Notwithstanding the intended participatory and inclusive status of citizenship education in Northern Ireland, it has remained a problematic concept for some (Smith 2003; McEvoy 2007), particularly given its potential to engage equitably with the historical legacy of a divided community while also addressing the social and cultural issues of an increasingly diverse society (Arlow 2001).

From this, it is possible to surmise that within the educational infrastructure, schools perform a singular function in the delivery of citizenship – both directly, in terms of what is taught, how it is taught and when it is taught, and indirectly,

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

through the permeable effect of the hidden curriculum, including institutional culture, teacher values and pupil voice. It is a potentially contradictory relationship that alternately acknowledges the responsibility of schools to acquire and use *intellectual capital* for civic and political purposes (Patrick 1999: 45) and propounds the relative merits of teaching citizenship as a historically informed factual subject or as a more issues-led, inquiry-based approach (Vontz and Nixon 1999, citing Shaver 1995).

The connection, then, between social cohesion and the overall aim of the curriculum lies in the extent to which young people are empowered with the knowledge, skills and aptitudes to navigate their future educational, employment, social and political prospects, and take their place as informed and participatory citizens (CCEA, 2007). Undoubtedly, the introduction to the curriculum of Local and Global Citizenship has underlined the importance of developing young people's understanding of how their lives are governed and how they can improve the quality of their own and others' lives through democratic processes (CCEA 2007). Equally, there is a concurrent responsibility to recognise the functional role of education in preparing young people to manage their own lives, relationships and lifestyles through offering pupils sustained opportunities for personal development, including autonomy, independence, decision-making, participation and self-efficacy.

The philosophy of togetherness

The combined forces of formal and non-formal education work are described in many international declarations as a key element in the promotion of peace (UNESCO 1998; COE 2002; Mualem 2010). Within the realm of education for diversity, the added contribution of inter-group contact – not least its nature and impact – has assumed a particular position. Based on the contact hypothesis (Allport 1954), it purports that engagement between opposing groups can endorse positive inter-group attitudes, generate more favourable relationships and promote increased tolerance and social cohesion (Paollini et al. 2004). Contact itself cannot be presumed to promote improved relationships; the pre-requisites for effective contact emphasise the importance of co-operation, institutional support and equal status (Allport 1954). However, it is acknowledged that these conditions are not always achieved in educational settings, the most recurrent obstacles being an institutional hierarchy that constrains communication between pupils and teachers, teacher attitudes that undermine the remit of programmes, teachers who perceive such approaches as an opportunity to offload their educational responsibilities, and insufficient support from senior management (Orfield 2001; Schell Faucon 2000; DfES 2007).

As an alternative, the practice of peer mediation to facilitate inter-group contact is viewed as a cornerstone in the philosophy of conflict resolution education programmes (Cohen 2003). It is commonly applied in post-primary and, increasingly, primary schools, as well as in community and youth work settings. Typically, peer mediation conforms to the reciprocal acts of creating a safe learning environment, creating a constructive learning environment, enhancing students' social and emotional development and creating a constructive conflict community (Jones 2004). Its fundamental purpose is 'to enhance young people's sense of responsibility and empower them to resolve both their problems among themselves as well as with teachers and adults' (Schell Faucon 2000: 13). The defining feature of peer group education is that the 'educators' are similar to the students in age and background.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

The demographic compatibility is significant, not least for promoting positive values and challenging prejudices without losing credibility or status (Schell Faucon 2000). The benefits of peer mediation have been well documented: in particular, peer mediation can increase pupils' conflict knowledge and skills, negotiation, social and emotional competencies, and cognitive and affective perspective-taking (Jones 2004). It is within the parameters of mediation, through peer-led dialogue, that the SOE *Schools Together* programme evolved.

The Schools Together programme

The Spirit of Enniskillen Trust was established following the 'Poppy Day' bombing in the town in 1989, in which 11 people died and many more were injured. Within the divided society of Northern Ireland, the premise of SOE is that 'while we are not responsible for Northern Ireland, we are responsible for our own contribution' (www.soetrust.org). Its philosophy is founded on the transformative potential of 'dealing with difference together', through pupil-centred programmes that encourage a process of 'dialogue, learning and good relations' in participative learning environments that 'enable young people from all backgrounds to reach across barriers, build relationships and make their own contribution towards a peaceful and shared future' (ibid). This is a position that has evolved from consensus that mutual awareness and understanding of the self and others can be most successfully achieved in a mutual learning environment that promotes a 'win-win' scenario (www.soetrust.org).

