

**Citizenship Education in English Secondary Schools:
teaching and learning to transform or conform?**

Nicola Samantha Horsley

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds
School of Sociology and Social Policy

July 2014

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

The right of Nicola Samantha Horsley to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

© 2014 The University of Leeds and Nicola Samantha Horsley

Acknowledgements

This research was made possible by the thoughtful accounts provided by teachers and pupils of the case study schools and I gratefully acknowledge their participation.

This study is the result of a CASE studentship funded by the ESRC and the Citizenship Foundation. As well as gratitude for this funding, I would like to express sincere thanks to all at the Citizenship Foundation, and especially Don Rowe, Tony Breslin and Tony Thorpe for their support and encouragement.

I am similarly indebted to my supervisors, Dr Angharad Beckett and Prof. Nick Ellison, for their invaluable advice and wisdom.

I would also like to thank my parents, John and Valerie Horsley, for their constant support; Leanne Hilton, for her encouragement from application to submission; Ami Lewis, for her diligent reading and diversions; and Katherine Pittore, who kept me going.

Abstract

This qualitative exploration of understandings of active citizenship in educational contexts reports on interviews with pupils and teachers in six English secondary schools. It sets out to trouble the foundations of citizenship education by tapping into the meanings that citizenship takes on in schools.

This thesis therefore engages with the contested concept of citizenship at the level of its interpretation in schools and argues that the tradition of agonistic debate over core citizenship issues should be reflected in educational practice. Insights from critical pedagogy are drawn upon to imagine a transformative educational process with which the practices described by participants might be compared. This focus adds depth to the existing body of research, which has tended towards a pre-occupation with outcomes. The analysis asks: how *active* are pupils' and teachers' understandings of citizenship? and what forms of knowledge are engaged with to construct conceptions of active citizenship in schools?

The argument is made for a more nuanced understanding of the value of citizenship in schools, through which the edifying contributions of engagement with the political and the personal might be recognised and nurtured. Mouffe's radical democratic citizenship offers an account of citizenship as an ongoing process through which this goal might be achieved. It is ventured that the current culture within education policy for schools in England is unlikely to accommodate such a radical approach as learners' agency is neutralised by pedagogical models that are fundamentally resistant to the practice of citizenship through educational processes but instead serve an instrumental agenda of manufacturing 'model citizens'. This form of education may equip young people to appear as citizens, as they follow the model presented to them, but such imitation is a departure from the original aims of introducing citizenship to schools; and, it is argued, anathema to true democratic participation.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Objectives	3
1.2.1 Research Questions	6
1.4 Outline of Thesis	8
Chapter Two: A Critical Review of Citizenship Theory	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Liberal Citizenship	13
2.2.1 Classical Liberalism	13
2.2.2 Liberalism Towards the Twenty-first Century	21
2.2.3 Cultural Citizenship.....	24
2.2.4 Challenges to the Liberal Account	26
2.3 Republican Citizenship.....	29
2.3.1 From Republicanism to Communitarianism.....	32
2.4 Beyond the Liberal and Republican Accounts	38
2.6 Conclusion	46
Chapter Three: Theories, Models and Practices of Active Citizenship.....	49
3.1 Introduction	49
3.2 Influential Theories of Citizenship Education	51
3.2.1 Rousseau’s Civic Republican Model.....	51
3.2.2 Mill’s Participative Learning	53
3.2.3 The Reconstructive Education of Dewey and Barber	54
3.3 Translating Theories of Citizenship Education to the Classroom	55
3.3.1 Models of Education for Democratic Citizenship	57
3.3.2 The Place of Citizenship Education in Broader Discourse.....	62
3.3.3 Citizenship Education in a Capitalist Society.....	63
3.4 Critical Pedagogy	65
3.5 Conclusion	76

Chapter Four: Cultivating Active Citizens – Introducing Citizenship Education to English Schools	77
4.1 Introduction	77
4.2 Debates on Education for Citizenship in a Changing Context.....	79
4.3 Crick’s Views on Citizenship.....	82
4.4 The Light Touch of the Crick Report.....	85
4.5 Implementing Citizenship in Schools	89
4.6 A Changing Policy Context.....	91
4.7 The Construction of Citizenship Education a Decade on	97
4.8 Research on Citizenship Education.....	98
Chapter Five: Methodology	103
5.1 Introduction	103
5.2 Theoretical Framework: a Critical Approach.....	103
5.3 Research Design.....	109
5.4 Case Studies.....	111
5.5 Sampling.....	111
5.6 Data Collection.....	115
5.6.1 Interviews with Teachers	116
5.6.2 Interviews with Pupils	118
5.7 Data Handling and Analysis	121
5.8 Reflections on the use of Semi-structured Interviews	123
5.9 Ethics	125
5.10 Conclusion	126
Chapter Six: Teachers’ and Pupils’ Experiences of Teaching and Learning Citizenship	128
6.1 Introduction	128
6.2 Teaching Citizenship.....	128
6.2.1 A Tool to Tackle Social Problems	128
6.2.2 Empowering Young People	131
6.2.3 Balanced Discussion	135
6.2.4 Pupil Voice.....	137
6.3 Learning Citizenship.....	141
6.3.1 Right Answers	141
6.3.2 Balanced Discussion	147
6.3.3 Pupil Voice.....	149
6.4 Discussion.....	152

6.4.1 “They <i>have</i> a voice” – a pedagogy of citizenship?.....	152
6.4.2 “Sir’s giving us the right answer” – passing the citizenship test.....	155
6.4.3 “God, Sir, that was biased!” – the construction of bias in schools	157
6.4.4 Right Answers and Golden Tickets: the Construction of Common Sense	160
6.4.4.1 “You’re not wrong, it’s just your opinion” – manufacturing choice	162
6.4.4.2 “Drugs should be banned” – the construction of a common sense consensus	163
6.4.5 What Kind of Common Sense Does Citizenship Education Teach?.....	165
6.4.5.1 Citizenship is... learning to invest your capital: “becoming a normal, average worker”	166
6.4.5.1 Citizenship is... learning to stay out of trouble – “cos we call it skills for life”	168
6.5 Conclusion	170
Chapter Seven: What Kind of Citizens Does Citizenship Education Produce?	173
7.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of the Impact of Citizenship Education.....	173
7.1.1 Model Citizens?	173
7.1.2 Getting by	176
7.1.3 Moving on.....	177
7.2 Pupils’ Perceptions of the Impact of Citizenship Education.....	178
7.2.1 Model Citizens?	178
7.2.2 Getting by	180
7.2.3 Moving on.....	181
7.3 The Neutralisation of Agency in the National Curriculum.....	183
7.3.1 Active Citizenship as part of the National Curriculum ?	183
7.3.2 Why Would Young People Want to be Active Citizens?.....	186
7.4 Discussion and Recommendations	190
7.4.1 Manufacturing Model Citizens.....	195
7.4.2 What have we got to lose?.....	198
7.4.3 Recommendations.....	200
7.5 Conclusion	202
Chapter Eight: Conclusion.....	206
8.1 Citizenship as a school subject.....	208

8.2 Engaging with the politics of schooling	209
8.3 Engaging with the personal	210
8.4 Implications for Policy and Directions for Future Research.....	211
Bibliography.....	215
Appendix A Interview Schedule (Teachers).....	235
Appendix B Interview Schedule (Pupils).....	236

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background

Citizenship is a concept that has been contested by theorists for centuries. In introducing citizenship education to the National Curriculum in 2002, the New Labour government chose to endorse and advocate a particular conception of citizenship for young people to learn about and practise. Drawing on qualitative research conducted in six case study secondary schools across England, this study investigates teachers' and pupils' accounts of the processes that construct ideas of citizenship in schools and asks how constructions of citizenship in education influence young people's understandings of their roles as citizens.

The use of compulsory education to formally introduce ideas of political literacy, social and moral responsibility and community involvement to young people in England came at a time when British society was perceived as riven by various social problems. Many of these were narrated with young people in a central role, and many were seen as stemming from a deficit of knowledge, skills and practices of these three strands – political literacy, social and moral responsibility and community involvement – in the general population. The implementation of the teaching of citizenship in English schools therefore represented not only a change in education but a development in policies aiming to reaffirm the role of active citizens in British society. As such, the government's message to teachers that they were to help pupils to 'play an effective role in society' (DFEE 1999) – set citizenship apart from other National Curriculum subjects where teachers' roles were defined by their relation of disciplinary knowledge to pupils. Citizenship education was acknowledged to be concerned with more than depositing knowledge in young people as its curriculum sought to develop particular traits and a certain way of being as a 'citizen'.

The role of the citizen in Britain was historically rooted in a classical liberal vision concerned with the preservation of individual freedoms, which came to be associated with the market freedoms of neo-liberalism in the latter part of the twentieth century. New Labour's election campaign priorities of 'education, education and education' were at the forefront of a manifesto that sought to offer an alternative to the neo-liberal agenda that had dominated social policy in the UK throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Once elected, the egalitarian ideals of the Labour government's 'Third Way' were alloyed with those of 'civic renewal', which applied civic republican and communitarian thought to emerging social problems of youth crime and community tensions fuelled by ethnic and religious divisions, particularly in the wake of riots in northern English towns in 2001, the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the 7/7 bombings carried out in London by Islamist extremists who were British citizens.

Since its inception, citizenship education has reflected elements of those issues that have entered into the national public consciousness and shaped policy, including questions of immigration and austerity. Citizenship education itself has been hotly debated by policy makers because of varying perceptions of its place on the National Curriculum and its potential utility in the function of defining British citizenship for young people in state schools. This study therefore sheds light on the experiences of those young people as well as those teachers to whom the ultimate responsibility of interpreting the curriculum falls. In this way, the findings of this research illuminate a level of understanding of how citizenship education *really* functions within schools and how young people's interaction with the discourse might be reconciled with current policy agendas. The findings further understanding of how those aims are filtered by school contexts and ask important questions about the desirability of working this contested concept into the state school framework. This thesis is therefore of interest to all those concerned with future moves to serve social aims through the engineering of the National Curriculum.

1.2 Objectives

The main aim of this research is to explore how citizenship education, as experienced in English state secondary schools, might serve to privilege certain understandings of citizenship as it occupies a unique position as both a discipline of study under the National Curriculum and a medium through which young people engage with ideas of themselves as active citizens.

There has been considerable sociological interest in the general role of education in instilling certain values in young people from theorists of citizenship (Rousseau 1968; Mill 1910a; Dewey 1916; Barber 1984) and education (Freire 1970; Du Bois 1973; McLaren 1995; hooks 2003; Giroux 2011). The potential for citizenship education to shape pupils' understandings of themselves as citizens has been seen as key to addressing a range of social issues, as discussed above. There has, however, been limited research that draws together concepts from theories of citizenship with considerations of the possibilities and challenges of transformative education. This study draws on insights from both these traditions in its exploration of how citizenship education is experienced by teachers and pupils in English state secondary schools.

Once citizenship education had been introduced to the National Curriculum, research by government and independent agencies sought to evaluate its incorporation into schools. Studies have tended to report on the barriers to realising the vision set out in the final report of the advisory group on citizenship chaired by Bernard Crick (Crick 1998). For example, Davies' and Evans' (2002) research was concerned with ascertaining how well citizenship education had been embedded in a single Local Education Authority (LEA) area and how it might be developed to overcome any challenges to its early adoption. Although pupils' views were included by means of focus groups, the objective of these was to gauge young people's achievement of a certain level of understanding of the citizenship

curriculum and questions about how ideas of citizenship were related to were left to a multiple-choice questionnaire. Similarly, Cleaver et al. (2005) and Trikha et al. (2005) have surveyed the effects of citizenship education on positive attitudes to volunteering and trust in institutions respectively. This research is considered in greater depth in Chapter Four.

The most comprehensive study investigating pupils' and teachers' views of citizenship education is the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS), conducted by NFER, which ran from 2001 to 2010. Although CELS asked pupils to consider how their experience of citizenship education had tangibly affected them, its methodology as a large-scale quantitative study provided little nuance in its findings as it reported pupils' 'moderately positive' feelings about the level of democracy within their school and their opportunities to contribute to classroom debate (NFER 2010). The CELS's focus on 'citizenship outcomes' is characteristic of most research on citizenship education, in that young people's relationship to the content of the curriculum is not problematised beyond accounting for barriers to their ability to grasp the subject matter. This study sets out to trouble the foundations of citizenship education by tapping into the meanings that citizenship takes on in the school context. The accounts of teachers and pupils offer richly detailed understanding that is only possible when the implementers and participants of a new programme of study are enabled to speak of their experiences in their own words. This study therefore represents a wider exploration of these perspectives that is more illuminative than a simple evaluation of the implementation of citizenship education.

In exploring citizenship education on a deeper level through engaging with the experiences and understandings of teachers and pupils, the methodology of this study is similar to Mead's (2009) analysis of pupils' anti-war protests and Youdell's (2011) investigation of the challenges facing the critical educator. This thesis extends certain dimensions of those studies, however, with its specific focus on

practices carried out in the name of citizenship education and its concern for the effect of processes of teaching and learning on participants' understandings of their citizenship beyond the microcosm of the school. For instance, Youdell (2011) identified schools as sites of potential conflict and explored the possibilities of radical politics in education, invoking advocates of critical pedagogy such as Giroux (2006) as well as Mouffe (2005). This study proceeds in the same spirit but is focused on the possibilities of citizenship education specifically. Particular care is taken to ground the research in a consideration of the 'travel' of the idea of citizenship, from philosophical theory to its application to twenty-first century Britain, and significant junctures in the process of its implementation as a school subject.

The theoretical framework of this study therefore builds on meditations on critical practice such as Youdell's (2006; 2011) to understand the capacity for transformative practices to come to the fore under the auspices of Crick's (1998) somewhat radical vision for the new statutory subject. Against this understanding, the tensions in implementing change at the classroom level – the inevitable result of the multiple meanings different actors bring to the classroom context – are exposed by a nuanced analysis that provides a more subtle reading of citizenship education practice than those treatments that mark off progress towards an ideal representation of the curriculum. The analysis therefore eschews reliance on constructions of citizenship set out in the citizenship syllabus in favour of recognising the essentially contested nature of citizenship and questioning the processes that may work to privilege certain understandings in the classroom. Ultimately, this thesis seeks to shed light on young people's understandings of citizenship, and how these may be shaped by their educational experiences, by providing a framework for interpreting their views about citizenship that is distinct from a purely evaluative methodology. Chapter Four presents an overview of studies of citizenship education, which locates the contribution of the present research to the literature.

This study therefore contributes to sociological knowledge of understandings of citizenship in schools by drawing on qualitative accounts from teachers and pupils at a range of schools across England. By researching the experiences of teaching and learning in six case study schools, which served communities with a range of characteristics more or less invoked in debates about the function of citizenship education, this study aims to include the voices of a diversity of British citizens. Through in-depth interviews that explored themes of active citizenship and the forms of knowledge engaged with at the classroom level that might bring out these themes, teachers' and pupils' perspectives were captured. This data was then subject to analysis through a framework that drew on concepts from theorists of transformative education in order to address the research questions. This thesis presents the findings of this research to illuminate how the process of citizenship education is experienced by pupils and how the construction of certain conceptions of citizenship in the classroom affects young people's understandings of themselves as citizens.

1.2.1 Research Questions

- 1) How active are teachers' and pupils' understandings of citizenship?

Understandings of active citizenship are central to this thesis and this research question seeks to explore *how active* teachers' and pupils' understandings are in light of themes common to citizenship theory. These include whether understandings conform to ideas of 'good' or 'model' citizens, who gets to be an active citizen, and the relation of citizenship to the political. In examining the interpretation of citizenship education in this way, this research sits within a developing field of studies of the practices of teaching and learning citizenship in English secondary schools. The original contribution of this research to this area lies in its focus on how *active* citizenship is realised and made manifest through citizenship education. Whereas much research has focused on 'outcomes', tending towards measurement of the success of citizenship education in terms of curriculum

targets for pupils' acquisition of knowledge, this study investigates experiences of citizenship education as a process that might reflect the rhetoric of transformative engagement at the core of theories of active citizenship. Although work in this field has noted that the uncritical transfer of knowledge from didactic teachers to passive pupils is not compatible with an active conception of citizenship (Crick 1999, 2001; Davies and Evans 2002) and some research has suggested that pupils' critical reflection and opportunities to participate in debate have been neglected areas of the curriculum (Davies 2003; Summers et al. 2003; Oulton et al 2004), the depth of qualitative data provided by this study's theoretical focus provides a more detailed and complex account that extends understandings of active citizenship in schools.

2) What forms of knowledge are engaged with to construct conceptions of active citizenship in schools?

Citizenship education brings together certain forms of knowledge as valid elements of active citizenship. These include the explicit content of the syllabus and school-level practices that determine what other knowledges might be included in lessons and what forms of pedagogy are appropriate to convey them. Themes from education theory may then be explored by this research question, including concepts of what education is *for* and the role of pedagogy in creating or allowing consensus or dissensus. In this way, the thesis sits alongside research in the fields of both citizenship theory and critiques of educational practice.

With its concern for the active strands of the contested concept of citizenship, the thesis takes forward an agonistic perspective. Mouffe (2002; 2005) explains agonistic pluralism as offering a platform for struggle between adversaries who tolerate each other's perspectives out of a common commitment to liberty and equality while each seeks to advance their interpretation of those values (rather than an antagonistic struggle for hegemony between enemies). Mouffe considers this adversarial confrontation to be the essence of a vibrant democracy and

scholars like Youdell (2011) have pursued this idea in educational contexts. By focusing on how experiences of citizenship education in the case study schools affect young people's perceptions of their citizenship within and beyond education, however, this research contributes new knowledge. More broadly, the thesis' critique adds to sociological debates centred on education as a private asset consumed by pupils (Freire 1970; Habermas 1987; Bauman 1998; Crick 2001; hooks 2003; Giroux 2011). Citizenship education provides an insightful case through which pedagogy that might be described as following a 'banking' model (Freire 1970), which reduces education to its direct outcomes of benefit or loss to the individual, might be exposed.

The thesis also adds to those critiques of education with a commitment to challenging coercive practices of conformity to social norms. Proponents of critical pedagogy such as Freire (1970) have provided concepts that are constructive to the task of analysing educational experiences. Concepts such as co-intentionality and praxis help to further understanding of teachers' and pupils' accounts of school practices. Whereas contributors to the field of critical pedagogy are usually educators who reflect on their own practice, this research explores the transformative potential of practices of teaching and learning by applying concepts from critical pedagogy to qualitative data from interviews with teachers and pupils, giving voice to both educators and learners.

1.4 Outline of Thesis

This thesis is organised into eight chapters. Following this introductory chapter, Chapter Two examines the theoretical debates about citizenship that underlie the nature and purpose of citizenship education, and which introduce themes relating to the first research question. The tensions between these perspectives, which are said to consign citizenship to the category of 'contested concept' and which present

challenges to the adoption of a particular model to be taught in schools, inform the study's approach to the theory and practice of citizenship education.

Chapter Three describes how theories of education for democratic citizenship have informed the construction of citizenship to be taught in schools. It discusses how these theoretical positions have been translated into models for citizenship education and how a nation's political culture and historical contingencies, of which a state education system is a part, shape the introduction of a citizenship curriculum. Themes relating to the second research question are explored.

Chapter Four extends the discussion of the role of national culture in shaping education for citizenship to an analysis of how contemporary debates in the UK informed the model of citizenship education that was introduced to the National Curriculum. The nature of this implementation is described in terms of processes from policy to classroom. There then follows an overview of studies of citizenship education, which locates the contribution of the present research to the literature.

Chapter Five explains the methodological approach of the research. The theoretical framework and research design are described. Methods of sampling, data collection and analysis are then detailed, before a consideration of the ethical implications of the study.

Chapters Six and Seven introduce the empirical findings of the study. Analysis of interview data draws out the key themes of teachers' and pupils' experiences and understandings of citizenship. In Chapter Six, teachers' interview data are presented to demonstrate the key themes of their accounts, which were: that citizenship education is a tool to tackle social problems; that it should empower young people; that it should focus on 'balance' – prioritising the recognition of certain forms of bias and equity of views; and that it should promote pupil voice – that is pupils' opportunity to actively express themselves and contribute to their learning activities in their own terms. Pupils' interview data are then presented to

demonstrate the key themes of their accounts, which take forward the themes of 'balance' and pupil voice. There then follows a discussion of the implications of these themes for the practice of active citizenship, ending with observations on two forms of 'common sense' that emerged from the analysis, a construction that may undermine active citizenship. Chapter Seven takes forward the assumptions of the two forms of common sense to set out a discussion of what kinds of citizens might be 'produced' by the messages found to be prevalent in citizenship education. Recommendations for how citizenship education might be made more meaningful for young people and inspire more active citizenship are then made.

Chapter Eight concludes the thesis by arguing that citizenship education's position as a school subject is problematic because of barriers to the practice of active citizenship in schools. This finding mobilises the two recommendations made in Chapter Seven, whose arguments are revisited and concluded. It is therefore argued that: the politics of schooling should be directly engaged with in citizenship education; and that an adversarial approach that encouraged pupils to take up positions on issues that matter to them, and facilitated the expression of conflicting understandings as part of an ongoing democratic dialogue, would better reflect the practice of active citizenship than present pedagogy. The implications of these findings for policy and future research directions are then discussed.

Chapter Two: A Critical Review of Citizenship Theory

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will critically review influential theories of citizenship in order to consider how they might contribute to an understanding of citizens as active participants in society in the context of the UK at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

The subject of this thesis is citizenship education – and specifically how contemporary education for citizenship is perceived and understood by teachers and pupils in English secondary schools. Before engaging directly with these perceptions, however, it is important to gain a clearer understanding of the possible meanings of citizenship itself. Though the concept has played a central role in social and political thinking since at least the time of the ancient Greek philosophers (Oldfield 1990), debates about definitions and meaning have abounded – to the point where citizenship could be said to fit the criteria of an ‘essentially contested concept’ (Gallie 1956; Connolly 1983). Essentially contested concepts unite thinkers who agree on the importance of the concept but are divided on what constitutes its *proper use* (Gallie 1956). As can be seen from the discussion below, theorists of citizenship may be equally committed to the concept but different interpretations of key sub-concepts (such as liberty or freedom, rights, responsibilities and civic virtue) come into play.

The most obvious example of this is the disagreement between thinkers in the liberal and republican traditions over the proper balance of the rights and responsibilities of the citizen. For the purposes of discussing UK education, it is the issue of the National Curriculum’s focus on ‘active’ citizenship that this review seeks to trace back through theories of citizenship. It will be shown that approaches vary in their support for more active or passive models, often referred to as ‘thin’ or ‘thick’ citizenship. ‘Thin’ liberal accounts of citizenship position the citizen fundamentally as a legal member of a defined political community who should be enabled to enjoy certain rights, particularly the right to liberty (Thompson 1994). Over the centuries, liberal theorists have argued about the nature of these rights – especially the nature and extent of liberty and the degree of support from the state and other public institutions that may be required to give liberty real meaning. Republican thinkers, on the other hand, offer a ‘thicker’ definition of citizenship that

locates the citizen not only as the legal recipient of certain rights, but also as an active, 'engaged' member of a defined polity who has an obligation to contribute to the common good. Here the state, and the formal public sphere more generally, has a more significant role than it tends to be granted by liberal thinkers. In consequence, notions of social justice, duty and 'civic virtue' become especially important in republican thinking.

While it is perhaps possible that continued theoretical advances could yet produce widespread acceptance about the meaning of citizenship, such agreement remains remote. Gallie (1956), however, argued that essential disputes serve to further understanding of contested concepts. This chapter therefore seeks to develop a clear understanding of the central issues that divide citizenship theorists and provide theoretical context for Chapter Three, which examines debates about citizenship within the parameters of citizenship education. The main objective of this chapter is to 'map' the major strands of thinking about citizenship and their main conceptual tributaries as these have developed over time.

Theories of citizenship have traditionally been concerned with the question of how agreement can be reached on what the overarching goals of a society should be, and whether such a vision can be worked towards in a climate of diverse interests and competition for resources (Heater 1999). Envisioning how a particular type of citizenship might be brought to life by the embodiment of core theoretical values in a 'good' or 'model' citizen is a common feature of otherwise abstract theories. This provides opportunities to interrogate the desirability of different understandings of citizenship for diverse groups of citizens. For example, theorists of citizenship often seek to mitigate the ill effects produced by competition for resources with reference to the concept of character. The notion of the 'reasonable' individual that characterises much of liberal theory, and can be seen in more recent theory such as the work of Habermas (1987), has been employed to demonstrate the character required for such co-operation, and republican theorists (Barber 1984; Oldfield 1990) speak of model citizens who transcend self-interest and act on virtue. Traditionally, this has fomented an emphasis on the promotion of equality and universal rights to empower citizens to realise their potential but more recent theories have taken a step back from the goal of maximising the extension of such rights to explore the merits of a plurality of co-existing and, ideally, complementary citizenships. Some have argued that theories of cultural and group citizenship apply a more sophisticated method to the problem of inequalities created by vulnerabilities specific to certain minority groups (Kymlicka 1995; Young 1989).

Such theories are concerned with how a citizen's identity is conceptualised in relation to fellow citizens and *others*, as well as with the influence of the diversity of extant and emerging social problems, global hazards, cultures and communities that shape the world today. Consideration of these theories draws out themes at the core of this study's first research question, which explores how *active* teachers' and pupils' understandings of citizenship are.

Finally, this chapter considers the potential benefits of parting ways with the major strands of citizenship theory to explore a radical approach to participating in democracy that may offer some more useful co-ordinates for navigating contemporary social problems. Ultimately, understanding the development of and differences between theories of citizenship provides the context for understanding the development of education for citizenship – and what alternative models might offer.

2.2 Liberal Citizenship

A key facet of liberal theory is the separation of the public and private spheres, with the decision as to whether to enter into public life left entirely to the individual. The state exists to safeguard private life by protecting rights, to which the citizen is entitled through their contribution of paying taxes and other nominal duties. This is often illustrated by the notion of a social contract into which both citizens and the state are assumed to have entered for mutual benefit (Heater 1999). The form of citizenship envisaged by classical liberalism has influenced politics in Britain since the seventeenth century and the discussion below illustrates the continuing significance of some of its key concepts.

2.2.1 Classical Liberalism

In *Leviathan*, a seminal work of classical political theory, Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) put forward his account of the nature of citizens' relationship with the liberal state. Hobbes (1973) viewed individual rights as having been surrendered to the state when people made the self-interested choice between the anarchy of the 'state of nature' and the absolutism of total state control, legitimising the sovereign's role as a 'slave master'. The view that people's fear of disorder overrides their anxiety about oppressive state control, to the extent that basic rights are given up, has led commentators to claim that, in the classic liberal accounts, politics and citizenship are 'terminated' (Clarke 1996). It is probably accurate to say that

Hobbes' citizen is no more than a *subject* but his model is important because it was the first to posit a relationship, however weak, between the state and equal members of a defined political community (Faulks 2000).

This liberal, rather passive form of citizenship is also to be found in the work of Locke (1632–1704). For Locke (1946), the citizen's obligations are minimal, and his rights-based conception of citizenship sought to increase individual freedom by limiting the state to the role of 'night-watchman': an unobtrusive custodian of limited powers to interfere in the lifestyles citizens chose to pursue. Like Hobbes', Locke's contractarian approach, later to be advanced by Rousseau (1968) and Rawls (1972, 1993), viewed states as if they were products of formal or informal agreements amongst numerous individuals, who then become their citizens (Hindess 2002). Locke, however, hypothesised not only a contract to enshrine the bargain of restricted freedom in lieu of state security but also one to legislate for the protection of rights. This is a significant addition because it implies that state power rests on the contentment of its citizenry that rights are being observed and in this way suggests a reciprocal relationship between state and citizen.

Locke viewed private property as an essential freedom, and indeed a goal of individual freedom. His theory of property was founded on the premises that: citizens create and maintain their property; law and government exist to protect it; and lawful exercise of property rights should result in inequalities without injustice. This has been called 'possessive individualism' (Schuck 2002:133). Locke believed that any disadvantages produced by this system would be mitigated by individuals' natural concern for others and early liberal theory was heavily influenced by Locke's vision of the individual as ostensibly 'reasonable' (Schuck 2002:133), an idea later developed by Habermas (1987).

Rousseau's (1968) seminal work built on Hobbes' (1973) *Leviathan* to introduce themes that heavily influenced the liberal tradition. Unlike Hobbes, Rousseau did not see citizenship as a stark choice between anarchy and absolutism. He supplanted the notion of the 'sovereign will' with that of a genuine 'general will' of the people, with whom, he believed, lay the origin and the exercise of legitimate sovereignty (Deranthe 1970). The consensus of this sense of the common good supported the liberal principles of minimal government in that, because society would be united in its interests, scant legislation was needed. This scaled-back administration was the ideal society however, and this utopia was not attainable by all. Rousseau's (1968) subject was the 'natural man', who needed to be 'denatured'

in order to have the character instilled in him that would allow him to make a positive, active contribution to society. Unlike Hobbes, Rousseau believed humans could be trusted to choose not to be motivated by pure self-interest once they were so enlightened, but he endorsed governments' assumption of control for problems beyond the cognitive abilities of the individual. Rousseau's was, nevertheless, a crucial divergence from the classical liberal relationship between the autocratic state and the passive citizen, suggesting a dynamic that needs citizens to be educated and active (Rousseau 1968), in order to maintain the 'two-fold relation' a citizen has with both the state and fellow contractees: another key progression in Rousseau's citizenship, which is a crystallisation of the reciprocal relationship that was intimated in Locke's two contracts.

Rousseau sought further understanding of how the character of active citizens might be developed. His brand of republicanism advocated civic religion for the promotion of social cohesion. For Rousseau, specific benefits to be gained from civic religion lay in its focus on the life to come and its concern for rewarding virtue and punishing vice. His model for the creation of 'good' citizens therefore comprised this element of coercion through culture, complemented by the law and formal education. In *Émile or On Education*, Rousseau (1979) considers the relationship between the natural man and society in terms of how a comprehensive education system could mould children into model citizens. He argued that education for citizenship was crucial for achieving an ideal state in which the general will was served. His belief in the power of education to homogenise the interests of the individual and the state led him to write one of the most sophisticated treatises on education of the time. Detractors contend, however, that it resembles an instruction manual for indoctrination into dominant prejudices, as can be seen in its treatment of the education of women, which basically consisted of training to better serve men (Wollstonecraft 1996).

Rousseau's account has nevertheless been influential. Taking *Émile* as the inspiration for much of his moral psychology (Knippenberg 1989), Kant (1724–1804) drew on Rousseau's concept of denaturalisation. Kant asserts that humans' innate fear and ambition are forms of self-interest that must be de-programmed from the human psyche through a process of 'moralisation' (Kant 1960). What Kant fundamentally proposed was a rejection of the barbaric view of others as rivals and an adoption of goals that are congruent with the goals of others. This was an ethical ideal that could not be achieved through coercion, as this would conflict with the right of a member of the realm to freely agree their own goals. Kant took the social

contract to be a hypothetical construction through which we may question whether the conditions under which citizens live *could* have been agreed upon by individuals starting from the state of nature (Thompson 1994).

Kant's late work *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (1794), took this idea of progress to describe how 'the perfection to which humanity is destined and for which it also has a disposition' can only be achieved through the engendering of morality, discipline, 'cleverness' and the acquisition of a trade. 'Cleverness' is the skill that enables the individual 'to turn civil society to [her/his] purposes and to accommodate [her/himself] to it' (Kant 1797). The realisation of this, according to Kant, is to be 'educated as a citizen'. His focus on individual rights and the capacity of citizens to bend others to their will has led to a perception of Kantian ethics as individualistic but Kant's primary aim was to resolve the supposed conflict between our desire to enjoy our natural freedom and our need to interact with others in society, and in this sense, be an active citizen. Kant's psychological analysis identified these aspects of human nature as being played out on a grand scale in warfare and it is this propensity that he wished to pacify through a cosmopolitan education that would cultivate citizens with the character to co-operate amicably with their peers and achieve 'perpetual peace' (Kant 1795).

John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) was also concerned with developing people's capacity to co-operate in society. In fact, although famous for his treatment of liberty, Mill (1910a) actually believed that developmentalism was more important because liberty should be reserved for those judged to have the requisite faculties. He believed in democracy for the sake of developing people's faculties, and that only a government built on participation could stimulate public concern that is in itself enlightenment, and his work on *Representative Government* presents a convincing case that the development of these skills will be stunted if they are not to be put into practice. He argued that this holds for the development of both knowledge and morals (Mill 1910b).

Parents' moral obligation to cultivate their children's knowledge, Mill (1910a) believed, should be enforced by the state but it should be left to the parents to decide how to educate them. He was an advocate of diversity in education as better for building character than a narrow national curriculum.

A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another: and as the mould in which it casts

them is that which pleases the predominant power in the government ... it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body. (Mill1910a:199)

His view of the state's role in education echoed his more general concerns. Aside from liberty, Mill (1910a) regarded as the 'most cogent' reason to resist government interference the 'great evil' of unnecessarily increasing state power. Significantly, however, he also urged a rejection of excessive governance on the premise that citizens' action would serve as an edifying experience in itself – which begins the use of vocabulary more common within republic thought (Isin and Turner 2003). In taking citizens 'out of their narrow circle of selfishness', and talking of 'aims which unite', Mill's (1910a:70) ideal shares some of the features of Kant's. Although very much in the liberal tradition of supporting citizens' choice to determine how much they enter into the public realm, Mill hoped that citizens would take the decision to become publically active, as 'the only government which can fully satisfy all the exigencies of the social state is one in which the whole people participate' and he believed that 'any participation, even in the smallest public function, is useful' (1910a:141).

In this sense, Mill sought to move beyond a static vision of citizenship as an end to demonstrate the importance of ongoing active participation as a means to reproduce and progress democratic values. The work of Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and Kant outlined the founding tenets of liberal citizenship that are recognised as the basis for subsequent thought. Mill therefore contributed to the liberal canon by building on those macro concepts of freedom, rights and responsibilities and turning attention to how micro processes of active citizenship reinforce these. The role of the citizen envisaged by classical liberalism influenced politics in the UK into the twentieth century and beyond.

Despite his optimism for active participation, Mill is one of the liberal thinkers Berlin (1958) names in his insightful essay, *Two Concepts of Liberty*, as characterising the 'negative' conception of freedom that is not instructive. Berlin argues that Mill's thought conflates two liberal views: that all coercion is inherently bad and 'non-interference' is inherently good; and that 'men' should be educated to develop 'a certain type of character of which Mill approved – fearless, original, imaginative, independent, non-conforming to the point of eccentricity, and so on', which was possible 'only in conditions of freedom' (Berlin 1958:159). Berlin sees this second view as fundamentally flawed and neglecting of the proliferation of historical

examples of human spirit thriving in struggles with oppression. Berlin believed that care should be taken when privileging the concept of liberty because of these kinds of unchecked progressions of thought.

Berlin contrasted Mill's claim that 'the only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way' (Berlin 1958:158) with 'positive' constructions of liberty, which Berlin defines as the realisation of the individual's desire to be the 'instrument' of her own acts of will, of thoughtfully 'conceiving goals and policies of my own' and actively realising them. He explains the distinction between this understanding of the purposeful citizen and Rousseau's natural man: that 'lower' nature governed by irrational impulse, which is the target of 'rigidly disciplined' moral training (Berlin 1958:161).

With the rise of capitalism from the nineteenth century onwards, the liberal view of the relationship between citizenship and liberty, and particularly freedoms connected to property, took on a new dimension. As it was acknowledged that property ownership was a privilege not enjoyed by all members of society, the assumption that a citizen's commitment to the state was a return on the state's investment in protecting private property was no longer operational (Heater 2004a). As capitalism expanded into the twentieth century, the idea that the state's role should include some level of redistribution of the assets of the wealthy to enable the poor to achieve a standard of welfare conducive to attaining equal citizenship gained purchase, and the relevance of the classic liberal account was challenged. The traditional debate diversified as more contemporary thinkers sought to address the inequalities created by *laissez-faire* markets and the classic liberal position was re-evaluated for the new age by a number of theorists (Heater 2004a).

Writing in 1971, Rawls (1921–2002) argued that democratic society rested on a notion of free and equal, moral citizens being embedded in its culture. He understood, however, that this was not our starting point. Like Kant, Rawls was concerned with the question of whether we would have chosen to enter into a social contract from a state of nature. For this reason, we must use our imagination to assume the 'original position' by positioning ourselves behind a 'veil of ignorance', which blinds us to our own attributes and place in society. Only by adopting this disinterested state can we agree a sense of justice on principles conducive to an ideal society, rather than our own bias. Rawls believed that, as long as basic liberties and equality of opportunity were in place to encourage collaboration and productivity, a society could be considered 'thoroughly just'. However, in order to be

'perfectly just', the wealth of the least well-off group must be maximised. His so-called 'maximin principle' (Rawls 1998) centred on the point at which the least well-off group attained its maximum possible wealth without this having an adverse effect on any other societal group.

Rawls' principle aim was to achieve fair social co-operation, and establishing a citizenry of free and equal individuals was really a 'companion idea' that he thought would aid the realisation of this goal (Freeman 2007:339). This view was set out in *A Theory of Justice*, in which he proposed that a well-ordered society was an *ideal* of social co-operation, a *highly idealised concept* to which, like Kant, Rawls presumed we aspire (Rawls 1971). As he furthers this idea in *Political Liberalism*, however, Rawls (1993) asserts that reasonable pluralism and reasonable disagreement about the fundamentals of justice are part of the make-up of a well-ordered society. This more sophisticated view of ideal society is a move away from a Kantian vision of moral consensus. In preferring the democratic idea of 'overlapping consensus', Rawls makes a notable departure from the contractarian accounts of Locke, Kant and Rousseau (Freeman 2007).

Rawls' interpretation of freedom also develops an interesting account of identity as it allows for an individual's conception of herself to change according to context. Citizens' power to define and redefine the common good according to their own reason, and to pursue it in their own way, allows them to maintain a public identity that exists parallel to private affiliations and lifestyle choices. In this way, Rawls reconciles the satisfaction of the goals of the 'nonpublic identity', linked to individual interests, with those agreed to serve the public interest (Rawls 1998:64-65). Thus, rather than Hobbes' conception of self-interest conflicting with the common good and resulting in anarchy, individual goals shape one's contribution to society and determine how it will tessellate with myriad other contributions to form a structure of complementary goals. Rawls' distinction between public and private identities that positions citizens as co-operating on the basis of their *reasonable* character, rather than interwoven interests and inter-dependencies, raises questions about such normative claims, which Rawls himself acknowledged in his later work (Rawls 1993). By the time he re-visited this issue, however, discourses of pluralism, multiculturalism and communitarianism had begun to dominate thinking on citizenship. Rawls' thought was influential in British politics in the 1970s and 1980s and represented an ambitious departure from previous liberal attempts merely to 'knock the worst edges off' the effects of capitalism, the most notable of which was TH Marshall's rights based approach.