Historically, SOE's work has been undertaken in the non-formal education sector. As the constitution, profile and purpose of education continues to evolve and change, SOE has redefined its remit to reflect two core characteristics: the establishment of partnerships between formal and non-formal education and a commitment to creating capacity-building programmes within schools. The former underlines the mutual reciprocity of shared knowledge and expertise, while the latter reinforces the fundamental objectives of institutional ownership and teacher autonomy. The *Schools Together* programme (hereafter referred to as *Together*) was officially launched in 2004. It is a strategic partnership between SOE and schools from across Northern Ireland that is defined by a philosophy of working together through a developmental process of non-formal learning and active citizenship. The aim of the programme is to offer young people, on an inter-school basis, an opportunity to engage in dialogue that 'explores the commonalities and differences of life in Northern Ireland … working together for a shared future in a fair and pluralist society' (www.soetrust.org). This is facilitated through 'discussions exploring commonalities and differences … to develop the blend of skills, understanding and attitudes needed to lead others through a similar process of learning' (SOE, 2006). The rationale for the programme is based around two key principles: that the positive legacy of work undertaken within non-formal education can be usefully applied within the formal education sector, and that peer-led dialogue can make a significant contribution to the learning process. The programme is characterised by a sequence of participative and transferable learning situations that engender ownership within and across the school environment. The number of schools involved has grown exponentially, from an initial cohort of 12 schools (comprising controlled, maintained and integrated schools) to 21 in 2007/08 (the time of the evaluation), involving approximately 700 students from across Northern Ireland.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

The delivery of the *Together* programme comprises four phases, from a skills and dialogue preparation day for individual schools to a joint residential and schools review day involving young people drawn from the clusters of participating schools and a joint day for teachers. The key objectives of the programme are identified in terms of building personal leadership capacity, developing dialogue and negotiation skills to deal with difference and celebrate diversity, developing personal understanding, and supporting schools' capacity to engage in the dynamics of non-formal approaches to education.

The evaluation context

The independent developmental evaluation of the *Together* programme was conducted in fulfilment of funding criteria set down by the International Fund for Ireland. The researcher had no previous involvement with the programme and completed the evaluation in response to three key events. Firstly, the programme's preparatory phase had concluded, so it was timely to reflect on its implementation and impact and to consider its future direction. Secondly, the joint implications of educational rationalisation and the introduction of a new curriculum would have implications for how, where and with whom the programme continued to operate (at the time of the evaluation, the impending implications of financial cutbacks had yet to be fully realised). Thirdly, the transitory status of Northern Ireland from a divided to a shared society has led to some revision in the language of community relations and a growth in the lexicon of rights, democracy and citizenship.

The small-scale evaluation was undertaken in six schools, comprising three controlled (nominally Protestant) and three maintained (nominally Catholic) institutions. Data was collected via a series of semi-structured interviews with principals (n=6), teachers (n=6) and focus groups with students (n=19 female and 16 male) from Year 13 (all 17 years old). While the sample limits the extent to which the findings can be applied to other participative education initiatives, the data can certainly be used to inform the development of the *Together* programme. The collated findings of particular relevance to the focus of this paper are: the remit of the programme; the delivery of the programme; and the position of the programme within formal education.

The remit of the programme

The evaluation concluded that the *Together* programme has been unique and innovative in both design and intention. While its experimental nature is representative of a strategically different approach to diversity and good relations and compatible with the key objectives of the new curriculum, its alignment with wider educational (DE 2010) and social policy (OFMDFM 2005) was considered particularly relevant for pupils, as one teacher noted:

> I think, as schools, we tended to approach it from [an] educational point of view, but SoE tapped the issues that were really important to young people. So we quickly realised that two different types of induction were needed – a house-keeping induction and a more personal/emotional one that addressed the issues that mattered to the pupils. (Teacher 4)

The structure of the programme was generally devised in advance by SOE staff, although initial information sessions with teaching staff also ensured the contextual relevance of the content. This approach did not preclude flexibility; the partnership

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

sought to remain collaborative throughout so that the individual needs of pupils and schools were identified and addressed.

> I would say that a big strength of the programme was its function to deliver an inter-school programme as well as being school-specific. In other words, it was able to generalise and then widen the focus. SOE really helped us to see that. There were discussions between SOE and senior staff so it was a collaborative experience but they did gently nudge us in the direction ... so that we could see it from a wider community point of view rather than pupils just doing something else while studying for 'A' Levels, and we needed that nudge. (Principal 2)

Senior management and teaching staff strongly endorsed the principles of the *Together* programme, framing it within wider education policy as well as recognising its prospective sustainability. However, there was some concern that their limited engagement in the initial developmental process might reinforce the external character of the programme and minimise any sense of institutional ownership or capacity building. As noted by one teacher:

> There's been no resistance but at same time there's been no desire to get on board either. What you are faced with is the risk that teacher enthusiasm will wane if teacher involvement is minimal, peripheral and bound by administration; there is no sense of ownership if information is limited. (Teacher 6)

Schools reported enduring links with an assortment of community relations initiatives and, while acknowledging the value of these, considered that the curricular and participative structure of *Together* facilitated the exploration of concepts of diversity in greater depth. Some teaching staff acknowledged that while initial engagement had been 'a shot in the dark', the direct and indirect benefits were evident: the former enabled exploratory approaches to diversity within a safe environment while the latter encouraged contact among schools and communities in both local and geographically remote areas.

The delivery of the programme

The delivery of *Together* has thus far been largely undertaken by peer facilitators from SOE, although responsibility for the co-ordination of activities within schools has tended to be assigned to one or two members of staff. While there is a genuine commitment that the programme should continue to operate, the need for more robust teacher engagement was stressed to reinforce its position within schools and to facilitate strategic planning for capacity-building. As noted by one principal:

> Of course it is important to have a team rather than individuals, not least because this area will grow and citizenship is statutory obligation, so school must meet this demand and one teacher cannot deliver this alone. So we have built in some succession planning – two key teachers are due to retire soon so we need to nurture others. We're already thinking that replacement of staff will be shaped by the stipulation that they will be expected to be involved in things like this and that will be reiterated at interview. (Principal 5)

Interestingly, teachers of citizenship have thus far had limited involvement with the programme; while time constraints were acknowledged as a routine deterrent, there was general agreement that a dedicated staff team would play an integral role, particularly if the work of the programme was to extend beyond the existing pupil

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

cohort to include those pupils who may not progress to sixth form. One teacher commented:

> It's very important that it is taken beyond 6th year; everyone should have that experience and should be made to think of what the real issues are – but in a secure environment. In this school, getting pupils younger could add a different dimension to their personal development, particularly their early teenage years where there are quite a few die-hard individuals. Citizenship has a role here for the development of strong personal skills. (Teacher 1)

Participating pupils were universally commended by senior management, teachers and SOE facilitators. It was generally agreed that their willingness to engage in open, honest dialogue – often around sensitive or controversial issues – promoted personal development that would endure after they had left school.

> It's something that can't be easily quantified; the intangible effects on pupils are so evident and there are consistent benefits as well ... I see pupils with more self-confidence, more at ease with themselves, better able to cope with diversity and difference, more sure of their own identity and that's been a great outcome. (Principal 1)

However, one pupil stressed that, to be effective, the location and timing of this work should not be overlooked.

> We get the chance to do bits of work like this ... but it's in form class and a lot of [pupils] are too tired or not motivated enough to get into a discussion so they go for a free class instead ... take the discussion out of the classroom – even to the assembly hall – you would get more energy, enthusiasm and motivation. (Pupil 12)

It was acknowledged that the peer educators occupied a pivotal role in the delivery of the programme that could not, in the first instance, be assumed by teachers. The reasons given for this were two-fold. Firstly, pupil engagement with these peers offered a learning opportunity that was validated by the facilitators' own background as past participants and by their familiarity with contemporary issues affecting young people today:

> Yeah, it was good to have a facilitator close to our own age. We knew that they had started out just like us and so they have been through the same process. They know what it's like to be in our position. (Pupil 7)

Secondly, it was perceived that the nature and level of discussion was conducted with greater honesty than would be possible with teachers.

> We get the chance to talk about things that wouldn't normally come up in ordinary conversations and it's good that the facilitators ask questions you want to ask or were not confident enough to ask. It allowed you to figure out who you are as a person and ... made me realise I held opinions on things I previously hadn't really spoken about. So, yeah, it's good to have the freedom to talk about things directly. (Pupil 3)

The position of the programme within formal education

Senior management and participating teachers' commitment to and encouragement of the *Together* programme was repeatedly highlighted, notably by the pupils themselves.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

> They really encouraged us to take part, not in a pushy way, but the way they talked about it made me want to find out more. You knew just by talking to them and listening to them that they were up for it and they really wanted it to work and they were with us all the way. (Pupil 5)

Undoubtedly, the endurance of the programme in individual schools is dependent on staff's willingness to embrace an alternative critical educational approach. However, the subject matter requires teachers with particular aptitudes and skills that may not always be readily available.

> Citizenship is a whole-school initiative but there is not necessarily the staff to deliver it properly. It needs a different type of teacher and there aren't that many teachers yet who come out with training in this area. (Principal 4)

The centrality of teachers' learning emerged as a key issue and, encouragingly, this group strongly endorsed the implicit professional development opportunities that involvement in the programme offered:

> We're still teachers of subjects rather than teachers of children but this is a skills element that is not about teaching subject matter but about enabling young people to talk and discuss in various situations. It's also about teachers getting the chance to discuss these issues so that they know where they stand on them; traditional teaching doesn't operate like that. (Teacher 3)

Although limited staff capacity within SOE has delayed the implementation of dedicated training for teachers, this is recognised as a strategic developmental priority, not least because of the contribution it will make to the programme's sustainability.

At present, *Together* is offered to Year 13 (otherwise known as sixth-form) pupils (aged 17–18 years). Undoubtedly, the involvement of these students has offered a degree of longevity, as participants are in school for another two years and are potential representative ambassadors for the programme both inside and outside the school. For some, this profile requires greater visibility, particularly at community level, not least due to the message on shared education that it conveys.

> Our biggest gap is that there is little recognition at community level. The council, the mayor or the press should be contacted whenever there are school events. The visibility of different uniforms mixed together and the message that this sends to the community is so powerful. So, yes, we need to develop better publicity. (Principal 6)

The characteristics of non-formal education were perceived to be a particular strength, and teachers recognised the value of the flexibility and creativity that was sometimes absent from their own practice.