In his highly influential work, *Citizenship and Social Class* (Marshall and Bottomore 1992), T. H. Marshall (1893–1981) pioneered the notion of social rights, which shaped debates about citizenship in post-Second World War Britain, when the welfare state was in its infancy (Dwyer 2003). In his considerations of increasing citizens' share of power in capitalist society, Marshall claimed that his main concern was the impact of citizenship on social equality. He saw social rights as Britain's area of need in the twentieth century, after the development of civil rights from the eighteenth century and political rights through the nineteenth century. His approach was based on the universal enjoyment of classic freedoms but he did not believe that this necessitated the demolition of social stratification, rather, he was in favour of installing an 'educational meritocracy'. Through this system he believed an ideal of 'a structure of unequal status fairly apportioned to unequal abilities' (Marshall and Bottomore 1992:109) would be rightly achieved and those most suited to public life would naturally enter into it.

Marshall's vision becomes problematic when one considers how these social benefits are to be specifically defined and legislated for. Equality of education, even when aided by the substitution of inherited privilege for educational meritocracy, is a particular challenge. As Marshall admitted, 'social stratification', albeit of a different kind, was bound to prevail. Marshall recognised that he was replacing one hierarchy with another but believed that, because his was based on merit, it had 'the stamp of legitimacy' (Marshall and Bottomore 1992:39). However, it could be argued that Marshall's acceptable inequalities are just as damaging and reproductive as those he sought to redress. The social stratification that would determine who is to enter into public life, taking on active citizenship duties, and who is to assume a passive role, would require the cultivation of a range (if not a binary) of citizen characteristics likely to result in the marginalisation of those assigned a passive role. With inequalities in education come inequalities in job opportunities and ultimately, embedded economic inequality of the sort Marshall would consider to 'cut too deep' (Heater 1999:16).

Perhaps Marshall's industrial age locus, pre-occupied as it was with the effects of industrialisation and the liberal state's weakness in ameliorating the ensuing problems of poverty and disease, is the cause of much of contemporary concern about his view of citizenship. For instance, Modood (1992) argues that an assumed connection between citizenship and the nation state is detrimental to minority ethnic groups, and he finds that the profoundness of individuals' social exclusion can be mapped by degrees of their distance from 'a white upper middle class British,

Christian/agnostic norm' (Modood 1992:54). Also, Marshall's model assumes economic citizenship, which those who do not cultivate economic capital (such as the young unemployed) cannot hold. His vision of knocking the worst edges off capitalism also maintains the gendered separation of the public and private spheres and neglects complex identities (Turner 1993) discussed later in this chapter.

2.2.2 Liberalism Towards the Twenty-first Century

Marshall's commitment to liberty in the context of the dichotomy of public and private spheres continues to find resonance in contemporary thought, particularly in the work of 'neo-classical' liberals following Hayek (1944) and Nozick (1974). In recent times, however, liberalism has also branched away from such individualism, with thinkers like Young (1989) and Kymlicka (1995) developing ever-more sophisticated strands of thought. As theorists continue to strive to formulate the model of citizenship that best serves the diverse identities and emergent problems of today's societies, it is perhaps inevitable that they have begun to amalgamate the most germane values of established traditions. The 'social-liberal' approach advocated by Marshall and Rawls has influenced many contemporary theorists attracted to its treatment of social inequality. However, even as this social-liberalism was gaining momentum, it encountered opposition in the shape of the nascent doctrines of Conservative neo-liberalism and neo-republicanism (Beckett 2006).

Although less influential than their coeval, these new approaches provide useful critiques of social-liberalism. Conservative neo-liberals like Hayek (1944) and Nozick (1974) introduced ideas that were incorporated into the 'New Right' theories adopted by the policies of Thatcher's government (1979–1990). Hayek's critique of social-liberal theory centred on a rejection of social rights in favour of a *laissez faire* approach that did not seek to redress economic inequalities (Beckett 2006). Nozick took Hobbes' notion of the relationship between the state and the individual being similar to that of a master to slaves, to develop the idea of the state as a 'hired protection agency' akin to the notion of power being isolated in the sovereign, but this time with the free market as the sole distributor of resources. Citizenship in these terms is very much in the passive end of the spectrum as there is little compulsion for the citizen to enter into public life. Hayek and Nozick's Conservative neo-liberalism also fomented debates on consumer citizenship to be discussed later on in this chapter.

Another product of the fracturing of liberal theory in the twentieth century was the emergence of those who supported a liberal vision of the state that was not minimal. Kymlicka (1995), while insistent that he was a liberal thinker, championed a differentiated citizenship that upholds not only civil, political and social rights, but group rights also. Kymlicka's 'multicultural citizenship' focused on the recognition of minority groups through three types of rights. Firstly, he advocated the right to self-government by devolution of power to minorities within the state. Secondly, polyethnic rights should be enforced to validate and protect the co-existence of group identities alongside extant legal and financial structures. Thirdly, Kymlicka supported special rights of representation to ensure minorities' participation in the political arena. The first of these rights are clearly the most consequential in that they may lead to the secession of a culture or nation from its governing state, while the other two types aim to integrate difference into the polity.

This design for citizenship clearly has some integrity in the way it boldly addresses the consequences of a liberal form of citizenship 'originally defined by and for white, able-bodied, Christian men' (Kymlicka 1995:174). Kymlicka's analysis also provides a definition of the citizen that appears more grounded in the characteristics of modern societies than those liberal theories that depend upon understandings of societies as culturally homogeneous. However, Kymlicka's other key concepts were less well defined. In particular, the idea of a shared culture that binds a group seems to fall back on normative liberal description of the kind criticised by Berlin (1958). Anti-essentialist thinkers have taken issue with the implication that minorities are in fact homogeneous and that their identities are dependent upon their imperviousness to external influences (Waldron 1999). Indeed, education for citizenship would have little chance of efficacy if so. Present-day proponents of cultural citizenship have also stressed the fluid nature of culture (Stevenson 2003), a definition incongruent with Kymlicka's allocation of 'group' rights. Kymlicka's theory is a significant departure from the liberal concern of the individual's relationship with society – Kymlicka himself asks whether a citizenship based on group membership can be called 'citizenship' at all (1995:1) – and liberal commentators have attacked him on this very point.

I.M. Young (1949–2006) also argued for group rights but she did so as part of what she claimed was a wholesale rejection of liberal citizenship based on pluralist values. Of the three connotations of universality Young identified in liberal thought, she supported only the ideal of universal political participation. She disagreed with what she saw as the 'universal point of view' citizens are forced to adopt at the

expense of the unique contribution that could be derived from 'their particular experience and social position' (Young 1989:274). She therefore found the Kantian pursuit of shared goals misguided and disapproved of any attempt to inculcate common values. The third aspect follows from this; that the decisions that result from this process will have universal application. Young (1989) saw these universalities as upholding equality and adherence to a Rousseauian general will to the detriment of difference.

Young (1989) also provided a convincing critique of the republican dimension of Rousseauian thought that we shall see sought to transcend self-interest to form a universal perspective based on equally valid points of view. She pointed to the simplistic nature of a platform from which all competing views can be appreciated, when what would be a more accurate representation is a tangled web of power relations which serve to propel some views towards the centre and hold others back. Citizens do not start on an equal footing, the 'paradox of democracy' means that some citizens are more 'equal than others' (Young 1989:259) and without differentiation, privilege is perpetuated. Young therefore asserted that means should be established for true representation and recognition of all perspectives of which society is composed, particularly those of the disadvantaged. Institutional practices and resources should therefore be directed to:

- (1) self-organisation of group members so that they gain a sense of collective empowerment and a reflective understanding of their collective experience and interests in the context of the society;
 - (2) voicing a social group's analysis of how social policy proposals affect them, and generating policy proposals themselves ...
 - (3) having veto power regarding specific policies that affect a group directly ...
- (Young 1989:261-262)

Here, Young laid bare some of the main flaws of her argument. Firstly, she admitted that even supposed members of the group may not have a clear idea of the group's priorities, so how is it to be objectively defined as a group? If we accept that the group can subsequently arrive at a consensus on its interests, do we imagine that it will do so more democratically than wider society, taking into account all voices to form the group's voice? It is perhaps more likely that, like Kymlicka's admission that devolution breeds secession, Young's self-governing groups could become microcosms of the government she finds so flawed.

Although adamant that her work was a break from liberalism, we can draw clear parallels with Kymlicka's (1995) account, which he locates firmly within the liberal tradition. Young echoes Kymlicka's sentiments about group rights and, while claiming to provide a transformative perspective, she fails to answer the question identified through Kymlicka's work: what can be said to unite citizens if we reject the idea of a shared culture on normative grounds? Young's brand of pluralism has been attacked for its essentialist treatment of identity that disqualifies citizens from adopting, or lobbying on behalf of, more than one identity and her schema was purely concerned with groups defined by culture. Various contemporary thinkers (Lister 2002; Skeggs 2004; Youdell 2011) highlight the need for other socially dividing factors to be taken into account, not least Nancy Fraser's (2000) class-based analysis that is concerned with recognising *status*, not just potentially stigmatised cultures. Again, this critique reflects Young's failure to engage with multiple issues, and the possibility that some groups may seek both recognition and redistribution. Such theoretical blindspots stemming from some contemporary thinkers' reliance on a liberal understanding of pluralism, as critiqued by Mouffe (1993) later in this chapter, surface in debates on multiculturalism discussed in Chapter Four.

2.2.3 Cultural Citizenship

Proponents of cultural citizenship have sought to engage with contemporary social divisions. Although they critique elements of liberal thought such as Marshall's minimal provision of social rights and Kymlicka's essentialist definition of cultural groups, advocates of cultural citizenship are concerned to contribute to discourse on rights and representation. What characterises theorists who take a cultural approach to citizenship is a level of analysis that eschews normative assumptions. Stevenson (2003), for example, commented that a Marshallian approach to rights cannot be applied to present-day dilemmas of social exclusion, which are more complex than those that centred on the industrialist concerns of a state that operated within a stable national culture, and require a fuller analysis of issues of cultural diversity, identity and globalisation. Willis (1998) suggested that young people, who some accuse of adopting an indifference to public life through consuming the 'wrong culture' (through negatively perceived art forms such as hip hop and street art), have limited access to alternative cultures. These excluded individuals must be given the opportunity to make informed choices and to contribute to, and be critical of, a range of cultures to which they are not currently exposed (Stevenson 2003). This would perhaps empower marginalised citizens to

reclaim the power to define their identities, which may be multiple, and express themselves more publicly as members of whichever cultural, or other, groups they affiliate with.

A view of identity such as Hall's – 'multiple across different, often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and positions' (1996:4) – rather than speaking of a 'true self' that is not a product of culture is perhaps the most helpful way of analysing identity for the study of citizenship. This approach uncovers opportunities for empowerment by acknowledging the power of dominant discourses to construct meaning, as in the polarisation of the *Other* from the accepted norm evident in queer theorists' (Butler 1990; Sedgwick 1990; Hamberstam 1998) analysis of the positioning of homosexual identities to reinforce the superiority of heterosexuality. This view rejects attempts to fix 'essential' identities like a singular black or working class culture as the work of oppressive discourses (Stevenson 2003) and Butler argues that such discourses condemn categories of 'woman', 'class' and 'race' to be 'permanently moot points' (Butler 1990:15). Such 'disembedding of the ways of industrial society and the reinvention of new communal ties and biographies' (Stevenson 2003:30) is said to be growing as class bonds weaken and life is seen more as an 'individual project' (Beck 1992). The counterpart to this in popular culture would be the 'cult of personality' that has grown up around reality television and it has been suggested that the individualistic, privately focused 'project of personality' (White and Hunt 2000:95) or Smart's 'modern cult of the self' (1998:89) may undermine concern for the community, but are identities just another commodity for the consumer citizen to buy into then dispose of?

White and Hunt (2000) argued that the turn towards developing a 'unique self' rather than 'building character', which was the prevailing social trend in the twentieth century as liberal constructions dominated the cultural landscape, was not individualistic because it promoted active citizenship in forming relationships with others in order to be recognised (White and Hunt 2000:95). Stevenson (2003:152) put forward two types of individualism: market individualism – happiness through a consumer's realisation of the good life – and he stressed that economic goods may be symbolic to this effect; and cosmopolitan individualism – being 'true to ourselves' by living as creatively as necessary to realise our true identity. Cosmopolitanism eschews a worldview of 'national exclusivity, dichotomous forms of gendered and racial thinking' (Stevenson 2003:5), it seeks to transgress boundaries to develop inclusive cultural democracy and citizenship while supporting political and institutional structures that have the power to address global concerns. This sense

of ownership of one's attributes is also central to the work of Ahmed (2012), who observed that the concept of diversity may be used by institutions as a form of capital. This kind of commodification of aspects of identity endangers citizens' ability to engage with the social world on their own terms.

Stevenson described culture as being connected with 'dialogic production of meaning and aesthetics through a variety of practices'. He believed that 'the power to name, construct meaning and exert control over the flow of information within contemporary societies is one of today's central structural divisions' (Stevenson 2003:4) and so defined cultural citizenship as 'the contested desire to foster a communicative society' (2003:151). He observed a 'diversified public sphere' that has 'multiple points of engagement and participation' (2003:102) as a characteristic of the globalisation of mass communication media, which have historically negated interaction with one-way delivery of information. The internet and mobile technologies, however, should facilitate greater public involvement. Indeed, 'have your say' or comment features are now commonplace as a way to wrap up the reporting of news stories both on television and the internet, micro-blogging through Twitter is often a primary source for the immediate reaction of public figures to current events and many television documentaries are followed by public debate between journalists, experts and viewers, in online fora.

Whether the information media will become still more interactive remains to be seen but the power of mass media reporting in today's world cannot be denied. The power to reinforce and sensationalise cultural messages, and to re-package complex issues as digestible synopses for mass consumption is significant, and can serve to label and criminalise groups in society (Jones 2011) or to foment anger at government policies. Operating in such an environment, twenty-first century citizenship is perhaps better explained by a cultural approach than the classic liberal understanding. White and Hunt (2000) also argue that republican sentiments for a global age would need to become part of a common education for democratic citizenship, which would surely include learning to critique messages from a variety of sources.

2.2.4 Challenges to the Liberal Account

Chaney (2002) describes cultural citizenship as being transformed by the weakening of the presence of the nation-state amongst a multitude of cultural influences, reducing it to 'a mediator between its citizens and global trends and

markets' (Chaney 2002:132); which include the flood of internet information that defies normalisation and champions the Other. Mass media, mindless consumerism, legislation of traditionally informal relationships, weakening of family and religious ties and the intrusion of the welfare state and of judges into the private realm have all been blamed for undermining liberal citizenship (Crick 1999a). Its proponents, however, defend its relevance to today's societies by pointing to the liberal awareness that the state constantly seeks to expand its power. Liberal constitutionalism seeks to confine that power through public institutions and values, and liberals insist that civil society must support this by 'nurturing an independent citizenry capable of resisting state power grabs, solving problems with minimal intervention' (Schuck 2002:136).

Liberals' thin citizenship of minimal social duty has been attacked, however, on the basis of the sustainability of 'reasonable' civic harmony. Even if traditional inequalities are overcome, research suggests that new battle lines will always be drawn, whether over the rights of minority groups seeking autonomy (Schuck 2002), or even miniscule differences (what Freud (1930) called the 'narcissism of minor differences'): causing fragmented citizenship(s). Some have seen these examples as the expiration of liberal citizenship's relevance (Horowitz and Matthews 1997). As Berlin highlighted, however, liberal accounts of citizenship are at the root of discourses of civil liberties and individual rights, and 'every protest against exploitation and humiliation, against the encroachment of public authority, or the mass hypnosis of custom or organised propaganda, springs from this individualistic, and much disputed, conception of man' (Berlin 1958:159).

The liberal tradition of citizenship has therefore provided the foundation from which the legitimacy of new concerns may be understood although, it might be argued, not adequately addressed. The global spread of capitalism has opened up one such thread of new issues for debate within citizenship theory: the effect of consumer culture. Liberal concerns for a compromise between self-centred desires and civic-minded social duty are seen as falling short of addressing this burgeoning area of debate. As Stevenson (Stevenson 2003:127) stated, 'we need to avoid polarising the debate' about citizenship and consumerism between the belief that consumerism can only serve to undermine citizenship, and that consumerism in fact provides opportunity for new practices of citizenship yet to be appreciated by conventional analysis. Those who find Locke's possessive individualism averse to the true practice of citizenship have claimed that the individualism of consumer culture is diametrically opposed to it, but it has been argued that the two are not

mutually exclusive (Klein 2000). Featherstone (1991) argued that the bohemian notion of treating one's life as a work of art has found a new home in a consumer society. A society that is ordered by mass consumption of trends, however, certainly presents challenges for the promotion of an over-arching culture for citizens to organise around.

For instance, Willis (1998) hypothesises that young members of the working class use consumer culture to escape de-humanised work and their exclusion from 'high' culture. This idea is taken up in Jordan's (1996) sentiments on strategic withdrawal from citizenship. He claims that some groups have adapted to social exclusion by withdrawing from public life, instead 'seeking their own satisfactions strategically using those parts of the formal institutional structure that are advantageous and finding ways around the rules and regulations that limit them' (Jordan 1996:107). Such practices suggest that the rationale of consumer choice may be applied to more fundamental life choices, with a guiding logic of 'what's in it for me?' overriding considerations of wider social benefits of certain policy aims.

Certainly, the ideals of consumerism are not an obvious catalyst for the civic virtue of republican citizenship and with luxury items marketed as desiderata across the social spectrum, competition for luxuries is played out on every level of society. Today's bad citizens are those who have contributed to 'toxic debt' by failing to keep up with the cycle of acquisition of the latest must-haves (Elliot and Lemert 2009). Politicians' and newspaper journalists' reference to 'hard-working families' and talk of public services in terms of their cost for 'the taxpayer' reinforce the idea that citizens' primary contribution is economic (Jensen 2013), but how do we overcome the challenges in promoting non-monetary values in the information society? What kind of citizenship would inspire truly active citizens?

Locke's (1946) conception of the individual who subscribes to rules of citizenship out of self-interested choice offers little hope of a society in which co-operation towards common goals is freely entered into. Kant's (1960) rejection of the view of citizens as rivals insists that human tendencies towards self-interest must be 'de-programmed' but, as Rawls (1972) states, individuals are 'placed at birth' in a social group of a certain level of privilege – more than a mere state of mind – within which they must function. Whilst Rawls' maximin principle seeks to address this state of inequity, he relied on the achievement of a precarious balance whereby members of the least well-off group are content to curb their aspirations of wealth at the point at which their advances start to impact negatively on the fortunes of other groups.

This assumption seems to exhibit an inherent inadequacy for theorising social life in today's European societies. Recent public reaction to cuts in welfare spending, juxtaposed with revelations about the extreme salaries and tax evasion practices of the rich, suggest some would support a redistribution of resources that would impact negatively on some groups. Liberal accounts can also be seen to struggle to challenge negative connotations of capitalist consumerism when they are rooted in T. H. Marshall's vision of rights based on economic citizenship, which is ill equipped to address the experiences of those whose contribution to society cannot be described in economic terms. Fundamentally, liberal approaches to citizenship emanate from a desire to accrue and protect property and a critique of consumer values is therefore more difficult from this position. Although theorists such as Mill sought to promote common values and collective action for the sake of wider benefits, such goals were, for him, dependent upon a Rousseauian chastening of humans' 'lower' nature, which seeks to consume base, 'irrational' pleasures (Berlin 1958:161).

The narrative of consumerism, with its focus on enjoyment over duty (Bauman 1998) can be seen as a threat to the discipline required to win this war between our enlightened and immature selves, championing as it does immediate gratification and status symbols that imply lifestyles of abundance beyond the grasp of all but the rich and famous. A liberal fidelity to negative freedom has too much in common with the individualism of consumerism to challenge its implications effectively. Theorists in the republican tradition therefore draw on positive conceptions of freedom to conclude that the liberal occupation with a compromise of liberty, of 'giving up' a minimum amount of freedom in order to preserve and protect what remains (Berlin 1958), cannot provide meaningful solutions to contemporary social problems. Instead, republican thinkers are concerned with questions of how a culture that sees virtue and value in non-material assets, more conducive to co-operation than competition, can be cultivated.