> The strength of a voluntary organisation is that they are more willing to take risks than statutory bodies. SoE always looked at what was happening in the widest community and were prepared to take risks. Their stance is that there aren't any boundaries; it's not formulaic, so flexibility is the norm and schools need to take on board some of that. Formal educators in schools have gone through a strict regime of what, when and how to teach with little opportunity to think on your feet or be creative. It's been trained out of them so there is a need to re-educate teachers to develop their natural ability to communicate. (Teacher 2)

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

The argument for sustainable links between the formal curriculum and non-formal education was shaped by three inter-related factors: firstly, the core position of Local and Global Citizenship within the curriculum; secondly, the suggestion that dissemination of an age-appropriate programme to younger pupils could address potentially prejudiced behaviours at an earlier age; and thirdly, raised awareness of the impact of peer mediation among the whole-school population.

Discussion

The nature of this developmental evaluation, although small-scale, should not detract from some core findings that may usefully inform the future prospects not just of the *Together* programme, but of other voluntary agencies wishing to initiate or maintain partnerships within the formal education sector. The shifting demography of the social, political, economic and cultural landscape of Northern Ireland cannot be viewed complacently. As the review of community relations has demonstrated, the significant reduction in funding has done little to assuage concerns that this work is no longer considered a priority area.

The *Together* programme has offered schools a unique opportunity to engage in innovative approaches to diversity that may not otherwise have been possible. The evaluation highlights two over-arching findings: firstly, the complementary combination of informal approaches to learning in a formal setting has been a relatively unexplored area of school culture and practice; secondly, peer-led learning can be a valid and necessary component of dialogue on diversity.

Undoubtedly, changes in the education system (and in associated approaches to teaching and learning) have presented teachers and school leaders with rationalised and revised institutional infrastructures that can be viewed as either challenges or opportunities. The potential for organisations such as SOE to assume a strategic role in, and contribution to, the process of change reflects the evolving nature of formal education. It is clear that the *Together* programme has a number of informative strengths that could usefully establish the value of education for diversity work in schools. However, the findings also merit some consideration in relation to the direction of such programmes. These can be addressed in relation to the strategic development of the programme, the sustainability of the programme within schools and the contribution of the programme to educational reform and social change.

The strategic development of school-based programmes

Many NGOs in Northern Ireland have a legacy of working predominantly within either the formal or the non-formal education sector. Sustained interaction between these two paradigms has been variable, with a tendency to remain in sectoral silos and some reservation about what the other could offer in terms of a community relations experience. The *Together* programme offers tangible evidence that approaches to diversity in the nominal youth sector have the potential to be effectively merged within the structured environment and curriculum of a school. Crucially, the statutory introduction of Local and Global Citizenship to post-primary schools has provided a solid foundation for enhanced collaboration via the curriculum (DE 2011: 1). This evaluation reinforces the precept of shared, participative education. Such partnership between the formal and non-formal sectors is not an incidental by-product; rather, the collective commitment of staff, students and peer

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

facilitators to forge a reciprocal learning experience is an ongoing and progressive interaction. Those factors that have undermined similar initiatives, namely poor senior management support, lack of teacher engagement and the constraints of structured timetables, still have the potential to militate against productive partnerships (Hughes et al. 2003; Donnelly 2004; Elwood et al. 2004). Critical awareness of such developmental factors is imperative, therefore, if meaningful engagement is to flourish.

It is difficult to address the strategic development of collaborative programmes such as *Together* without factoring in current community relations policy and the impact that a review of the system may have on partnerships with schools. The review of community relations is notable in its proposed re-definition of practice and its position within schools and the wider equality and good relations agendas (DE 2010). It is an exercise that could undermine the status of voluntary organisations, weakening their position within the educational infrastructure, particularly in light of suggestions that schools become less reliant on external organisations in helping to deliver community relations (DE, 2011). This sits somewhat at odds with the recommendation that greater cohesion between the formal and non-formal sectors engenders a joined-up approach, with agreed outcomes and targets usefully demonstrating the impact of such work (Haydon and McAlister 2011; YCNI 2011).

Although there are policy claims to increase the skills of teachers in this area, it is not clear how this will be undertaken, nor do we know the time and resources that may be allocated. This is clearly uncertain ground and is a position that those involved in daily exposure to the repercussions of social and political unrest are keen to keep on educational, social, political and community agendas.

It is also apparent that teachers' professional development is a key factor in the strategic alignment of similar programmes. The current consultation on the review of teacher education in Northern Ireland acknowledges the need for change within a new educational landscape (DE 2010). Of particular consideration is the nature of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for teachers, which has been beset by suggestions that its reactive and sporadic composition has had an adverse effect on the credibility of professional learning (DE 2010). While certain core subjects may have priority over other curricular areas, including citizenship education, the imperative remains to support teachers to confidently deal with issues of diversity through joined-up and complementary approaches (DE 2011; ETI 2009).

Partnerships between the formal and non-formal sectors have sound educational credentials in two key areas. Firstly, the pilot phase of the introduction of Local and Global Citizenship represented a strategic commitment by the DE, not least given the priority status conferred by substantial financial support for a phased training programme for all post-primary schools and corresponding teaching resources. Such investment carried an implicit expectation that similar work would be sustained in ongoing, meaningful curriculum programmes reflective of the society in which young people lived. Given the variable delivery of citizenship in Northern Irish schools and a reported lack of confidence on the part of teachers to address controversial issues (O'Connor et al. 2009), there is a strong case for organisations whose particular skills and expertise can scaffold schools in developing their citizenship curriculum.