2.3 Republican Citizenship

The turn away from a conception of liberty dependent on property outlined above undermined the supremacy that liberalism had enjoyed as a basis for citizenship until the twentieth century. Although the legacy of thinkers such as Rousseau continued to be influential, it was the more republican strands of his theory that came to resonate more strongly, leading to a resurgence in support for the republican ideals of public duty, social justice and civic virtue as a foundation for

citizenship (Faulks 2000). The republican model of citizenship is based on a 'thicker', more active role, with citizens encouraged to think and act on behalf of the common good and the state given more power to intervene in citizens' lives. The republican approach is more demanding in terms of what it expects of its citizens but still takes freedom as a central theme.

Rousseau famously proclaimed: 'Man was born free, and he is everywhere in Chains' (Rousseau 1968:11). Rousseau did not want to break the shackles but rather transform them into legitimate bonds that served to confine 'man' to a moral code but otherwise ensured his freedom. Rousseau's is a view that encapsulates that of civic republicans, who argue that civic liberty, seen as freedom to combine self-interest with a sense of duty, is preferable to natural liberty, seen as freedom to pursue self-interest alone. Freedom in republicans' terms is also freedom from the distraction of mankind's base urges that conflict with a morally guided lifestyle. Performing one's civic duty is the most desirable use of this freedom, and the very expectation of participation serves to emancipate the citizen from the threat of an autocratic, tyrannical state (Heater 1999).

Rousseau borrowed from Aristotle when he proposed the idea of the 'general will' to explain how government could strike the balance between protecting citizens' freedom and promoting the values of the republican state. Both believed a mixed constitution of both democratic and aristocratic power to be the best foundation for republican citizenship, with a small-scale city-state or *polis* that would optimise opportunities for participation. In order to work, the civil republic must enjoy civil order amongst its citizens and, moreover, a special communal harmony described by Aristotle as *homonoia*; literally concord in society. Rousseau agreed that 'public fraternity' was vital to the operation of republican citizenship (Rousseau 1968).

There is some doubt in the republican tradition, however, as to whether even a citizenry coaxed into 'fraternal' participation can be trusted to fulfil its civic obligation. Ancient Greeks drew a distinction between the state of idiocy, a natural state of ignorance into which all individuals are born, and the state of citizenship, into which one must be educated. They therefore excluded those who exhibited self-centredness by prioritising private rather than public life. Such a preference was evidence of idiocy and proof that some were not sufficiently enlightened to play a public role (Dagger 2002), and although Rousseau was in favour of republic-wide engagement, he too was circumspect.

How can a blind multitude, which often does not know what it wants, because it seldom knows what is good for it, undertake by itself an enterprise so vast and difficult as a system of legislation? ... The general will is always rightful, but the judgement which guides it is not always enlightened. (Rousseau 1968:II.6)

With the high expectations heaped upon members of the republican citizenry, it is indeed difficult to envisage a society of such ideal citizens, united in their collective motivation and dedication to the common will. It is this problem that has led republican theorists to assert the need for education to engender the judgment, skills and practical knowledge essential for full citizenship (Faulks 2000).

Although republicanism's popularity waned towards the end of the eighteenth century, more recently, republicanism has enjoyed a resurgence of interest, as active citizenship has been posited as a remedy to the failings of the 'thin', passive citizenship that has taken root in much of the West. In particular, lamentations of the decline of electoral participation and social capital (Putnam 2000) have been construed as a desire for republican citizenship, and some republican notions have remained in the public conscious, as evident in the use of the term 'good citizen'. Attributes that have made republican citizenship an attractive theory include its basic proposition that human beings are inherently social beings that should not be expected to live in a disaffected state without the capacity to influence, or be influenced by, others.

In addition to the merits of republican thinking, in many western countries, including the UK and USA, perceived abuse of social welfare, together with despair at a burgeoning 'claim culture' that prizes rights without the counterbalance of responsibilities, has weakened support for liberal citizenship. Today's citizens are, according to Bauman, consumers who believe in an individualised 'right to enjoy, not a duty to suffer' (Bauman 1998:31), and the ensuing competition for luxuries has been identified by some concerned commentators as socially erosive (Jones 2011; Jensen 2013). Such a breakdown of responsibility to others threatens society's *homonoia*, which discourages anti-social behaviour and allows for less state intervention in social order. Republican theory's solutions to such problems have therefore found support in recent social climates, especially with reference to instilling in the young those values thought to be missing in twenty-first century life, through education.

Republicans view citizenship as a form of education, an edifying experience (Dagger 2002). There is, however, a slight disagreement between republicans who favour Rousseau's simple dedication to the community and those who support Mill's (1910a) 'enlightenment', a more sophisticated development of the faculties through engagement. In particular, accusations of paternalism have been levelled at those who seek to direct education and other resources to state-driven ends, which is seen by some as negating the cultivation of free choice and critical thought – which republicans claim is so vital to making more than a passive citizenly contribution (Turner 1993). These differences demonstrate the ways in which the definition of the good citizen may be manipulated for different ends and how this is linked to constructions of freedom. As Berlin explains in his consideration of the 'split-personality' that pervades considerations of positive and negative conceptions of liberty, what type of freedom is prized depends on what is thought to constitute a 'self, a person, a man' (Berlin 1958:163): or a citizen. Therefore, if the definition of a 'good' citizen is manipulated for specific ends, a certain conception of freedom will result.

Republicans' definition of the good citizen through a commitment to the Aristotelian elite of the *polis* conflicts with many thinkers' concept of equity of opportunity for participation. Feminists in particular have found fault with a system that concentrates efforts to involve citizens in the realm of formal politics (Hanisch 1969), an arena already fraught with social divisions which would only be reinforced. The pervasion of ancient connotations of concern for the private sphere as 'opting out' of public life could also be seen as just as limiting as the liberal priority to keep this realm closed off from politics, reinforcing the exclusive legacy of existing structures of formal participation in what Lister (1997) describes as the maintenance of a false public/private dichotomy.

2.3.1 From Republicanism to Communitarianism

As the republican vision of citizenship came to be seen as too narrowly focused on formal political participation to encourage active citizenship across social groups, theorists in the second half of the twentieth century sought to respond by developing new strands of thought that adapted republican values to emerging social problems.

Proponents of neo-republican approaches sought to promote active citizenship that privileged issues of public interest, and to open up the public sphere, much as their

neo-liberal counterparts sought to maintain an ample private realm (Delanty 2000). Encouragement of civic participation was fundamental to this neo-republican goal and advocates such as Arendt (1958), Barber (1984) and Oldfield (1990) aimed at increasing active participation in public life as a way of 'strengthening' democracy (see Chapter Three). Despite their attempts to move republicanism into the twenty-first century, neo-republicans like Oldfield have been attacked for their support for the coercion of wayward citizens into 'civic virtue' (Heater 2004a). The authoritarian overtones of this approach have left it open to the same criticism as that of Rousseau's neglect of individual rights. Neo-republican thinkers have also faced the critique that they are utopian in their vision of the promotion of trust and solidarity and that they misconceive the complexity of conflicts caused by social inequalities and competing identities (Beckett 2006).

Although there are certain continuities between republican and communitarian schools of thought, communitarianism takes the republican commitment to community and public duty in a new direction that does not focus on formal political participation. The precedence of the community over the individual is an idea that has been put to many uses but today's communitarian theorists draw on an approach that was developed in the 1980s and the work of the diffuse approaches of American scholars such as Taylor (1994), Etzioni (1998), MacIntyre (2001), Galston (2005) and Sandel (2007).

Fundamentally, communitarians dispute the polarisation of debate between free market and state intervention approaches. They point to different types of American communities in which anti-social behaviour is more or less prevalent, dependent, they believe, on the strength of communal bonds (Etzioni 1998). Communitarians are motivated by what they see as liberal society's undermining of the values that bind communities together by its emphasis on individual rights. Sandel (2007), for example, criticised Rawls' 'instrumental' construction of community, that is, the coming together of individuals for the sake of furthering their own overlapping interests. For communitarians like Sandel, 'constitutive' community, whereby members' identities are defined through their membership of the community, puts a positive emphasis on the public good, which supersedes individual interests. They therefore seek to redress the balance between rights and responsibilities. Advocates of communitarianism have suggested more or less intrusive remedial action including scaling down social welfare provision and more vigorous promotion of traditional 'family values' amongst citizens (Dwyer 2003).

In asserting the primacy of the community, however, communitarians necessarily reject 'outsiders' and indeed assume that the interests of all members of the community will gel. Bauman (1993) commented that the liberal notion of difference is concerned with individual freedom and communitarian difference is concerned with the group's power to limit individual freedom. This majoritarianism is also a crucial departure from communitarianism's commonality with classic republicanism, as it does not rely on citizens fulfilling their duty to think and act on behalf of the common good.

Communitarians' fondness for a return to traditional values may be seen as a battleground for feminists (Frazer and Lacey 1993) but Young (2000:181) sees their attitude to caring as a 'positive concern' in comparison to liberals' separation of the public from the private. Certainly though, communitarian citizenship does not accommodate multiple identities, instead it assumes that communities are essentially communities of interest, singular in their identity (Etzioni 1994). Delanty argues that community should be understood as social, not moral or cultural, and he calls for a more reflexive approach than what he sees as communitarianism's 'fixed life-world'. (Delanty 2002:160). Nevertheless, there are aspects of communitarianism that appeal to contemporary policy concerns. Taylor's (1994) work on the importance of identity recognition, which relies on discourse between citizens of diverse cultural backgrounds, has practical applications that transcend the communitarian approach's essential neglect to define the nature of citizenship in more than normative terms (Lister 2002). While civic communitarianism promotes civic engagement to build *social capital* (Putnam 2000), a proactive approach that promotes democratic values of trust and solidarity in order to prevent conflict rather than cure it (Delanty 2002). It is these, more progressive, strands that have led to the adoption of the principles of communitarianism by western governments, most notably the New Labour administration in the UK, while support for classical republican values has waned.

Miller (1989) recognised that republicanism's continued relevance depended on adapting to new types of community, whose interests are less homogeneous than the traditional schema but are nevertheless united by a 'common public culture' (Miller 1989:267). Miller's brand of civic republicanism did not necessitate a single moral code, rather he envisaged the formation of 'factional groups on the basis of occupational, leisure and other interests' (1989:272). However, members of these groups must maintain objectivity when participating in public life 'as citizens whose main concerns are fairness between different sections of the community and the

pursuit of common ends' (Miller 1989:284). This required citizens to prioritise their shared identity over individual identities based on group membership: essentially a 'common identification ... at the level at which most major decisions affecting the shape of a society are made' (Miller 1989:235-6); and Miller strongly recommended a national identity as the device by which a common conception of this process can be achieved. 'Statist' approaches such as Miller's face a challenge in a globalised world, as the role of the nation state becomes less clearly defined.

Whatever the outcome, the changes wrought by globalisation certainly pose a threat to understandings of citizenship based around identification with a single national status, and the fixity of its accompanying rights and duties. Habermas (1987) rejected approaches that reduce democracy to the unitary concern of either the state or the communitarian vision of community (Delanty 2002). In his political works, Habermas differentiated between the *lifeworld* and the *system*. The lifeworld encompasses the background resources, contexts and cultural norms that provide the platform for people to develop mutual understanding of their experiences and co-operate to achieve common ends. The system comprises society's various spheres of communicative action, such as markets and bureaucracies, which are defined by the area of interest they serve and structured to achieve their associated goals (Habermas 1987). Analysing society using these terms, Habermas observed a 'de-coupling' of the lifeworld and the system. The lifeworlds of tribal societies, he commented, are almost inseparable from their systems: a tribal society 'reproduces itself as a whole in every single interaction' (Habermas 1987:157). But as societies 'evolve', the development of laws as distinct from morality rationalises the lifeworld, erodes traditional social bonds, and facilitates 'new levels of integration' (Habermas 1987:179), which he believed to be the inevitable outcome of modernity.

Although Habermas approved, to some extent, of this 'post-conventional' morality, he disagreed with Miller in that he advocated a unitary moral code and considered the increased application of systemic reasoning to social life a threat to modern justice (Beckett 2006). He pointed to the conflation of the role of citizens with that of consumers, and the resultant weakening of their ability to oppose capitalism's injustices. Habermas claimed that the lifeworld becomes 'colonised' when the instruments of power and money extend into the private sphere (Outhwaite, 1996:270) and the invasion of these media imputes that authoritarian conventions have been escaped only for society to become *more* restrictive. Consumerism has therefore universalised the role of citizen whilst closing it off from the decision making process. There is little scope for participation or analysis by citizens and

alienation from public discourse in the post-industrial society is accepted, as was the abstraction of labour in industrial society (Fromm 1956). This could be seen as an inevitable result of liberal society, as theorists like Hampton (1986) view the alienation of citizens from their rights as integral to the social contract and part of the Hobbesian goal to isolate power in a single sovereign.

It is ironic then, that Habermas' modernity was in a state of *refeudalisation*, in which the public sphere is controlled by a smaller elite of large and powerful organisations, and only organised private citizens can influence public discourse. These organisations vie for their interests, using the public's exclusion to their advantage by constructing support through manipulated publicity (Habermas 1989). It is precisely this bleak context, however, that Habermas believed offered hope for social action. He saw the encroachment of the system upon the lifeworld as providing opportunities for new social movements to challenge elitist public discourse, and as providing the momentum to reinstate 'discursive democracy' by creating conditions which foment public participation and real influence (1987).

The likelihood of such a consensual uprising, however, might be called into question. One difficulty is the united opposition Habermas saw as a backlash of the 'mediatised' public against the manipulative publicity that controls them by restricting their access to objective sources. But how oppressive can this control be if it does not preclude this? This point is difficult to address as Habermas failed to theorise how power differentials between different groups in society may come into play in their public participation. Indeed, commentators have questioned whether consensus can be reached at all, and whether it is a valid aim in a diverse society (Beckett 2006). Although the potential for *refeudalisation* in a world of new global organisations has garnered some support (Murdock 2010), analysts like Chaney (2002:124) suggest that 'traditional' forms of authoritarian domination represent less of a threat to public life than the 'dissolution of critical engagement by citizens who have been deflected by overriding concerns with everyday normality' and Chaney's critique therefore proposes that the context of contemporary lifeworlds is not conducive to a reinvention of public discourse. The depoliticising of the citizenry Chaney and others (Lee 1993; Sassatelli 2007) have observed results from a perceived degradation of public life, whereby political parties are revealed as preoccupied with appearances, consumerist values are championed and political discourse is trivialised, making a united uprising of the public even less likely. Chaney's work therefore calls for a shift towards radical democratic citizenship, which is the subject of the next section.

The theories of citizenship discussed hitherto certainly raise questions about their capacity to serve as a basis from which to inspire an understanding of citizens as active participants in British society at the beginning of a new millennium. For example, could Rousseau's (1968) 'general will' be applied to an age in which individuals' diverse interests are celebrated? Rousseau theorised about a particular schema for cities and was progressive in his acknowledgement of the power of shifts in society. If we were to consider how his vision might be realised in a society of multiple cultures and sub-cultures, we could of course turn to his conviction that the interests of the state and the individual could be homogenised through formal education; but this may not be a desired means or end.

Kant's (1795) commitment to shared ends and perpetual peace leads him into the same battleground – barbarism versus civilisation – as John Stuart Mill (1910a). While this call for civilisation was driven by a preference for the creation of equals rather than rivals (an elevation similar to Rousseau's process of 'de-naturing'), should we, more than a hundred years on, aim to 'maximise' our civilisation or, since our political and legal processes are still essentially 'adversarial', does rivalry have a part to play? Perhaps Rawls' development of his ideas to accommodate disagreement may have some currency.

Perhaps we should be satisfied with inequalities as long as they pass Marshall's test and do not 'cut too deep'. Differences between groups may not indeed be static but if this is the case then more recent examples of theorists informed by the liberal tradition, such as Kymlicka and Young, may not be able to sustain the idea of groups organising around essential characteristics. The complexity of inequalities and competing identities in contemporary societies has seen theorists turn from republicanism to communitarianism in the pursuit of common values that might bind communities together. Even as communitarian notions of citizenship have fallen out of fashion, theorists like Miller and Habermas have continued to advocate a 'common identification' (Miller 1989) or even a singular moral code (Habermas 1989), supposed to elevate citizens beyond the drudgery and alienation of life in a twenty-first century capitalist society, but is such a consensus achievable or even desirable if the aim is to inspire individuals' active participation in society?

Despite the traditions of thought on citizenship documented in this chapter stretching over centuries, the defining characteristic of continuing debates – the trade-off between the freedoms of the individual and the collective – suggests that this long history may not have set us on a clear path towards an understanding of citizenship that is helpful to the Britain of today.

2.4 Beyond the Liberal and Republican Accounts

Mouffe's (1993) *The Return of the Political* sought to reinvigorate citizenship theory by addressing contemporary debates, particularly between liberals and communitarians. Building on *Hegemony and Socialist strategy* (Laclau and Mouffe 1985), the seminal work of radical democratic citizenship, Mouffe developed the argument that we should not choose a model that predetermines the primacy of the individual or community. Instead, it is this dispute itself that should form the basis of the political (Rasmussen and Brown 2002). Fundamental to the creation of a radical democratic citizenship, Mouffe asserts, is the construction of citizens' identity, as the definition of the citizen is 'intimately linked' to the kind of society to be created. Unlike its theoretical predecessors with their normative claims, radical democratic citizenship opens up every aspect of citizenship to be contested. Anti-essentialist feminists like Butler (1990) and Fraser (2000) use radical democratic theory to support claims that identity categories like 'woman' are political categories (Rasmussen and Brown 2002:184).

By politicising the supposed apolitical, the reflexivity craved by many commentators can be achieved. Laclau (1994) drew on psychoanalytic and post-structuralist theory, especially the concept of 'lack', wherein the subject is characterised by lack, seeking identity in familiar forms of representation that shape but do not determine identity. He suggested that 'the representations available to the subject are contextually contingent upon particular hegemonic formations and are subject to change. Therefore politics is not about defending the intrinsic interests of a political subject but about a struggle to construct subjects, making identity a primary ground for the operation of politics' (Laclau 1994:37). Notions of incomplete citizens ready to be constructed evoke young people in particular. In answer to the question 'what kind of political identity should a project of 'radical and plural democracy' aim at constructing?', Mouffe called for the creation of new identities in the form of 'radical democratic "citizens"' (Mouffe 1992):

The social agent is constructed by a diversity of discourses among which there is no necessary relation but a constant movement of overdetermination and displacement. The "identity" of such a multiple and contradictory subject is therefore always contingent and precarious, temporarily fixed at the intersection of those subject

positions and dependent on specific forms of identification. (Mouffe 1992:1)

Mouffe disagreed with what she saw as Rawls' universalistic account of identity, and his assumption that all citizens will relate to the original position from the same context, on the grounds that the identifications we make over time colour the way we look back to our natural state (Mouffe 1993). Mouffe did however recognise the contribution of liberals like John Stuart Mill to pluralist democracy and therefore the value of liberal accounts' rejection of the notion of a universal common good. This is in keeping with Mouffe's dedication to pluralism, which led her to declare that a *gemeinschaft* community idealised by republicans and communitarians was not compatible with the character of late modern democracy. As she argues in *The Return of the Political*:

The communitarian insistence on a substantive notion of the common good and shared moral values is incompatible with the pluralism that is constitutive of modern democracy and that I consider to be necessary to deepen the democratic revolution and accommodate the multiplicity of present democratic demands. The problems with the liberal construction of the public/private distinction would not be solved by discarding it, but only by reformulating it in a more adequate way. (Mouffe 1993:83)

Indeed, Mouffe also found the liberal view lacking, in that it limits the identity of the citizen to a superficial level of belonging, with no stronger bond than membership of a club (Mouffe 1992). In order to strengthen this bond, Mouffe called for the promotion of a shared language of civil intercourse. Such discourse would hold the political community together without stifling citizens' identities, as common concerns are constantly re-negotiated (Mouffe 1992). Mouffe believed that this approach was the only way of addressing the liberal/republican debate on whether to champion liberty or equality; with the understanding that it is the ongoing nature of this tension that keeps democracy alive.

The alternative is what she called Rawls' 'political philosophy without politics' (Mouffe 2000). Mouffe felt that this would be a reductive discourse that sought to build new foundations for democracy, rather than acknowledging the competing interests already at work and attempting to increase the plurality of new discursive positions. Although she found Rawls' theory of justice to be flawed, Mouffe (2000)

believed it could make a contribution to this struggle against hegemony. In particular, if Rawls' defence of political liberalism could be alloyed with a civic republican approach to participation in a 'community of language' – for Mouffe, the essential ingredient for constructing human identity without deference to essentialist norms – then existing discourses of rights could be augmented by 'a revalorization of the political understood as collective participation in a public sphere where interests are confronted, conflicts resolved, divisions exposed, confrontations staged, and in that way ... liberty secured' (1993:57).

Mouffe picked up on Sandel's (2007) critique of Rawls' conception of community as an exemplar of communitarian clashes with 'Kantian' liberals, and declares that 'two different languages are confronting each other' over the issue of citizenship. Mouffe offered two approaches to this conflict. Firstly, she argued that a liberal, 'negative' conception of liberty was not necessarily incongruous with active citizenship based on civic virtue. A negative premise that promotes individual liberty unencumbered by all but the most minimal restraints can enable the realisation of citizens' chosen goals. Citizens, understanding this premise, would choose to actively participate in government in order to perpetuate the protection of individual liberty, avoiding the oppression of political masters through the cultivation of civic virtues and commitment to the common good. Mouffe saw this marriage of individual freedom and active participation as essential to establishing a radical democratic citizenship. Related to the fostering of a political community appropriate for nurturing this relationship is Mouffe's second consideration of the debate between liberal and communitarian thought: the priority of individual rights over the common good. Mouffe supported the liberal defence of the individual's privilege of living in accordance with her own wishes, without coercion to a particular vision of the good life by the encroaching apparatus of social justice; and saw this absence of a 'substantive common good' as characteristic of modern democracies. Indeed, in Mouffe's Foucauldian view of power, a conception of multiple, untraceable forces acting on the individual, the legitimacy of a substantive common good cannot be established and is an unattainable goal (Mouffe 1993).

Mouffe disagreed with Rawls' progression from his rejection of the substantive common good, however, whereby he asserted the absolute supremacy of rights over the good. She pointed to the communitarian analysis of the provenance of democratic rights as evidence of the achievements of a tradition of human co-operation that must be continued in order to shore up those rights (Taylor 1994). Mouffe also sympathised with communitarian critiques of the Rawlsian *instrumental*

construction of co-operation based on compromise between pre-defined interests. The associated assignment of *values* to the private realm leaves no opportunity for normative concerns to be questioned in the public sphere. Mouffe found that this absence of debate, coupled with liberalism's retreat from guidance on how citizens should exercise their rights, had devalued civic participation around shared concerns, and contributed to weakening social cohesion. She therefore championed communitarian attempts at civic renewal.

Mouffe was not satisfied with the progress of either liberal or republican accounts of political participation, however, as she opposed what she saw as 'a false dichotomy between individual liberty and rights' (Mouffe 1993:65). Instead, Mouffe utilised a conception of mutually reinforcing prerogatives of individual liberty and civic participation to propose a form of citizenship of constructed political identity, rather than an arbitrary status, wherein competing interpretations of democratic principles of equality and liberty continue to be questioned. Mouffe (1993) believed such a form of radical democratic citizenship would allow for an entirely new conception of the citizen, defined by her engagement with the *respublica*. Citizenship is not then merely one of many identities privileged in liberalist society, nor is it the dominant identity as prescribed by civic republicans: it is 'an articulating principle that affects the different subject positions of the social agent ... while allowing for a plurality of specific allegiances and for the respect of individual liberty' (Mouffe 1993:70). As such it describes a common political identity shared by those who, while committed to a set of rules defined by the *respublica*, may be motivated by varying conceptions of the good to engage in a wide range of activities.

Mouffe saw the *respublica* as providing the 'grammar' of citizens' conduct, and its rules as emerging from a new kind of shared understanding between citizens. Taking a radical democratic view of society, members of different social groups will identify diverse examples of dominating forces that threaten liberty and equality in different contexts, and this recognition will empower individuals to transcend their own struggles and share in a radical democratic discourse that connects them to their fellow citizens through the realisation of their common concerns. This conception of co-operation and collective action deviates from liberal views of *alliances* that rely on power negotiations and liberal constructions of the inclusion of hitherto marginalised groups as a steady process of granting equal rights. This narrative of linear progress is 'the typical story as told by T. H. Marshall' but, for Mouffe:

The problem with such an approach is that it ignores the limits imposed on the extension of pluralism by the fact that some existing rights have been constituted on the very exclusion or subordination of the rights of other categories. Those identities must first be deconstructed if several new rights are to be recognised. (Mouffe 1993:70)

Thus, whilst acknowledging the historical contribution of liberal discourse to the advancement of a narrative of rights that excluded groups may now use to articulate their position, Mouffe maintained that a radical re-assessment of citizenship was essential to the struggle for genuine democracy. Mouffe tackled the complexity of social inequalities head-on and saw it as an opportunity to spread a radical understanding of citizenship:

A radical democratic interpretation will emphasize the numerous social relations in which situations of domination exist that must be challenged if the principles of liberty and equality are to apply. It indicates the common recognition by the different groups struggling for an extension and radicalization of democracy that they have a common concern (Mouffe 1993:84)

She goes on to describe the radical democratic approach's view of the common good as a 'vanishing point': 'something to which we must constantly refer when we are acting as citizens, but that can never be reached' (Mouffe 1993:85) Key to this is the 'reformulation' of the division of public and private spheres and Mouffe drew on Oakeshott's (1975) conception of *societas* to re-imagine this binary. In a *societas*, the inter-dependency of public and private realms is recognised and every social act is recognised as having an impact on both realms and thus exposing the tension between them. Mouffe applied this overview to her concept of the citizen as a social agent:

The distinction between private (individual liberty) and public (*respublica*) is maintained, as is the distinction between individual and citizen, but they do not correspond to discrete separate spheres. We cannot say: here end my duties as a citizen and begins my freedom as an individual. Those two identities exist in a permanent tension that can never be reconciled. But this is precisely the tension between liberty and equality that characterises modern democracy. It

is the very life of such a regime and any attempt to bring about a perfect harmony, to realise a 'true' democracy, can only lead to its destruction. This is why a project of radical and plural democracy recognises the impossibility of the complete realisation of democracy and the final achievement of the political community. Its aim is to use the symbolic resources of the liberal democratic tradition to struggle for the deepening of the democratic revolution, knowing that it is a never-ending process. (Mouffe 1993:72)

While Mouffe acknowledged the utility of established liberal institutions and values, her belief that achieving universal 'rational' consensus was impossible led her to contend that a preoccupation with this goal had 'put democratic thinking on the wrong track' (2005:3), whereby the essence of political questions – choosing between opposite paths where there is no middle ground – is denied on the basis of faith in rationality. Mouffe argues that liberals' use of the individual as their 'ultimate point of reference' constitutes a 'methodological individualism' (2005:11) that is incapable of considering collective identities; rather it assumes grudging co-operation between self-interested individuals (2002). Moreover, Mouffe illustrates the complexity of forces that coalesce and influence the individual to act in irrational ways with the example of choosing to cast a vote: voting behaviour would surely be much easier to predict if people merely acted in defence of their interests (Mouffe 2005).

In these ways, Mouffe exposed what she saw as the limits of the liberal conception of consensus. The 'wrong track' is, for her, paved with market concepts, which lead to an instrumental rendering of the political world in economic terms (Mouffe 2005). She argued that liberals who have become conscious of this paradigm have attempted to re-focus on a kind of applied morality, what Mouffe calls 'communicative rationality' – rather than 'instrumental rationality' – 'which aims at rational moral consensus' (2005:13) through the power of deliberation. Whether economic or ethical, however, Mouffe finds the pursuit of rational consensus fundamentally flawed.

Mouffe (2005:5) saw the portrayal of the political in moral terms as a notable contemporary phenomenon, with valid political alternatives increasingly presented as a choice between 'good and evil'. In these terms, a political opponent is cast as an enemy to be destroyed, rather than engaged with as, in Mouffe's preferred term, an adversary. According to her understanding of agonism between adversaries,

opponents should be pitted against each other in a way that recognises the power of collective identities in political confrontation and tames unproductive antagonism, rather than those 'passions' – denigrated by liberals intent on our evolution towards rational individualism – that stir people into action. This 'agonistic pluralism', Mouffe (2002:8) argues, offers a method for engaging with issues within a political framework, going against the twenty-first century proclivity towards a form of specialisation that constructs social problems as technical matters in need of expert attention (but, ultimately, puzzles designed to be 'solved').

The current tendency towards consensus, incorporating a disdain for confrontation, is blamed by Mouffe (2002) for creating apathy and a general lack of interest in formal participation in politics. This is of concern as the 'passions' that may be a fundamental motivating factor for citizens' engagement become marginalised as institutions and processes are seen as fixed and excluding of radical contributions, when, Mouffe would argue, the precarious and contingent nature of any social order is best served – indeed driven – by a citizenry interested in a constant process of change to secure better representation of diverse groups of citizens. The liberal view of tessellating interests seems naïve in comparison. Following Gallie (1956), ongoing disputes over its essence serve to further understandings of the essentially contested concept of citizenship.

A radical democratic approach to citizenship does then provide a compelling alternative to those theories that have been woven in to the fabric of British society over the centuries. A strength of this approach, moreover, is its refusal to sweep away the present context in favour of some utopian starting point: its admission that 'the terrain in which hegemonic interventions take place is always the outcome of previous hegemonic practices and that it is never a neutral one' (2005:34). Such sophistication of analysis underlies a convincing critique that ultimately provides hope, as Mouffe declares:

... the problem with our societies is not their proclaimed ideals but the fact that those ideals are not put into practice (2005:32)

Youdell's (2011) work is concerned with putting an agonistic model into practice. She considered schools to be sites where conflict between teachers and learners, as well as those conflicts that take place within the learner exposed to a range of ideas, play out. Youdell (2011:104) identified the agonism Mouffe advocated as 'fundamentally passionate' and went so far as to suggest that without these

passions, we risk a descent into a dystopic future. Invoking the stark fantasy worlds of science fiction, Youdell's (2011:105) work aims to move beyond the 'rational' basis associated with liberalism to acknowledge what lies at the heart of understandings of 'political passivity' across the theoretical spectrum: those elusive 'passions' that spur citizens to actively participate. Youdell was critical of attempts to 'tame' these passions by locating them within the individual, however, as she maintains it is the process of impassioned, adversarial dialogue that offers the creative spaces in which any element or value of citizenship might be critiqued.

Drawing on concepts from critical race theory, Youdell (2011) problematised efforts to enact social change that characterise social problems as requiring the closing of 'gaps'. For example, the difference between the education outcomes of the most privileged and most disadvantaged social groups, conceived as a gap that might be incrementally reduced, constructs this concern in a mould that:

'... eclipse[s] the ways in which education's business as usual constitutes and limits what counts as valid knowledge, valuable culture, acceptable behaviour, thinkable ideas, acknowledgeable feelings, and 'who' counts as a valuable, legitimate and worthwhile teacher, student, learner and person. And in eclipsing these processes it also eclipses the gross exclusions, erasures and denials that they have a part in.'
(Youdell 2011:34)

Youdell therefore sought to uncover the possibilities of radical politics in education, which would be attentive to shifting forms of knowledge through a continual endeavour to open up spaces for the active expression of new subjectivities, rather than attempting to usurp one set of 'correct knowledges' with another (Youdell 2011:35). Youdell saw the consideration of rival theories for participation in public life as an invitation to re-imagine the practices of society's institutions such as education. She notes, for example, queer pedagogy's contribution to a re-imagining of the positioning of the Other as a 'genuine interlocutor' in a process of learning that 'insists on the centrality of recognition of the suffering of Others and our implicatedness in this' (Youdell 2011:142). Youdell also invoked critical pedagogues such as Giroux (2006) to demonstrate how a radical imaginary might be realised in Foucauldian 'heterotopias', which she described as not only a utopian model for an agonistic future politics but 'a multiplicity of real counter-spaces in the present' (Youdell 2011:142). Youdell's work offers a glimpse of what a radical imaginary might look like in the context of a learning environment:

It is a semi-formal space that is physically accessible, welcoming and comfortable; it is a space of listening, exploration and openness; it is a space of dialogue where consensus and disagreement are both important, where uncomfortable truths are spoken and where the intolerable is named and responded to; it is a space where there is time for and interest in children and young people's lives, ideas, experiences, feelings, imaginings and hopes; it is a space where trust circulates; it is a space where feelings of all sorts, whether thought through and translated into the language of emotions or in the form of flowing affective intensities, are not simply allowed but are acknowledged as a vital part of living and learning; it is a space where both engagement and disconnection are valid and where participation is elective; it is a space that is interdisciplinary, where learning moves from children and young people's pressing concerns, where teachers map connections to existing knowledges as well as the gaps in this, and where the possibility of new ways of knowing and new knowledges is real; it is a space where identifications and subjectivities are heard, explored and offered recognition, even as this recognition includes critical interrogation and problematization; it is a space where tests, performance indicators, league tables and the terrors these bring with them are insignificant; it is a space that is recognized as being deeply political and deeply significant. (Youdell 2011:144)

Drawing on Youdell, we can see how radical democratic practices might take Mouffe's agonistic pluralism forward at the micro level and, by moving beyond satisfaction with recognition in favour of possibilities for transformation through education, how these micro practices might serve to unsettle wider political practices. Youdell's suggestion that a radical approach must be 'constantly on the move' (Youdell 2011:33), in order to evade appropriation by dominant practices that seek to essentialise the revolutionary, captures the spirit of Mouffe's (1993) radical imaginary. Youdell credits the work of critical pedagogy as exploring possibilities of dissensus and these educational applications will be examined in the next chapter.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has suggested that citizenship is an area of social theory upon which it is perhaps impossible to reach consensus. Although the core issues to be engaged with have altered little over time – with the extent of rights and responsibilities, the

size of the state's role and how we structure society for the greater good while nurturing new contexts and identities constantly recurring – each of these considerations raise more points of contestation. The schools of thought considered above each take a position on the *extent* of citizenship, especially the idea of individuals' enjoyment of a universal, socially equal status in a context of economic inequality. The *depth* of such a conception of citizenship is also a matter of debate, never more so than in the current culture of seeking to accommodate complex identities and ensure equality of representation and participation. Most significantly, it is argued, the issue of *content* – what should be expected of citizens in terms of their responsibilities to their fellow citizens and the state and what kinds of rights they should expect in return – is potentially the most crucial aspect of any model of citizenship, in that it defines the role of the state, the individual in society, and the way in which citizens can come together to create a better society for all. This issue has been explored through conceptions of *active* citizenship.

The theme of how we reach agreement on what is just and how we co-operate to achieve common goals in a changing climate, across actual and perceived borders, and in contexts of cultural differences and conflicts, recurs in foundational theories of citizenship. Some theorists aver that we should strive for an ideal that accommodates disparate needs whereas others prefer to work within the scope determined by a 'general will'. A radical approach eschews consensus as a goal on the basis that there is no 'proper balance' of rights and responsibilities that would serve a society in perpetuity – and so the quest for a conclusive position in that regard, and the pursuit of the perfect tessellation or overlapping of citizens' goals, miss the point that it is the inherent ongoing struggle that realises the practice of active citizenship. Whichever conception is favoured, the question arises as to how we propose to enable individuals in society to act as citizens in accordance with that conception. How do we build and maintain a culture that reinforces the role of citizens? Most commentators support the use of education to this end but, again depending on whether an active or passive approach is favoured, there is dispute about whether this should take the form of simple knowledge transfer or a more formative experience.

That people enter into society on different social footings is undisputed but the preceding debate demonstrates the conflict of views on how and whether such inequalities should be minimised. If we are merely to 'knock the edges off' the worst deprivations, how do we decide what these are? Indeed, can such measures ever work to elevate people out of 'natural' self-interest to take a broader perspective of

the value of their contribution to society and become 'active citizens', or is it preferable simply to extend individuals' freedom to take a passive role? Questions of this kind have been taken on by theorists of citizenship education, many of whom take Marshall's civil, social and political elements as a starting point, but embroider them with a more defined reciprocity between rights and responsibilities in acknowledgement of the need for an active model of citizenship that befits democratic expectations. Thinkers such as Crick (1999a) have extolled the enlightenment benefits of education *and* experience, echoing the sentiments of Rousseau. On these terms, citizenship clearly needs to be interwoven across public and private spheres, and messages relayed in the classroom need to be reinforced in citizens' interactions with each other and with the agencies of the state in everyday life. How this can be managed on such a scale when the very concept of citizenship is a combination of so many points of contestation is the challenge faced in delivering a coherent programme of citizenship education.

A radical democratic approach to citizenship, as proposed by Mouffe (1993), might serve as both a way to discuss citizenship theory's foundational concepts through agonistic pluralism and to explore practices of active citizenship through a radical imaginary. Youdell (2011) suggests the creation of counter-spaces in schools through critical pedagogy might be transformational for both young people's participation in their education and the future of active citizenship. In order to examine the possibilities for citizenship education in England (Chapter Four) and analyse the experiences of teachers and pupils (chapters Six and Seven), the next chapter looks in depth at how theories have influenced citizenship education.

Chapter Three: Theories, Models and Practices of Active Citizenship

3.1 Introduction

Following Chapter Two's review of theories of citizenship, this chapter will look at how active citizenship might be cultivated through theories, models and practices of education. Three influential strands of theoretical thought on education for democratic citizenship – Rousseau's civic republicanism, Mill's participative learning and the reconstructive education of Dewey and Barber – are presented in the first part of the chapter. The second part explores the translation of theory to the classroom by looking at a selection of models of citizenship education, its role in broader discourse and its place in capitalist society. The third part turns to the practices of critical pedagogy, which have been credited with enabling the principles of active citizenship to be put into practice.

Whenever a programme of citizenship education is instigated, it is introduced into a particular culture. It was amid the shifting political climate of 1997, as the New Labour government took over from eighteen years of Conservative rule, that the Advisory Group for Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools, led by Sir Bernard Crick (hereafter: the Crick group), was asked to revitalise the debate on citizenship in the UK. The Crick group was given the dual tasks of establishing a working definition of citizenship education and making recommendations on how the subject could be approached in schools (Kerr 2003). Crick and his colleagues were by no means starting from scratch in addressing these tasks. In addition to the wealth of theories of citizenship described in the previous chapter, many theorists have turned their attention to the specific concerns of education for democratic citizenship. Elements of these different theoretical positions can also be found in the various forms of citizenship education taught around the world, many with a long history reflecting their national identities. This chapter examines these theoretical positions and examples of existing models to provide a basis for understanding the type of citizenship education that was introduced to the UK, which is the subject of the next chapter.

The role of different political traditions in privileging the use of particular theories of education to guide policy and practice is crucial to understanding a central function of a national education system. The idea of *reproducing* society through state-

controlled education is the source of much critique of theories of education, and has been expanded upon by Bourdieu, who saw even a seemingly autonomous school system as serving a function of reproducing social structures:

It is precisely its relative autonomy that enables the traditional educational system to make a specific contribution towards reproducing the structure of class relations, since it need only obey its own rules in order to obey, additionally, the external imperatives defining its function of legitimating the established order... (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990:199)

The idea of reproduction therefore suggests that the political culture and historical contingencies that inform *what* is taught in a country's state schools also govern the ways in which particular disciplines are perceived, in terms of *why* they are priorities for the education of citizens in that society and *how* they should be identified as such through a mix of content and pedagogy. Each discipline then earns its place on the curriculum by contributing to the school's 'function' as defined by those 'external imperatives'.