Secondly, the economic reality of reduced core funding for formal and non-formal community relations programmes, and the extent to which voluntary agencies rely on individual or combined sources of financial leverage, may dictate

organisational capacity to maintain or re-direct programmes of work. For some NGOs it will be an opportunity to re-evaluate their remit and identify a prescribed focus within the wider educational domain, which, in some cases, includes a natural affiliation with the formal education sector. The *Together* programme demonstrates a strategic shift within one NGO, where the constituent credentials of the organisation have been successfully adapted and applied to a statutory curriculum area. In this case, the combined variables of youth work, peer mediation and education for diversity have been re-formulated to accommodate the curricular content of Local and Global Citizenship within a structured, progressive programme. It is an option that other NGOs may pursue, particularly if official funding criteria demands greater transparency and accountability from applicants. This scenario does not overlook the robust work currently provided by many voluntary groups; rather, it represents an opportunity to re-assess organisational charters, agree areas of expertise and identify a developmental framework from which to evolve over the next few years.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

The sustainability of non-formal programmes within schools

The process of reform is as much an infrastructural responsibility as it is an institutional and individual commitment. Education is a key ingredient in the democratisation process and the protected setting of the school often provides a mutually safe and supportive space for pupils to begin to explore and articulate opinions through innovative teaching and learning approaches that extend beyond the parameters of a traditionally prescriptive classroom environment (Schell Faucon 2000). Equally significant, as evidenced in the aspirations of the Northern Ireland curriculum, is education's contribution to social capital through the pupil demographic, particularly the age at which young people engage in what Rogers (2005) describes as either more flexible schooling or the participatory education of non-formal learning. Young people can be naturally resistant to adult-designed, led and run provision, so the opportunity that SOE provides young people, as leaders and peer educators involved in the designing, planning and running of a programme, is crucial (Haydon and McAlister (2011). It is a dual reminder of the early adolescent years' position as a formatively critical time for the development of civic roles and responsibilities and the construction of identities, and of the associated potential for education to encourage social, cultural and political socialisation (Vontz and Nixon 1999; Davies 2005; Rogers 2005; Parekh 2006).

The provision of alternative education opportunities can undoubtedly help to foster democratic attitudes, and the relationship between programmes such as *Together* and the content of the Local and Global Citizenship curriculum provides natural access to, and a justifiable extension of, pupil participation in the subject matter. Although compatible with the remit of the citizenship curriculum, the content of the *Together* programme also offers a qualitatively different, socially oriented educational perspective that could be perceived as contrasting with the conventional, utilitarian profile of education. For some schools, the introduction of an experimental pedagogy can be a difficult cultural, institutional and pedagogical shift, particularly where non-formal teaching approaches are perceived to challenge prevailing definitions of what constitutes a genuine learning experience (ETI 2005). Additional challenges, notably the necessity for whole-school commitment and teacher capacity to engage with controversial issues, are already well documented both locally and nationally (Harwood 2000; Hughes et al. 2003; Donnelly 2004; Elwood

et al. 2004; Gallagher 2004; Ofsted 2005; CRC 2010), and continue to represent a significant training need (DE 2011).

Undoubtedly the substantial funding and dedicated training directed toward citizenship education has had some impact in redressing institutional and individual ambivalence, but it is acknowledged that recurrent gaps in school policy and practice continue to impact on sustainability (DfES 2007; Kerr et al. 2007; O'Connor et al. 2009). For example, proposed community relations objectives indicate the expectation that teachers should be able to assume greater responsibility for work of this nature with little recourse to NGOs and other agencies (DE 2010). However, this is a measure that requires forward thinking to ensure a balance is preserved: while the Department of Education views the shift as an opportunity to encourage schools to move away from a dependency culture through increased training, it cannot do so at the expense of concurrent policy that advocates 'strategic planning and connections across formal and non-formal education settings, including funding schemes that are focused on supporting formal and non-formal education settings to address the needs of the young people within communities' (DE 2011: 21). There are several integral considerations here. Firstly, it should be recognised that not all teachers are pre-disposed to undertake work of this kind, and evidence from previous research (O'Connor et al. 2009) has highlighted the importance of identifying the 'right' teachers to form a cohesive team. Secondly, an effective training programme by necessity requires an element of personal as well as professional development. Again, not all teachers may feel ready or willing to engage in training of this nature. Thirdly, there is some evidence that the degree to which young people engage with sensitive issues can be enhanced when conversations are facilitated by someone their own age (or someone who is not a teacher) (O'Connor 2009). If the policy environment is committed to developing a coherent and meaningful agenda around citizenship education, these variables should be absorbed within any developmental framework. This in itself may also be problematic. Collectively, they provide an argument for the strategic engagement of voluntary agencies to underpin certain aspects of the training process and school-based work. This is not to dismiss the need for schools to assume ownership of such work; rather it recognises the particular expertise of the non-formal sector to provide a template for capacity building that may not be present in other pre- or post-qualification training. In addition, if one factors in alternative approaches to teaching and learning, the non-formal option can readily become a valuable process that has perceived 'implications for teachers in terms of the values they hold, the freedom and autonomy they give their pupils and the choices they make within the curriculum' (Holden and Clough 2007: 17).