An awareness of the theoretical positions that have influenced the priorities inherent in definitions of, and practical approaches to, education for citizenship, helps to explain how particular models of education for citizenship have come to prominence amongst the myriad possibilities that could be constructed from the general theories of citizenship detailed in Chapter Two. The purpose of this chapter is therefore to describe how theories of education for democratic citizenship might have informed the construction of citizenship to be taught in schools. The first part of the chapter discusses some of the theoretical positions that have influenced discourse on citizenship education. The second part provides some examples of how such positions have been translated into models for citizenship education. The role of broader policy discourse is then considered and it is suggested that a function of citizenship education, alongside other policy instruments, is its potential to address social problems through the fostering of a sense of personal responsibility that might govern citizens' behaviour as well as shoring up the state's legitimacy as the active participation of citizens is seen to strengthen democracy. The potential for critical pedagogy to nurture this active participation is then discussed. This discussion raises questions of how the political, defined by Mouffe in last chapter as collective public participation where democracy is strengthened by agonistic debate, might come into play in the teaching and learning of active citizenship. This

discussion demonstrates how a nation's political culture and historical contingencies shape its construction of citizenship in schools. This point is then taken up in Chapter Four's examination of the English model of citizenship education.

3.2 Influential Theories of Citizenship Education

This section discusses the work of a selection of theorists who advocated forms of education for *active* citizenship. These are conceptions at what has been called the 'maximal' end of the scale of participation (McLaughlin 1992). Researchers such as Kerr (2001) and Hahn (1999) have observed that models drawing on the length of this scale can be found across the world. It is maximal interpretations with which this chapter is concerned, however, in anticipation of the discussion of active citizenship in English schools and in recognition that, as the second part of this chapter illustrates, there is considerable scope for variation *within* maximal approaches.

3.2.1 Rousseau's Civic Republican Model

As discussed in Chapter Two, much of Rousseau's work was concerned with the tension between the freedom of the individual to act autonomously and the need for co-operation in society (Dawe 1970). Rousseau's numerous meditations on education for citizenship sought to address this conflict on the basis that citizens must be encouraged to consider social issues in terms of the public interest, forgoing their individual interests and allegiances. This required the learning of a specific citizenship discourse. Rousseau was an advocate of active citizenship in the form of citizens' genuine involvement in matters of the law and their contribution to an ongoing deliberative process. This form of active citizenship demands knowledge of how to participate and the skills to do so. 'It is not enough to say the citizens, *be good*; they must be taught to do so', Rousseau (2004) claimed. He was therefore a proponent of a form of civic education that centred on the development of character, alongside laws and civic religion, to produce citizens of virtue.

Civic virtue is at the heart of civic republican theories of education, which see the need for education as underpinned by the assumption that capacity for citizenship is not an innate quality, rather it must be developed and inculcated. Processes of socialisation must therefore help citizens transcend 'weak and short-sighted' (Oldfield 1990:151) human nature through a continuing educative process and the state must take on a formative role to guide citizens' choices and ensure they are

made in deference to civic virtue. The inclusion of a moral aspect in education for citizenship is therefore crucial for civic republicans. Following Rousseau's strand of thought, the aim should not be simply to inform young people *about* citizenship so that they have knowledge of rights and wrongs in their culture, but to encourage the practice of 'good' citizenship through the creation of an appropriate moral character. In the words of Oldfield (1990:164), such a character 'does not generate itself; it has to be authoritatively inculcated'. A moral discourse is then internalised and a particular *type* of citizen is produced who can locate her choices and values within this discourse, with virtue an integral part of her conduct.

In order to truly demonstrate this internalisation, it is not enough to simply know the 'right' answers to moral dilemmas, rather *good character* must be shown through knowledge, desire to do good and practical action. Key to this demonstration of virtue is the discussion of controversial issues. Civic republicans contend that a moral component of citizenship education based merely on 'civic principles' fails to lay the foundations for constructive dialogue. It is argued that young people lack the skills for meaningful debate and would be stranded in a superficial process of detached reasoning, applying concepts without fully appreciating them, if the necessary moral framework is not installed in them first (Peterson 2011). From this standpoint, skills for critical thought cannot be isolated from understandings of values but guided by an inculcated underpinning that ensures personal and public values are interwoven.

Rousseauian ideas of character education therefore demand an inner morality that must be constructed and reinforced in a wider forum than a specialised school discipline. The practice of citizenship must extend beyond the classroom, into young people's experiences throughout their schooling and everyday life; and this requires coherence with the messages they receive through the range of formative processes and structures that impact upon them. Rousseau used the example of *Émile* to demonstrate his belief that a child's surroundings beyond school represented a corrupting threat, as different interests vied to reproduce themselves in the young (Rousseau 1979). He therefore advocated the isolation of pupils from existing political bias for their learning of democratic discourse. It is a contention of Rousseau's critics, however, that such a discourse cannot be made meaningful unless related to the extant structures of society (Parry 2003). This is a particular concern of Barber, as we shall see later on.

3.2.2 Mill's Participative Learning

As discussed in Chapter Two, Mill's concern for citizenship had much in common with Rousseau's, though his primary subject was individual liberty. He saw it as the state's role to compel parents to educate their children but his support for diversity in education and disdain for the 'mould' (Mill 1910a:199) of state-controlled schools led him to uphold parents' right to choose from a range of schooling options. Mill's priority for education was the encouragement of independent judgement. Key to this was the ability to criticise tradition and bias but criticism was not enough for Mill: the citizen had to be prepared to exercise her social and political duties, and this required a particular character. The same developmental process that saw Mill himself 'begin the formation of my character anew' (Mill 1958:118) was necessary for the fulfilment of active citizenship.

For Mill, political education was an art rather than a science:

What we require to be taught on that subject, is to be our own teachers. It is a subject on which we have no masters to follow; each must explore for himself, and exercise an independent judgement (Mill 1984:244).

The implication here is that learning itself should be *active*. Mill's example was that of ancient Athens, where citizens literally entered the political arena and learned about power by experiencing it. Though Mill saw politics as an allegory for a school, however, he was aware that modern power structures precluded the uneducated from entering politics. He was therefore keen to see state institutions incorporate practices of experiential learning by providing fora for debate and practical citizenship through local government, voluntary organisations and trade associations (Parry 2003). Only through this level of participation could citizens develop enlightened understandings of politics and society because education alone produces skills detached from action, basic tools that must be sharpened through use. It was Mill's view that neither knowledge nor morality could be learned without being practiced.

Whether education is structured in a way in which a learner might practise such 'unled' learning, however, has been a matter of considerable debate. The next section discusses Dewey's (1916) and Barber's (1984) arguments for greater emphasis on the social environment in which education takes place. How classroom

environments might operate without 'masters' is then explored in section 3.4's discussion of critical pedagogy.

3.2.3 The Reconstructive Education of Dewey and Barber

The idea of experiential learning was taken forward by John Dewey. He suggested that, although education formed character, both 'mental' and 'moral', educational activities do not take place in a vacuum and diffuse learning opportunities inherent in interactions with the social world should be utilised (Dewey 1916:72). Formation of character was then a process of reconstruction in response to social experiences.

Dewey was perplexed by 'biological' and 'cultural' accounts of development that advocate repetitive, 'retrospective' educational processes that stifled innovation and favoured the immediacy of individual and collective problem-solving. He defined education as "that reconstruction or reorganisation of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (Dewey 1916:76). Reconstruction was fundamental to Dewey's thinking on democracy and education because he believed that the structure of discrete disciplines that underpinned conventional education systems did not resonate with the dynamic relationship between the citizen and society. Dewey also questioned the role of the teacher as controller of the learning environment and found the management techniques teachers are trained in to be anathema to a dynamic, edifying experience. Similarly, he sought to reconstruct political and social structures, institutions, processes and practices on a permanent basis by subjecting them to citizens' challenges and deliberations on social justice (Dewey 1916).

Some claim Dewey's anti-foundationalism offers educative possibilities that are beyond traditional education systems (Rorty 1992). On the other hand, it is argued that continuous deliberation may pose a threat to the assurances and rights society has long stood for (Bennett 1998). A reconstructive analysis, however has proved an attractive critique for theorists of education for citizenship (Parker 1996; Hansen 2006). Benjamin Barber (1984) also made links to the radical reconstruction of political and educational systems. He suggested that contemporary political systems of representative democracy lack any sense of immediacy and seem remote from citizens, which engenders apathy among the electorate, most obvious in low levels of participation in voting. Barber (1984:272) believed, however, that people are 'apathetic because they are powerless, not powerless because they are apathetic'.

There is therefore little incentive for citizens to become politically active within this system of removed power.

Barber therefore proposed a 'strong democracy': a 'self-governing community of citizens who are united less by homogeneous interests than by civic education' (Barber 1984:117). For Barber, this would involve pioneering forms of political action at local and national levels, including the democratisation of everyday interactions between citizens and institutions, which would teach the public the skills of critical deliberation. The concept of *civic empathy* is also important for Barber. Related to *civic listening*, which, along with civic speaking, constitutes republican conceptions of deliberation (Peterson 2011); civic empathy allows citizens to understand others' points of view. Citizens could then use their experience and skills to achieve a common purpose. To this end, Barber sees compulsory and higher education as part of an ongoing process. He agreed with Dewey that the specialisation of established school disciplines is inimical to reconstructive efforts. Instead, he argued that it should be acknowledged that knowledge is 'socially constructed ... conditioned and thus conditional' and only if a consensus was a product of 'an undominated discourse to which all have equal access' (Barber 1984:214) could it be considered a democratic, and therefore accurate, representation of such constructed knowledge.

Barber was concerned, however, about the effects of *cognitive dissonance* that may result if a school is successful in establishing a democratic discourse that is not reinforced by its environment. It is this practicality of controlling a panoply of influences on citizens that critics of Rousseau find problematic in his efforts to enable children to transcend the corrupting effects of their surroundings (Parry 2003). As the isolation from the outside world that could be achieved by Émile's private tutor is not possible as a model for mass state education, educationalists must instead look to reconstructive approaches to the relationship between schools, their communities and wider society to ameliorate this dissonance.

3.3 Translating Theories of Citizenship Education to the Classroom

The power of education to combat dissonance by democratising society, rather than reproducing inequalities, is of course central to its theoretical popularity. Feminist theorists, for example, have used deconstructive and reconstructive approaches to discuss inequalities in education, arguing that normative labels be problematised

and made political (Butler 1990; Lister 1997). hooks' (2003) position on education is concerned with the role of neo-liberalism in advancing consumerism and the polarisation of social classes. She argued that consumerist culture encourages greed and competition amongst young people, for whom consumption is a more validated symbol of status than education. hooks (2003:43) advocated a focus on education's purpose of 'renewing the vitality of life', to see learning as less bound up by indoctrination or 'readiness' for economic citizenship and more a never-ending process that has intrinsic validity. Such a form of education, to which all would have equal access, is part of hooks' (2000:79) 'democratic vision of prosperity', where consumerist greed is abandoned in favour of the sharing of resources.

Skeggs' (2004) analysis of neo-liberalism emphasises the role of class in constructing discourse on educational reforms. For her, the pupil that is the subject of this discourse is middle class and endowed with cultural capital that will allow a young person to negotiate their future economic role once she has completed her learning, which consolidates her ability to make appropriate life choices. Working class pupils are characterised as *lacking* this necessary capital and objectified in the discourse as an Other. This can be seen in the recognisable stereotypes of 'chavs', a separate, consumerist underclass on whom education is wasted (Jones 2011). When such labels are applied to young people, a perceived lack of non-material aspiration as well as lack of matured character leads to a bleak projection of their future as citizens. Some recent research is beginning to deconstruct popular narratives around young people (Nolas 2011; Allen and Mendick 2013), and this study seeks to add to that literature.

More familiar critiques of a host of social policies at the turn of the twenty-first century, however, have centred on the use of techniques of guidance and coercion from theories of education to control the wider citizenry. Commonly referred to in the UK as the 'nanny state', strategies for achieving outcomes through influencing citizens' choices, often through 'nudges' rather than laws or policies, rely on cross-sector approaches for their success. A 'nudge' is an instance of 'choice architecture', whereby individuals' choices are influenced by the manner in which options are presented to them (Sunstein and Thaler 2008). This approach relies on a susceptibility to incentivised persuasion related to behavioural economics, rather than an ability to make rational economic choices. Creating citizens that will be responsive to nudges is therefore a key step in applying these techniques.

Thinkers such as Furedi (2003), Pykett (2007), Back (2002), Szasz (1998) and Chandler (2000) have observed educative tendencies in broader social policies and Hunter (1996) coined the term the 'pedagogical state' to describe the cultures of coercion built up around a spectrum of formative to reformative interventions. This shows the complex relationship between a mix of contextual factors, cultural and historical, that defines the place of education for citizenship within a state education and within society. The following section expands on this crucial consideration by drawing on some examples of permutations of education for citizenship in different cultural contexts. These vignettes might help us to understand how the relatively late implementation of a citizenship education agenda in the UK came about, which is the subject of the following chapter.

3.3.1 Models of Education for Democratic Citizenship

The latter part of the twentieth century saw previously authoritarian states in Europe and Asia adopt democratic values along with capitalist economic policies and this political repositioning demanded a realignment of the expectations citizen and state had of one another (Frazer 1999), providing fertile ground for the growth of citizenship education. Other nations have a long established citizen culture. France's republican tradition has utilised citizenship education in a process of assimilating young people into citizenship and the French way of life and the USA has a longstanding commitment to civic education through the totems of the constitution and swearing allegiance to the flag.

Aside from democratic forms of citizenship, it is worth noting that civic education has been used as a tool for the promotion of alternative ideologies. For example, education was a key tool in achieving the communist ideal in the USSR, with Lenin himself personally involved in educational reform as a means of supporting political aims. Counts (1975) points out that in the era of the Cold War, even textbooks for use by primary school teachers did not mince their words, as: 'the pupils of the Soviet school must realise that the feeling of Soviet patriotism is saturated with irreconcilable hatred towards the enemies of socialist society' (Counts 1975:55). Indeed, to Marxists, apolitical education would be a contradiction in terms and civic education was referred to as the 'third front' of the revolution. In Nazi Germany, considerable pressure to join the Nazi Party was strategically exerted on members of the teaching profession, with curricula overhauled and textbook publishers controlled to ensure the reflection of Party values. Subjects such as history and biology were rewritten to emphasise the role of race as an explanatory factor and

provide justification for the superiority of the *self* and hatred of the threatening *Other*. It has also been argued that ideological 'teachings' associated with the Hitler Youth movement amounted to an extreme form of citizenship education (Haynes 2009).

In the case of the USA, since the Founding Fathers, the idea of raising children to have a strong sense of republican civic morality has permeated American social and political culture. Such virtues were perceived to be threatened by the huge social change witnessed in the nineteenth century, when industrialisation, immigration and democratisation transformed citizenship in the United States, with the ensuing urbanisation of the population blamed for eroding the sense of community built up around rural settlements. This shifting landscape brought with it new priorities for education and unsettled preconceived notions of civil, political and social participation. It was during the era of Progressivism preceding the First World War that the concept of civic virtue was revived, with education a central concern. From the nineteenth century right through the twentieth, the themes of liberty and national destiny featured heavily in what became the civics curriculum, a subject that included both teaching from specialist textbooks and the use of patriotic ceremonies. The Pledge of Allegiance to the American national flag taken up by schools at the turn of the century was altered to include reference to god and make explicit allegiance to 'the United States of America' during the Cold War: an example of citizenship practice responding to its political context (Heater 2004b).

Steady progress was made in what was termed the *social studies* curriculum in the first half of the twentieth century, heavily influenced by some of the ideas of Dewey, who believed that it was the teacher's task to identify pupils' strengths and turn them to use for 'what they are capable of in the way of social service' (Dewey 1929). In one of Dewey's lines of thought that is reminiscent of Mill, Dewey sought to develop children's faculties to the end that they would grow into adults capable of engaging in democratic society and performing their civic duties. It was this element of 'character' in Dewey's thought, rather than his ideas of reconstruction, which found resonance in a society mindful of the ramifications of revolutionising education. The social studies agenda did not seek to create a generation of radical thinkers, merely citizens equipped to competently fulfil their role (Jorgensen 2012).

In the late 1950s, however, focus shifted to scientific endeavours and the resulting neglect of social studies was evinced by surveys in the early 1970s that found political literacy among schoolchildren to be alarmingly low (Lister 1994). What

remained of the civics agenda was observed to be inconsistently taught and poorly supported. This decline in citizenship education coincided with the beginning of the 'bowling alone' phenomenon explored by Putnam (2000), with America's vast economic expansion and increasing consumer culture widely regarded as responsible for the 'breakdown of community' and rise in pernicious 'selfishness'. Putnam's conception of social capital moves beyond Bourdieu's (1986) use to suggest positive promotion of social capital to combat this 'breakdown'. In Putnam's view, it is a locality's effective accumulation of social capital that brings the gains of an efficient economy and the achievement of citizen participation. In effect, an increase in social capital would address the various social problems that had caused social decline and manifested in citizens' retreat from public life (Siisinen 2000). In this sense, Putnam's is a functionalist argument for encouraging participation, but the nostalgic undertones of *Bowling Alone* nevertheless touched a nerve about the personal effects of a loss of 'community spirit'.

This led to much soul-searching and the launch of a national campaign to promote consistency in the teaching of civic education so as to cultivate and inform enquiring minds that would be stimulated by community action. Despite this, the progress of active citizenship education has been stifled by a pervading tendency towards uncritical patriotism and purely economic approaches to citizenship. This has been seen as a legacy of the 'civics' approach, which Johnson and Morris (2010:15) differentiate from citizenship by its focus on 'the provision of information about formal public institutions'. Citizenship education in the US has experienced unparalleled support from politicians and practitioners but this is perhaps the reason it has been so vulnerable to political and social change (Faulks 2006).

French citizenship education has traditionally been largely concerned with cultivating patriotism, with the imparting of information about institutions and nationalistic interpretations of history therefore prioritised over critical thought. Pre-Second World War French textbooks have even been said to have circumvented any mention of alternative political structures or lines of thought, denying the reader the tools to make a comparison or criticism of the French status quo (Faulks 2006). The convention of regarding schools as didactic, strongly hierarchical institutions pervaded into the 1970s, with little softening of the formal relationship between teachers and pupils despite progressive calls for increased democratisation. There was strong opposition to the teaching of civic responsibility as historically this has been seen as the preserve of family life (Brubaker 1992).

Political opinion has therefore often served to stifle the promotion of civic engagement despite the French legacy of republican citizenship. French Republican values of equality, democracy, rights and duties continue to be taught, however, and in 1998 efforts were made to 'improve living together and good citizenship at school' (NFER 2002). This new initiative has been linked to concerns about xenophobia and the challenges of multiculturalism debated on both sides of the Channel. This new focus included a new charter for every school, which defined the rights and responsibilities of all members of the school community and was to be signed by teachers, pupils and parents. By the time French young people reach the end of their compulsory education, they will have experienced discretely delivered civic, legal and social education, reflecting the importance the government places on its citizens having a knowledge of the law and the legal system. Syllabuses are also designed to enable students to draw on their learning to debate social issues of the day according to the themes of 'citizenship and civility/incivility', 'citizenship and integration/exclusion', which comprises issues of nationality, 'citizenship, the law and relationships at work' and 'citizenship and changes to family life', before considering practical applications of citizenship and in a 'changing world' in their final years of secondary school (NFER 2002).