Institutional sustainability also implies recognition of the importance of partnership with other schools and a willingness to maintain such an arrangement. Initially, the *Together* programme sought to develop and strengthen existing school links. If such programmes are to have longevity, the strategic potential to forge further partnerships requires close consideration. Such an approach is highly compatible with current departmental policy agendas for capacity-building institutionally, with other schools and with relevant statutory and voluntary agencies (DE 2006a, 2008, 2009). The added value of these co-operative endeavours could be sufficiently flexible to accommodate collaboration on a number of levels: for example, a partnership between a new school and an existing one, the establishment of geographic clusters, shared teacher experience, cascaded training and greater institutional commitment.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

The contribution to educational reform and social change

The contribution of the voluntary and community sector in building community cohesion is integral to wider government policy (OFMDFM 2005b). The alignment of the *Together* programme and the over-arching political agenda demonstrates the programme's relevance within the social infrastructure of Northern Ireland in terms of equality, integration and participation (OFMDFM 2011).

The inherent potential within the remit of voluntary and community organisations to nurture 'connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them' (Putnam 2000: 19) underlines their contribution to improved social capital. How it manifests in active participation can be developed through the organic processes that often have their foundations in schools.

In the process of educational reform, the complementary relationship between the formal and non-formal sectors 'to educate and socially develop children and young people as active contributors to an improved society' (DE 2011: 10) reflects the continuing pivotal role of education in its various forms in promoting positive community relations in a society emerging from conflict. While the value of meaningful contact between young people from the two traditions is recognised, limited developmental coherence has tended to undermine the overall status of such programmes and the contribution they can make to the wider policy agenda (ETI 2009; DE 2010). Clearly, changes in the curriculum have created greater opportunities for schools to help young people explore and develop the skills they will need to live in a diverse society. Crucially, this includes 'age-specific support to help them recognise prejudice, to overcome it and to respond in a positive way to negative influences' (DE 2010: 14). It could be argued that the nature of support could easily include the singular contribution of peer-led learning, which binds participants as much by their personal and social experiences as by their age.

The connection between social cohesion and education is an underpinning feature of the children and young people's strategy in Northern Ireland (OFMDFM 2006), with an emphasis on empowering young people to navigate their future educational, employment, social and political prospects and take their place as informed and participatory citizens. In doing so, the strategy has reinforced the universal principles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) regarding giving young people a say in how their lives are governed and how they can participate to improve the quality of their own lives and that of others through democratic processes (CCEA 2007). It can be argued, therefore, that the complementary nature of programmes such as *Together* demonstrates the importance of relationships – between individual life experiences, between people, between people and the state – and the participatory potential for each to express active citizenship, thereby redressing the perceived democratic deficit within society (Brodie et al. 2009). Collectively, they generate opportunities for shared dialogue to facilitate what Rogers (2005: 27) calls a 'difference approach', which embraces the 'multiple nature of society'. It can be argued, then, that non-formal engagement 'emphasises the capacity of organizations within civil society to encompass networks and norms that can generate trust and underpin social cohesion' (Acheson and Williamson 2006: 18).

Undoubtedly, the continued relevance and contribution of this work has been susceptible to the manifest ambivalence of a post-conflict society. In the history of Northern Ireland, while the young people who currently experience some provision

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

of citizenship education are, arguably, the first generation not to experience the worst excesses of the conflict, there is recurrent evidence to suggest that vestiges of the 'Troubles' still linger. Many young people continue to live in a largely divided and segregated environment. Although described as a society in transition towards more peaceful, inclusive and democratic structures, the pace of progress is still fundamentally dictated by atavistic social, cultural and political allegiances amongst young people and adults (NILT 2005, 2006; NIYLT 2006). Additionally, the end of the Troubles has not led to a complete end of violence in Northern Ireland; rather, what has emerged is a violence that is enacted not just in paramilitary and low-level sectarian attacks, but also in racist and homophobic incidents (Connolly and Keenan 2000; Connolly 2002; Jarman and Monaghan 2003; Jarman and Tennant 2003; PSNI 2007). It could be argued that the ongoing and less overt nature of such violence has imbued a degree of ambivalence and a loss of urgency in addressing the issues they represent.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

Conclusion

It is clear from this case study that there is great potential for interaction between the formal and non-formal education sectors, and the curriculum platform of citizenship education has provided a core foundation from which the *Schools Together* programme can naturally evolve. While an explicit connection has been shown between formal and non-formal education, these have tended to remain distinct concepts and for the most part are viewed as such in the policy and practice arena in Northern Ireland. The work of the *Together* programme has actively illustrated the link between these two concepts among principals, teachers, pupils and parents. Such practical initiatives require similar policy support to enable organizations to respond to social, cultural and educational change in both the short and the long term. It is unfortunate that current fiscal frugality would seem to dictate the future of this and similar programmes, with little cognisance that impact is not a time-bound exercise. There is genuine scope for the *Together* programme to grow. The commitment from schools is clear; whether the policy environment can provide similar reassurances remains to be seen.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges permission from the Spirit of Enniskillen Trust to publish evaluation findings from the Schools Together Programme.