Although the French model of citizenship education was re-visited by policy makers at much the same time as the implementation of the English model discussed in the following chapter, to address many of the same concerns, the French tradition of *liberté, égalité, fraternité* would appear to lend a more nurturing environment to a cohesive strategy for citizenship education. The French model has always emphasised the democratic importance of community, local democracy and formal political organisations, and sought to renew its commitment to these principles in the face of declining participation that led some to fear a European experience of *Bowling Alone*. In contrasting the French approach to active citizenship with English practice, Osler and Starkey give the example of a learning resource that reflects 'the French Republic's central task of promoting justice' through active participation:

The book's cover shows young people involved in a demonstration, and there are a further nine photographs of demonstrations and strikes, all presented positively. Active citizenship is linked explicitly to demonstrations, political party membership, and participating in strike action. Striking is described as "one of the great social achievements of workers, it is recognised by the Constitution." (Osler and Starkey 2009:343)

These historical examples illustrate the importance of understanding the context into which citizenship education is introduced in order to appreciate the aims of such a contested area of educational policy and the particular social problems for which it is a supposed remedy. As can be seen in the cases of France and the USA, the definition of democratic values, whether through three core principles inscribed on all public buildings or a two-hundred year-old constitution, can provide a useful blueprint for citizenship education. Once a tradition of educating citizens is established, emergent needs of society can then be responded to.

Perhaps the greatest potential threat to active citizenship is the pandemic of political disengagement, or apathy, that has been perceived to have taken hold across established European democracies, whose lacklustre election turnouts and sliding indicators of social and political engagement suggest declining levels of participation mirroring those recorded in the USA (Crouch 2004; Boyce 1993). Although some research has suggested that measures of disengagement use a narrow definition of the political (Roker et al. 1999), young people's alienation from formal participation is largely accepted as a problem in countries like the UK. This phenomenon has been described as 'democratic deficit', whereby the shrinking relevance of politics to the everyday lives of citizens in stable democracies – who perceive political and economic problems as either not having a direct impact on their way of life or not surmountable by their involvement in political process – leads citizens to take a minimal role in democracy and erodes civic culture. This democratic deficit has been accompanied by claims of a proliferation of xenophobic views, particularly among the young, and it has been suggested that cohort effects may have produced a younger generation predisposed to disaffection as a result of a combination of such factors (Sturman et al. 2012). While it is widely agreed that this is a problem that must be tackled in the interests of upholding democratic values and for the sake of offering young people the inherent benefits of being fully informed, and fully formed, citizens, it has also come to be acknowledged that there is a clear correlation between educational attainment and political engagement and association (NFER 2010), suggesting education for citizenship may serve to complement existing educational agendas.

The school itself has also been imprinted with the role of a microcosm of society, reflecting the desired pluralism and inclusive cohesion of the world outside by bringing together members of disparate groups to work together with the shared values of the institution. It may therefore seem intuitive that schools are the best place to learn about citizenship. An abundance of research suggests, however, that

political identity and participation is strongly affected by social and familial networks as well as mass media (Roker et al. 1999; Sturman et al. 2012). Notwithstanding the significance of influences outside formal education, concerns over citizens' disengagement from public life has seen a renewed focus on education for democratic citizenship in many post-industrial societies including the UK (Ruitenberg 2007).

3.3.2 The Place of Citizenship Education in Broader Discourse

The ambition of creating active citizens through state education relies on the delivery of practices at the micro level that faithfully reflect the intentions of policy. The nature of the school system means that, while national curricula, frameworks, standards and inspections may come and go, it is usually a lone teacher in a classroom with a group of young people (whose presence is ensured by law and convention more than a desire to develop certain dispositions), who is entrusted to deliver key messages in a coherent yet even-handed manner. As a government's flagship policy, the remoteness of those agents who are key to its success is a concern for policy makers. It must be conceded that there is an element of freedom given to those who are charged with making 'not arbitrary choices but, rather, political choices with political consequences' (Westheimer and Kahne 2004:237), in their construction of society and what it is to be a citizen. Even though teachers are expected to produce detailed planning and are subject to the regular inspections of both their immediate colleagues and an independent body, responding to ad hoc situations is a fundamental part of their job. They are therefore trained in the art of managing the unpredicted, and the pedagogical state, in turn, seeks to mitigate the effects of any unplanned learning by controlling the discourse that envelops the education system.

As we shall see in the following chapter, the Secretary of State for Education and Employment who introduced compulsory citizenship education to England, David Blunkett, was a proponent of policies that used technical or technological means of maintaining social order that have been described as part of a *culture of control* (Garland 2001). Questions have been raised as to whether such technological initiatives reflect democratic values, particularly considering corporate interests in 'social sorting', the threat to civil liberties in an era of 'exceptional measures' (Agamben 2005) and the growing culture of risk management that has spread to governance. Nevertheless, the goal of asserting control over potential conflicts has been observed to drive policy initiatives that emphasise the dangers of the 'risk

society' (Jans 2004). In Mill's vision of democracy, he saw the extension of the franchise to all classes as engendering a cultural stagnation that would stunt morality, taste and intellect but Marx's analysis suggested that the progressive element of capitalism threatened traditional communities, despite its inherent cultural degradation and subordination of the masses to exploitative conditions (Turner 1986).

3.3.3 Citizenship Education in a Capitalist Society

While not a typical Marxist, the principal architect of English citizenship education, Bernard Crick, drew on Orwell's (1941) account, which 'was deadly serious in arguing that capitalism, faced with a largely literate and free electorate, could only by means of cultural debasement maintain a class system so grossly unequal and inequitable' (Crick 2000). Crick would therefore have endorsed Habermas' description of a public 'mediatised' by manipulated publicity (Habermas 1987), though not necessarily share his view that this would ultimately lead to a united revolt. We might ask, therefore, why does capitalism need citizenship? The answer lies in the assumptions that underlie capitalist values. Post-industrial society has been seen to expand the definition of the citizen from the particular to the universal, in acknowledgement of the economic contribution of previously excluded groups. Women, for example, were not included in the citizenry as they were regarded as agents of the natural, rather than social, world, 'concerned with the reproduction of men rather than with the reproduction of culture' (Turner 1986:134). With the erosion of hierarchies necessary for open market competition came increased individual freedoms. This led to two paradoxes in contemporary social citizenship.

Firstly, the very rights that have been afforded the citizen as a result of free market culture have been used as the context for critique of capitalism through the welfare state. The rise of citizenship has, therefore, compromised the supremacy of profit and the grip of hierarchical authoritarian control (Turner 1986). The second paradox comes in the form of Arendt's critique of the development of human rights. The tension inherent in safeguarding any kind of rights, Arendt asserts, is that states were not to be trusted to restrain their own power or to act in their citizens' best interests without privileging some groups over others – that is, after all, why we enshrine rights in legislation. Yet the enforcement of these rights is left in the hands of these unreliable, if not wholly corrupt, states (Arendt 1951). Taken together, these two ironies provide an account of capitalism's effect on citizenship. The question is then raised as to how a capitalist government, which is not concerned

with achieving a solution to all society's problems or taking action which may upset the social order, might instead use citizenship as a basis for addressing particular concerns it regards as fundamental to the functioning of democracy. As Habermas suggests, however, a precarious balance must be struck to ensure against the uprising of a mediatised public, were it to become aware of its manipulation (Habermas 1987).

The term *educational democracy* has been used to describe the tension between state-imposed national curricula and the freedom of schools to set their own priorities (Davies 2000). The tense relationship between the individual and the state is replicated in this question of autonomy versus centralised control and the dependence upon the intermediary education agencies that have proliferated in the UK has been called into question. Hirst and Khilnani (1996) criticise the appropriation of a scientific vernacular to lend authority to the 'professionalisation' of education and the accompanying power given to public bodies like Ofsted and the QCDA (closed down by the coalition government in March 2012), arguing that:

... under the guise of "administrative modernism" and claims to greater efficiency and accountability, subjects which fell properly within the domain of political control and public scrutiny have been entrusted to 'experts' supposedly more competent to make decisions... the past two decades have witnessed the rise of a new form of 'quasi-government' composed of unelected and weakly accountable bodies who have been granted considerable powers. (Hirst and Khilnani 1996:3)

But if this system has served to regulate British education for the purposes of conventional subjects, why should it become controversial when applied to citizenship education? Unlike long standing statutory subjects, education for citizenship is vulnerable to distortion from its curricular aims due to its contested nature and 'light touch' openness to interpretation. It should also not be forgotten that it was introduced as a part of wide ranging initiatives aimed at changing citizens' behaviour, and seeks to promote certain character traits over others to this end. Policies designed to exert social control of this kind have been deconstructed using a Foucauldian analysis (Gray 2003; Lianos 2003). Such critiques posit the constitution of the individual as subject, whereby she takes on the role of subject and learns to internalise the duty to meet the concomitant expectations. Though the school environment hopefully does not resemble a Panopticon, citizenship

education could be seen as a policy instrument through which certain values are instilled in the consciousness of a particularly malleable subject; a child in a traditionally submissive position in relation to the authority of the teacher. This theme is explored in greater depth in from Chapter Six onwards.

Citizenship education is an example of a policy instrument whose delivery will be atomised by the nature of its universal dissemination and so depend on intermediary agents – school senior leadership teams, heads of subject and classroom teachers – to appropriately construe policy objectives (Lianos 2003). This, as Westheimer and Kahne (2004:238) point out, involves *political* choices with *political* consequences, as ‘decisions educators make when designing and researching these programs often influence politically important outcomes regarding the ways that students understand the strengths and weaknesses of our society and the ways that they should act as citizens in a democracy’. These decisions are crucial when considered in light of the expansive spectrum of political perspectives discussed in the previous chapter. It is, therefore, a great burden of responsibility that rests with citizenship teachers to ensure that a balance of views is represented. They must strive to avoid prejudice in their presentation of social groups whilst being unafraid to explore controversial issues and guarding against the proffering of defensive ‘counter-ideologies’ (Arendt 1951).

It is therefore important to situate citizenship education within its broader societal context to understand how it might be used to address particular social problems. In the UK, the language of choice is used to nudge citizens to act on a sense of personal responsibility (Pykett 2007). Formative interventions like citizenship education then seek to promote the need to choose wisely among the diversity of freedoms afforded to citizens in a capitalist society. Citizenship education is therefore concerned with fostering the knowledge and skills required for citizens to make an active contribution to society. In turn, the cultivation of these critical, active citizens is seen to strengthen democracy.

3.4 Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy’s focus on how different forms of teaching and learning might cultivate critical thought and action of the kind sought by proponents of active citizenship suggest that this radical tradition, pioneered by Paulo Freire, may have something to offer analyses of how theories and models of citizenship have been related to the classroom context.

Advocates of critical pedagogy have made a provocative contribution to the debate on the power held by teachers. Critical thinker Eric Fromm (1964) commented that domination transforms people into 'things', the 'essential quality of life – freedom' is sapped from those subject to such domination, rendering them inanimate beings. While this form of overt oppression would surely not feature in a recommended teaching style in any contemporary classroom, Fromm contends that a learner's freedom must be absolute:

... freedom to create and to construct, to wonder and to venture.
Such freedom requires that the individual be active and responsible,
not a slave or a well-fed cog in the machine (Fromm 1964 cited in
Freire 1970)

It is in accounts such as Fromm's, which equate the subjects of education systems driven by the values of the existing order with automatons, that we can see the value of some of the more transformative and revolutionary ideals of citizenship theorists discussed in Chapter Two. Writing about educational revolutionaries, Paulo Freire (translation, 1970:28) argued that, to increase public awareness, 'we must make oppression even more real by adding to the consciousness of oppression the infamy which at the same time has to be made more infamous'. This call to arms is reminiscent of Habermas' (1987) vision of the uprising of a mediatised public. Indeed critical pedagogy, pioneered by Freire's Marxist approach, is rooted in the critical theories of the Frankfurt school, including Habermas' (Johnson and Morris 2010). For Freire, didactic teaching methods were a means by which oppressive power structures could colonise what Habermas would call the lifeworld and thus dispossess the subject of the tools necessary for his 'consciousness of oppression'. Like Habermas, Freire sees revolution as the only solution and he saw a fundamental shift in power as the prerequisite for authentic participation. A revolutionary's conviction in the need for a tipping point, which allows the public to glimpse beyond its mediatisation and inspires it to put its capitalist freedoms to use for the sake of discursive democracy, is one that we can recognise in the work of Habermas (1987), Freire (1970) and Crick (2001). Unlike Crick, however, Freire's meditations on education revolve around the relationship between teacher and learner. Freire believed a truly participatory model for education must be *co-intentional*.

Teachers and students ... co-intent on reality, are both Subjects,
not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby coming to

know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge. As they attain this knowledge of reality through common reflection and action, they discover themselves as its permanent re-creators. (Freire 1970:44)

Importantly, as the spirit of revolution suggests, Freire called for a fundamental shift in the established dynamics of formalised teaching and learning and he warned that this new dialogue could only be achieved through upsetting traditional power relationships: these could not be disassembled piece by piece, nor could a truly revolutionary teacher adopt the methods of what he called the 'banking' approach to education with the intention of introducing a new order as a later part in the process. Freire was a key influence on hooks' (2003) rejection of economic models of learning. It was his belief that, if participation in a school environment were to be a model of participation in society, a structure based on teachers 'depositing' knowledge in pupils rendered passive receptacles, would be an undesirable model. When a teacher adopts the role of 'narrator', Freire argued, her ownership of the narrative dooms her pupils to *receiving* and storing their learning, ready for its later conversion to the currency of examination grades: this is a one-way transaction between the teacher and the taught, which does not require *communication* or *co-production* (Freire 1970).

Drawing on Freire, Henry Giroux's (2011) work is concerned with the multiple social impacts of this one-way relationship and he draws parallels with subordination in the corporate world and the stark choice between fear and security reminiscent of Hobbes' (1973) *Leviathan*. Education for citizenship under such a dominating force would be little more than agreeing terms of surrender. A far more desirable and fitting introduction to citizenship through schooling, Freire contended, would be to realise the opportunity for learners to truly reflect upon, and become active participants in, their learning. This is the critical pedagogues' conception of *praxis*, and it is the means by which they see citizens becoming empowered to transform their society (Freire 1970). In order to be such an agent of change, however, one must have engaged in a transformative education. Freire was adamant that a model of education that constitutes learners as essentially lacking, devoid of knowledge, thus reinforcing their position as opposite, in need of narration from, the teacher, could not succeed in providing an education for active citizenship. The only possible result of such a model would be the perpetuation of existing knowledge (Freire 1970).

Crucially, critical pedagogy introduces the spirit of debates in citizenship theory to the context of education precisely because its focus is the dynamics of the teaching relationship, in that dialogue is necessary for the development of critical consciousness, rather than a preoccupation with subject content. Giroux argues that this is especially important in contemporary neoliberal cultures like that of the UK, where, he asserts, 'teaching and learning are removed from the discourse of democracy and civic culture' (Giroux 2011:83). We might see this as the difference between *education* and *schooling*, in the way that Youdell describes it as a series of practices that *school*:

... the ways that particular identities are made and given bounded meanings within and beyond schools; the dynamic between how schools recognize or cannot recognize students and students' own identifications and the practices that flow from this dynamic; the way that the minutiae of everyday life in school is implicated in framing and constraining 'who' a student can be, even when this is nothing more than a simple look... (Youdell 2011:8).

In this understanding, determining what is left out of a curriculum may be even more illuminating than what is included. Sociologists of education have, for many decades now, been researching the ways in which the operations of a school serves to privilege certain identities and practices and marginalise others. On a broader scale, they are concerned with investigating how the processes of education systems, from policy to practice, serve to exclude certain groups from engagement with formal education (Youdell 2011). The idea of national education was famously problematised by W.E.B. Du Bois (1973), who observed that:

... education of youth becomes a preparation not for one common national life but for the life of a particular class or group; and yet the tendency is to regard as real national education only the training for that group which assumes to represent the nation because of its power and privilege, and despite the fact it is usually a small numerical minority in the nation. (Du Bois 1973)

After engaging with the many perspectives of theorists of citizenship, the revelations of Du Bois and subsequent sociologists of education could represent a disheartening setback but critical pedagogues offer hope of transforming education from the instrumental 'delivery' of approved knowledge to the student-consumers

who are encouraged to compete to out-perform their peers – what Stephen Ball (2003) calls the ‘terrors of performativity’ – to a more participatory and collegial model that is inclusive of diversity. Invoking Ball, Youdell sought to put the gravity of the implications of the former scenario beyond dispute when she claimed that education policies that ‘embed neo-liberal forms of governance and transform the public sector into a commodity and the public into individualized consumers are shifting what education is and what it means’ (Youdell 2011:14). Youdell contended that such forms of policy served not only to reproduce, but to essentially create inequalities in education and the subjection of students to categorisation by hierarchies. She saw these policy effects as having consequences ‘that reach far beyond the school and are a key reason why education is political and why it is a site of political struggle’ (Youdell 2011:14).

There are obvious neo-Marxist undertones of a critique of an education system that has come to be based on market values through the ‘professionalisation’ of teaching and an instrumental attitude to learning. This tension is best described by the question of whether education is a private right or a public good (Giroux 2011). Peter McLaren’s (1995) analysis, however, demonstrates the depth of potential in critical pedagogy, perhaps galvanised by his own flexibility in turning from a critical postmodern approach to greater engagement with Marxist thought. McLaren described pedagogy as the process through which teachers and learners ‘negotiate and produce meaning’ (McLaren 1995:34), as well as methods of representation of the self and others. The strength of critical pedagogy, McLaren (1995:34) attested, is its exposure of the ‘partisan nature of learning and struggle’, providing the dots to connect knowledge to power with a view to setting the scene for the struggle for greater social justice. A vision for this struggle is essential for critical pedagogy’s key contribution to society: embedding democratic practice as a means for social change, rather than installing democracy in a particular classroom context as an end. In McLaren’s terms, critical pedagogy’s fundamental strength is this provision of an alternative view of education that eschews any notion that schooling takes place in an apolitical vacuum so that, though it may represent a strong base for arguing for a particular model of education, its role in exposing the adversarial wrangles between advocates of different models is most highly valued (McLaren 1995).

Youdell (2011) used this appreciation of the power struggles behind educational models to highlight key features of the English context, which she identified as:

... the mandated National Curriculum; organizational approaches including 'ability' groupings; accountability mechanisms, targets and performance indicators; an audit culture and its inspection regimes; particular teaching and learning approaches, some mandated and some heavily promoted; the requirement for all lessons to be heavily documented; a demand for approaches to school activities, from school leadership to 'behaviour management' and promoting health and 'wellbeing', to be based on approved forms of 'evidence'; and required ways of working with other agencies from across sectors (Youdell 2011:13)

Here, Youdell outlines many of the sources of teachers' chagrin, which has seen their unions petition the government with growing frequency in recent years. Perhaps the least controversial, most accepted area of stringency in education (in England and a majority of other countries) is the notion of bounded knowledge within subjects, which fundamentally structures students' movement through their school day according to whether it is time to assemble in the science lab or the humanities block, and to direct their thoughts to the norms and routine practices of the appropriate discipline (Bernstein 1973). McLaren (1995:31) saw this categorisation in the same light as Youdell's other examples, as characteristic of a model based on 'ideologically coded' forms of knowledge, which are translated into commodities of a particular value. Giroux's work takes issue with any use of common-sense or taken-for-granted reasoning for not engaging in dialogue about any aspect of schooling and argues that the skills children require to become active citizens go hand-in-hand with the ability to call into question 'any pedagogy that refuses to name the political interests that shape its own project' (Giroux 2011:63). Such refusal is elemental to what Freire (1970) called the 'culture of silence' that upholds the existing order.