Bibliography

Acheson, N., and A. Williamson. 2006. *Voluntary action and community relations in Northern Ireland*. http://www.community-relations.org.uk/fs/doc/paper-2.pdf.

Allport, G.W. 1954. *The nature of prejudice*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Andrews, R., and A. Mycock. 2007. Citizenship education in the UK: divergence within a multi-national state. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning* 3, no. 1: 73–88.

ARK. *Life and Times Survey*. www.ark.ac.uk/nilt.

ARK. *Young Life and Times Survey*. www.ark.ac.uk/ylt.

Arlow, M. 2001. The challenges of social inclusion in Northern Ireland: Citizenship and life skills. Paper presented at the Conference for Curriculum Development for Social Inclusion, Lithuania. http://www.ibe.unesco.org/Regional/baltic_sea/Balticpdf/northern_ireland.pdf.

Banks, J.A. 2001. Citizenship education and diversity: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education.* 52: 5–16.

Banks, J.A. 2008. Diversity, transformative citizenship education and school reform. In *Just schools: Pursuing equality in societies of difference*, ed. M. Minow, R.A. Shweder, and H. Markus, 227–53. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bottery, M. 2003. The end of citizenship? The nation state, threats to its legitimacy and citizenship education in the twenty first century *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33, no. 1: 101–22.

Brodie, E., E. Cowling, N. Nissen, A. Ellis Paine, V. Jochum, and D. Warburton. 2009. *Understanding participation: A literature review.* London: National Council for Voluntary Organisations.

Cohen, R. 2003. Students helping students: Peer mediation. In *Kids working it out: Stories, strategies for making peace in our schools*, ed. T. Jones and R. Compton. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Community Relations Council. 2010. Good Relations Forum. Ensuring the good relations work in our schools counts. A strategy to meet our needs for the twenty first century. Belfast: CRC.

Connolly, P. 2002. *Race and racism in Northern Ireland: A review of the research evidence*. Belfast: OFMDFM.

Connolly, P., and M. Keenan. 2000. *Racial attitudes and prejudice in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: NISRA.

Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment. 2003. *Proposals for the curriculum and assessment at key stage 3, part 1: Background rationale and detail*. Belfast: CCEA.

Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment. 2007. *The statutory curriculum at key stage 3. Rationale and detail*. Belfast: CCEA.

Council of Europe. 2002. *Draft recommendations of the committee of ministers to member states on education for democratic citizenship*. Strasbourg, 16 October, 2002.

Crabtree, J., and F. Field. 2009. Citizenship first: The case for compulsory civic service. *Prospect March* 2009: 34–9.

Davies, L. 2005. Teaching about conflict through citizenship education. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education* 1, no. 2: 17–34.

Department for Education and Skills. 2007. *Diversity and citizenship curriculum review.* London: DfES.

Donnelly, C. 2004. What price harmony? Teachers' methods of delivering an ethos of tolerance and respect for diversity in an integrated school in Northern Ireland *Educational Research* 46, no. 1: 3–16.

Elwood, J., P. McKeown, T. Gallagher, R. Kilpatrick, C. Murphy, and K. Carlisle. 2004. *Equality awareness in teacher education and training in Northern Ireland: Summary report*. Equality Commission for Northern Ireland: Belfast.

Gallagher, T. 2004. After the war comes peace? An examination of the impact of Northern Ireland conflict on young people *Journal of Social Issues* 60, no. 3: 629–42.

Graham, B., and C. Nash. 2006. A shared future: Territoriality, pluralism and public policy in Northern Ireland. *Political Geography* 25, no. 3: 253–78.

Harwood, R.C. 2000. The nation's looking glass. *Kettering Review* Spring: 6–22.

Haydon, D., and S. McAlister. 2009. *An independent analysis of responses to the Department of Education's priorities for youth consultation*. Bangor: Executive Summary, DE.

Hughes, J., C. Donnelly, G. Robinson, and L. Dowds. 2003. *Community relations in Northern Ireland: The long view.* www.ark.ac.uk.

Jarman, N., and R. Monaghan. 2003. *Analysis of incidents of racial harassment recorded by the police in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Institute for Conflict Research.

Jarman, N., and A. Tennant. 2003. *An acceptable prejudice. Homophobic harassment and violence in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Institute for Conflict Research.

Jones, T.S. 2004. Conflict resolution education: The field, the findings, the future. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 22, no. 1–2: 233–67.

Jeffers, G., and U. O'Connor, eds. 2008. *Education for citizenship and diversity in Irish contexts*. Dublin: IPA.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

Kerr, D., A. Lines, S. Blenkinsop, and I. Schagen. 2002. *England's results from the IEA international citizenship study: What citizenship and education mean to 14 year olds*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Kerr, D., J. Lopes, J. Nelson, K. White, E. Cleaver, and T. Benton. 2007. *Vision versus pragmatism: Citizenship in the secondary school curriculum in England*. Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Fifth Annual Report. Nottingham: DfES.

Kymlicka, W., and W. Norman. 2000. Citizenship in culturally diverse societies: Issues, contexts and concepts. In *Citizenship in diverse societies*, ed. W. Kymlicka and W. Norman, 1–41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lockyer, A., B. Crick, and J. Annette. 2003. *Education for democratic citizenship: Issues for theory and practice*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.

McAuley, J.W. 2004. Peace and progress? Political and social change among young loyalists in Northern Ireland *Journal of Social Issues* 60, no. 3: 541–62.

McEvoy, L. 2007. Beneath the rhetoric: Policy approximation and citizenship education in Northern Ireland. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 2, no. 2: 135–57.

Modood, T. 2000. Anti-essentialism, multi-culturalism and the 'recognition' of religious groups. In *Citizenship in diverse societies*, ed. W. Kymlicka and W. Norman, 175–95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mualem, R. 2010. Building peace through education. OECD Round table on higher education in regional and city development. September 2010.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 1982. *The improvement of community relations: the contribution of schools. DENI Circular 1982/21*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 1999. *Towards a culture of tolerance. Education for diversity*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education and Training Inspectorate. 2000. *Report of a Survey on Teacher Education Partnerships 1998/99: The University of Ulster*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 2000. *Report of a survey of provision for education for mutual understanding in post-primary schools*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 2006a. *Report on the introduction of local and global citizenship at key stage 3 in a sample of post primary schools*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 2006b. *Schools for the future: Funding, strategy, sharing. Report of the independent strategic review of education*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education and Training Inspectorate. 2009. *An evaluation of the quality assurance of community relations funding in a range of formal and non-formal education settings*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 2006. *Schools for the future: A policy for sustainable schools* (The Bain Report). Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 2009. *Every school a good school: A policy for school improvement*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 2010. *Review of teacher education*. Bangor: DE.

Northern Ireland Department of Education. 2011. *Community relations, equality and diversity in education*. Bangor: DE.

O'Connor, U., K. Beattie, and U. Niens. 2009. *An evaluation of the introduction of Local and Global Citizenship to the Northern Ireland curriclum*. Belfast: CCEA.

Office of the Minister and Deputy First Minister. 2005a. *A shared future. Policy and strategic framework for good relations in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: OFMDFM.

Office of the Minister and Deputy First Minister. 2005b. *Investing together, the report of the task force on resourcing the voluntary and community sector*. Belfast: OFMDFM.

Office of the Minister and Deputy First Minister. 2006. *Our children and young people – our pledge: a ten-year strategy for children and young people in Northern Ireland, 2006–2016*. Belfast: OFMDFM.

Office of the Minister and Deputy First Minister. 2010. *Programme for sharing, cohesion and integration*. Belfast: OFMDFM.

Office of the Minister and Deputy First Minister. 2011. *Draft programme for government, 2011–2016*. Belfast: OFMDFM.

OFSTED. 2005. *Initial teacher training for teachers of citizenship 2004/05*. London: Ofsted.

Orfield, G., ed. 2001. *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012

Paolini, S., M. Hewstone, E. Cairns, and A. Voci. 2004. Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30: 770–86.

Parekh, B. 2006. *Rethinking multiculturalism. Cultural diversity and political theory.* Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Patrick, J.J. 1999. Concepts at the core of education for democratic citizenship. In *Principles and practices of education for democratic citizenship: International perspectives and projects*, ed. C.F. Bahmueller and J.J. Patrick, 1–40. Indiana University, Indiana: ERIC/ ChESS.

Pattie, C., P. Seyd, and P. Whiteley. 2004. *Citizenship UK: Democracy and participation in contemporary Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Police Service of Northern Ireland. 2007. *Hate incidents and crimes 1st April, 2006 – 31st March, 2007. Statistical Report No. 3*. Belfast: Central Statistics Branch, Operational Support Department.

Putnam, R.D. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Salema, M.H. 2006. *Active citizenship for democracy. Education and training for active citizenship in formal education*. Lisbon: Centre for Educational Services, Faculty of Sciences, University of Lisbon.

Schell-Faucon, S. 2000. *Conflict transformation through educational and youth programmes*. Berlin: Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management.

Smith, A. 2003. Citizenship education in Northern Ireland: Beyond national identity? *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33, no. 1: 15–31.

Spirit of Enniskillen Trust. No date. www.soetrust.org

Torney-Porta, J., R. Lehmann, H. Oswald, and W. Schulz. 2001. *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

UNESCO. 1998. *Youth, education and action to the new century and beyonds*. World Conference of Ministers responsible for youth. Paris: UNESCO.

Vontz, T.S., and W.A. Nixon. 1999. Re-considering issue-centred civic education among young adolescents: Project citizen in the United States and abroad. In *Principles, practices of education for democratic citizenship: International perspectives and projects*, ed. C.F. Bahmueller and J.J. Patrick, 141–62. Indiana: Social Studies Development Centre.

Waldron, J. 2000. Cultural identity and civic responsibility. In *Citizenship in diverse societies*, ed. W. Kymlicka and W. Norman, 155–74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Downloaded by [University of Ulster at Coleraine] at 02:56 16 April 2012