A more honest pedagogy would acknowledge the 'cultural and political baggage [educators] bring to each educational encounter', Giroux (2011:75) argued. Drawing on Giroux, we can see how awareness of such positioning can be transformed into a strength as a 'theoretical resource' (Giroux 2011:75), whereby the teacher allows her teaching to be informed by those (dis/)connections between the classroom and the wider world. Central to this approach is an understanding of the ongoing nature of debates about the relationship between pedagogy and the political as part of Giroux's call for a revitalisation of the language of civic discourse, through which a radical democratic project that is 'constantly in dialogue with its own assumptions'

(Giroux 2011:74) might gather pace both in classrooms and in public life. Giroux is conscious of the familiar foe that may lurk wherever critical pedagogy is conceived as pushing in a particular direction – that certain practices, identifications, values or interests are being privileged – but the constant dialogue modifies the course rather than leaving it on autopilot once plotted.

This continuous checking on the democratic orientation of education could be seen as a challenge to operating a national curriculum but it is a challenge a Mouffean approach might rise to, as Giroux (2011) implies when he cites Mouffe's preference for a 'democratic matrix', whereby democratic practices become embedded in an expanding diversity of social relations. As Mouffe (2002) contends, we would then be equipped not only to defend democracy but also to deepen it. Perhaps Giroux's greatest sympathy for a Mouffean approach lies in his rejection of common-sense confections and connections between complex, discrete concepts such as civil freedoms and market freedoms, the assumptions of which an adversarial approach would require to be opened up, unpicked and debated in detail. Indeed, while Giroux was aware of accusations that such attention to detail, namely critical pedagogy's focus on the subjectivity of the individual student, has detracted from ideas of collective struggle, he and his colleague Peter McLaren remained optimistic that this transparency will see critical pedagogues at the forefront of the construction of what Laclau and Mouffe would call a 'radical imaginary' (McLaren and Giroux 1995:34).

Giroux saw a radical approach as essential to debunking educational practices like Freire's description of 'banking', which he traces back to Gramsci's work on socialism. Gramsci (1916) described how a conservative culture was preserved in the act of rote learning, where the student is 'viewed as a mere container in which to pour and conserve empirical data or brute disconnected facts which he will have to subsequently pigeonhole in his brain' for no greater purpose than that the most able students will be equipped with the tools to 'almost raise a barrier between themselves and others' (Gramsci 1916, cited in Giroux 2011:55) by virtue of their greater store of these units of knowledge with no apparent narrative to link them together. Giroux is critical of what he sees as the appropriation of Gramsci's thought by conservative theorists seeking a veil for partisan approaches to education that in fact favour a banking model that upholds the status quo of championing the accrual of private assets. This kind of appropriation may be of interest in examining English citizenship education, which was brought into being by the seemingly radical academic Bernard Crick and the all-party group he chaired

with the aim of assuaging fears the emerging curriculum might be partisan or even that it might be 'political'. As Ruitenberg observes in her consideration of the education of political adversaries:

[t]eaching students how many seats are in Congress or the House of Commons is one thing, but teaching them how power differences are not an accidental but rather a constitutive force in the practices and institutions that are called "society" is often seen as too "political." Paulo Freire's (1985/2001) response to such concerns is that there is no extra-hegemonic or extra-political place for education, that "education has politicity, the quality of being political. ... Because education is politicity, it is never neutral. When we try to be neutral ... we support the dominant ideology" (Ruitenberg 2007:148).

In this passage, Ruitenberg and Freire's analyses make a powerfully simple point: education, as a function of the state, is inescapably imbued with political significance, and we are more likely to do harm than good by ignoring its political nature through a culture of silence that results in uncritical students unable to resist the steer of veiled ideology within and beyond their education. We might therefore envisage a Mouffeian citizenship education that agrees with the Gramscian assertion that the struggles that negotiate pedagogy are essential to the meaning of active citizenship and cannot be abstracted from it for the purpose of studying definitions of citizenship in isolation. Rather, citizenship education's fundamental purpose of empowering agents of social change should be realised in the cultivation of skills and knowledge to enable the learner to govern, not just be governed. As a companion to Mouffe's vision, Giroux's (2011) attention to Gramsci's thought is useful for his analysis of cultural hegemony and the role of common sense, which may be a seductive trope for teachers charged with tackling material outside the 'comfort zone' of their strongly bounded subjects. Mouffe's agonistic approach then comes into play as an alternative to didactic classroom methods, or indeed structured debates that may generate an unhelpful view of democratic practices. As Mouffe explained:

Envisaged from the point of view of 'agonistic pluralism,' the aim of democratic politics is to construct the 'them' in such a way that it is no longer perceived as an enemy to be destroyed, but as an 'adversary,' that is, somebody whose ideas we combat but whose

right to defend those ideas we do not put into question. (Mouffe 2000: 101-102)

Although Mouffe did not directly address formal education, this depiction strongly suggests a need to educate citizens in the art of disagreement and to understand political opposition as debate between adversaries rather than conflict between moral enemies. Ruitenberg (2007), too was concerned with this distinction, and she made the important point that an adversary is neither a moral enemy nor a competitor. The latter, she suggested, might be the common perception based on conventional classroom debating exercises as well as party political rhetoric. This observation of the pervasive language of competition returns us to the earlier discussion of the conflation of educational and economic values. Drawing on Ruitenberg, we might see a Mouffean approach to classroom debate that values this democratic process without seeking to decimate the opposition. The easy win of spin doctor rhetoric and logical fallacy would have no place in a forum where all assumptions are to be questioned

Furthermore, Giroux maintained that a crucial strength of critical pedagogy is its all-encompassing level of analysis, which embraces both critiques of 'common sense' and the broader concerns of 'post-Marxists' such as Mouffe, encompassing forces of social control beyond the classroom, reaching into it from afar (Giroux 2011). Ideas of critical pedagogy then, move the education for citizenship debate on from the relatively unsophisticated acknowledgement of teachers' quandary of making political choices with political consequences (Westheimer and Kahne 2004), to much more profound questions of empowerment through education as a political act.

Johnson and Morris' work (2010) makes a helpful distinction between the more political nature of critical pedagogy and the largely apolitical basis of critical thinking. Their review of the literature on critical thinking found that it was commonly regarded as a 'theoretic science' (Johnson and Morris 2010:4), removed from the passions of moral or ideological judgements. The capacity for critical thinking to transform into critical action is seen as limited by its political neutrality and the deeper reflection engendered by critical pedagogy is then invoked as the art of accessing critical consciousness (Johnson and Morris 2010). The boundary between critical thinking and critical pedagogy therefore represents a significant frontier for the design of a curriculum for active citizenship, in that it raises the question of how critical, or political, pupils are desired to be.

In particular, the teacher's role in cultivating critical consciousness has been seen as threatened by the 'professionalisation' that Freire argued has resulted in teachers becoming 'just the specialist[s] in transferring knowledge' (Freire and Shor 1987:8). Concomitantly, the idea that *rigour* might be fixed and measurable is disputed by critical pedagogues like Freire and Shor (1987), who argue that rigour is achieved through a commitment to rigorous thought, rather than by holding up an atomised piece of knowledge to some universal test. The UK's recent education reforms led by the then education secretary Michael Gove seem to rest on the latter definition of rigour but if there is room in the National Curriculum for another understanding, citizenship education's light touch might provide an alternative space.

A significant strength of critical pedagogues' approaches is their basis in educational practice. Kumashiro (2004), for example, drew on his considerable experience as an educator to propose techniques of anti-oppressive teaching. He suggested the practice of discussing a lesson's strengths and weaknesses with learners as productive for a number of disciplines and levels of schooling and reflected on his own experiences of being educated by pupils whose contributions challenged his teaching by uncovering contradictions between his democratic approach and hidden messages that might infiltrate the content of lessons when his own critical thought lapsed.

Kumashiro's (2004) candid reflections alert us to the struggle inherent in critical pedagogy and, perhaps, the limits of its idealism. Lefstein (2006) argued that pupils' mandatory attendance, teachers' professional obligations, and the fundamental difference in the distribution of resources between the two, results in an imbalance of power that requires a more pragmatic approach than critical pedagogy's ideal. Idealism, of course, is not incompatible with citizenship theory but the degree to which idealism might be allowed to inform pedagogy in one subject without having (unintended or unwanted) consequences for other subjects and school practices may prove contentious. It is perhaps more likely that the flow of pedagogy between subjects will be from the tide of established disciplines towards the relatively nascent school practice of citizenship, as Chapter Six will examine in detail.

Bowers (1987:129) was also concerned with unintended consequences of critical pedagogy when he contested that the critical reflection necessary for Freirian emancipatory dialogue 'shifts the locus of authority from that of community and tradition to the individual who unifies thought and action in a new praxis'. A close

reading of Freire confirms that his work does not support the location of authority in an individual learner in this way – that he would not consider this to be rigorous (Freire and Shor 1987) – but Bower’s perception of the possibility of this outcome may be valid.

More fundamentally, critical pedagogy has been attacked on ideological grounds, in that its Marxist roots consign theorists and practitioners to a preoccupation with class that marginalises consideration of characteristics such as race, gender, sexual orientation (Burbules and Berk 1999) – and indeed an intersectional analysis that might yield insights into how the experience of more than one form of oppression affects learners. The anti-essentialist approaches to radical democracy discussed in Chapter Two (Rasmussen and Brown 2002) might therefore complement the spirit of critical pedagogy by contending that racial, gender and sexual orientation categories are political categories alongside (and intersecting with) class identities. Mouffe’s (1993) approach to Pateman’s feminist critique of social contract theorists, for example, upheld her analysis of the liberal construction of citizens as essentially male but found fault with Pateman’s attempt to counter this through constructing a female counterpart as it drew on the same brand of essentialism. This is an example of the dynamism that can be achieved through the constant dialogue advocated by both Mouffe’s radical democratic citizenship and critical pedagogy.

As we shall see in Chapter Four’s discussion of the Crick Report (1998), some of the goals of critical pedagogy were mirrored by the aims of the citizenship curriculum for England. Although it has been pointed out that critical pedagogy is now a diverse field (McLaren 2003), DeLeon (2006) has identified the essential goals of critical pedagogy as the pursuit of social justice and the use of education to foster social change and empower learners. In the context of English citizenship education to be explored in the next chapter, the final goal of critical pedagogy DeLeon identified is more contentious – that of ‘viewing education as a political act’ (DeLeon 2006:2). Burbules and Berk (1999:55) have teased out an important distinction between critical thought and critical pedagogy: ‘Critical thinking’s claim is, at heart, to teach how to think critically, not how to think politically; for critical pedagogy, this is a false distinction’. Critical pedagogy might therefore challenge followers of the theories discussed earlier in this chapter to consider just *how* critical they would wish pupils to be and whether they lean towards the teaching of critical thought for its benefits in the application of rationality and production of logical conclusions (Doddington 2008) or for its political possibilities.

3.5 Conclusion

The application of critical pedagogy to the practice of citizenship education raises some challenging questions in light of the civic republican model of citizenship education discussed at the beginning of this chapter. Civic republicans' view of young people as essentially lacking those values and skills that ought to be instilled in them in order for them to actively participate in their education and in society is a point of disagreement with a critical pedagogy that seeks to engage learners on the same level as their educators. Civic republicans' conviction that citizens' personal and public roles should be interwoven is, however, compatible with critical pedagogy. It could even be argued that a Rousseauian commitment to citizens' moral character demands a more radical approach than a Freirean pedagogy as its distrust in formal education is based on a belief that it cannot compete with the corrupting influences of the outside world. Mill's (1910a) answer was for learners to be independent and practice the art of the political, whereas Dewey (1916) and Barber (1984) found that such freedom would only be possible if we could deconstruct learning practices to represent the dynamism of active citizenship. This discussion is important for the next chapter's consideration of those ideas that fed into the citizenship curriculum for England.

This chapter's consideration of the various ways in which theory, practice and emerging concerns can contribute to the construction of a model for active citizenship education, demonstrates that the introduction of a citizenship curriculum to schools represents an opportunity to *create* the citizenship – and the citizen – that best serves the unique strengths and challenges faced by a nation state. As a country with no entrenched tradition of citizenship education, the model for England could be regarded as especially easily influenced by contemporary debates. In light of the approaches highlighted in this chapter then, the next chapter's description of the citizenship education that came to be proposed, implemented and experienced (according to previous studies), reveals how particular conceptions have shaped the discourse.

Chapter Four: Cultivating Active Citizens – Introducing Citizenship Education to English Schools

4.1 Introduction

As described in the previous chapter, not only was Britain adjusting to a change in government when the Crick group set about its tasks of defining and configuring a new National Curriculum subject, but the broader context was one of changing relationships between the individual and the state, eroding civic cohesion, and ‘democratic deficit’ (Kerr 2003). It had been recognised in many industrialised nations that a weakening in civic virtue or social capital had led to, and been perpetuated by, alienation from public life, particularly among younger generations (Putnam 2000). Consternation about this trend led to a renewed interest in civic morality across the spectrum of social and political thought, not least from the new Secretary of State for Education and Employment, David Blunkett (Kerr 1999). The strength of this concern for civic cohesion, coupled with the force of political will from Blunkett and others committed to values central to New Labour ideology, helped to elevate a conception of citizenship education to the top of the Curriculum reform agenda.

The concept of political education has always been a controversial one in the UK. It has struggled with the perceptions that it is either a tool for political ends or a solution to social problems that threaten the fabric of society, neither of which have seemed justified in a British context (Faulks 2006). In particular, its development has been stunted by the relative stability of the relationship between the individual and the state, when other countries have been observed to introduce ideals of citizenship as a means of fostering solidarity and constructing a sense of nationhood.

Unlike educators in the United States, British teachers do not have an obvious narrative to draw on in the form of a codified constitution that accounts for the distribution of political power. Although this would seem like a relatively minor obstacle to the teaching of political education, this lack of consensus on a concrete starting point has exacerbated the debate about its fundamental function. Those on the political right continue to argue against the use of the school to instil in the young values other than those necessary to augment the learning of core subjects, whilst critics on the left are suspicious that it would simply serve to legitimise the

injustices of the status quo. It is this widespread scepticism that has prevented Britain from enjoying the supportive momentum that pushed citizenship up the educational agenda in the USA and helped develop a consensus on the nature of democracy more easily framed by European experiences of authoritarianism or historically overcoming absolutism (Frazer 1999).

Kerr (1999) describes the history of education for citizenship in England as 'a curious mixture of noble intentions, which are then turned into general pronouncements, which, in turn, become minimal guidance for schools' (1999:1). Kerr sees the reticence of successive governments to pronounce any form of overt direction over citizenship education as 'a national trait' (1999:1). As a discipline that seeks to influence young people's understandings of the social world, however, citizenship education is a stated concern of numerous groups in society, which have very different priorities for both the content that should take precedence and the best approaches to relating this material to young people. Some work has been done to categorise how different perspectives have been translated into a range of models of citizenship education (Rowe 1997; Breslin and Dufour 2006), but it has been argued that the nature of teaching and learning within the subject ranges beyond such clear definitions (Kerr 1999).

As discussed in Chapter Three, variance between models of citizenship education can be associated with cultural and historical contexts. In the UK, debate has focused on questions of what it means to be British, what values define British society, and how these values should be reflected in education. Of these three concerns, the issue of national identity has attracted the most attention in populist debates, with an inability to succinctly define 'Britishness' seen as indicative of social ills from ignorance of national history, culture and heritage to a failure to successfully integrate minority groups into society (Blunkett 2002). Policy makers, meanwhile, have been concerned with shoring up definitive values to tackle the UK's perceived democratic deficit, and the potential for education to improve the health of British democracy. The need to strengthen the democratic system has been linked to failures of the education system to provide appropriate preparation for young people to take on the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Specifically, schools have been charged with 'upholding standards' and addressing attitudes and behaviour that diminish young people's propensity to successfully adjust to their future roles.

In terms of social policy, the value in discussing 'Britishness' comes from possible benefits for social cohesion. For policy makers, it is the contribution of community relations between the 'established British' and minority groups to national social harmony that should be the focus of educational endeavours. 'British' values should therefore be presented as inclusive, encompassing common understandings rather than virtues that may be associated with a particular social group. As Kerr (1999) points out, questions about the nature of British society and what it means to be British elicit answers that may be revelatory for debate about the role of education in society, with implications for every aspect of the education system from the structure of schools to the shape of the Curriculum. The fundamental purpose of state education as part of a democratic state has then been questioned from differing perspectives through times of political change.

4.2 Debates on Education for Citizenship in a Changing Context

As a concern of a range of interest groups, arguments for and against different incarnations of citizenship education have emanated from those within the education system as well as political actors with broader social concerns. Pressure came from within education in the 1970s and 1980s for the personal and social development of young people and momentum was gathered following tensions brought into view by inner-city clashes such as the Brixton riots of 1981. The teaching of 'political literacy' was advocated, as well as a more inclusive curriculum that facilitated discussions of contemporary, multicultural society more than the existing focus on British history and traditions. These calls resulted in an expansion of 'new' subjects that were seen as more relevant to young people's needs, many of which revolved around a core tenet of social justice, as advocated by Dewey, and could be described as forms of political education (Kerr 1999). In 1985, the Swann Report furthered this agenda with its statement that 'all schools and all teachers have a professional responsibility to prepare their pupils for life in a pluralist society' under the title *Education for All* (DES 1985: 560).

These reforms were associated with the political left and concerns were duly raised by those on the right who saw them as opening a door for bias and indoctrination in schools, as well as dismantling the essentially conservative nature of the curriculum. The consequences of adopting a multicultural narrative for the preservation of majority British culture were especially troubling to the assimilationist agenda of the right (Hillgate Group 1986; Marenbon 1987). Fears of indoctrination were sufficiently strong for two new clauses (44 and 45) to be added

to the 1986 Education Act. Teachers have since had a statutory duty to avoid overt bias in the classroom.

Debate in the late 1980s and early 1990s centred on the content of the new National Curriculum. The Conservative government sought to re-assert traditional values by excluding those 'new' subjects that had proliferated in preceding decades from the Curriculum. The National Curriculum was established by the Education Reform Act 1988, which made no mention of multiculturalism and emphasised history, English and religious education. In the same year, Section 28 of the Local Government Act banned local authorities from 'promoting' homosexuality as a normal part of British life. This was seen as part of the Conservative drive to maintain focus on marriage and families (based on heterosexual relationships) in education and beyond, an agenda that was furthered by the spread of AIDS in Britain. At the same time, the concept of 'active citizenship' was used for what has been called the Conservative Party's 'hegemonic project' to combat 'weak' citizenship that erodes moral consensus (Davies 2012). According to Faulks, in Thatcher's Britain, the 'active' citizen was:

... a law abiding, materially successful individual who was willing and able to exploit the opportunities created by the promotion of market rights, while demonstrating occasional compassion for those less fortunate than themselves – charity rather than democratic citizenship was to be the main instrument of "active citizenship". Faulks (2006:125)

Although the Conservatives did not take this project forward into a comprehensive approach to educating 'active' citizens, it effected consideration of the role of education, including recommendations by the House of Commons' Commission on Citizenship. The Commission's recommendations for teaching to encourage, develop and recognise active citizenship were absorbed into the National Curriculum, although no provision was made for the teaching of a discrete subject. Attempts to define education for citizenship were now being made. Following the Commission on Citizenship's recommended focus on education, public services and the voluntary sector in *Encouraging Citizenship* (1990), *Curriculum Guidance 8: Education for Citizenship* (1990) offered schools advice on developing active citizenship as an over-arching theme.

The 1990s saw debates turn to more specialised aspects of social and moral education to address the effects of rapid economic and social change on the so-called moral fabric of British society – that is, those institutions and values that are thought of as underwriting British society, promoting cohesion and continuity through deference to marriage, traditional family structures and the law – resulting in both the ‘democratic deficit’ of political apathy and a more general lack of interest in public affairs that can be observed in the diminutive role of civic culture and associated discourse in everyday life. Young people were particularly targeted by discussions of deficit, with anti-social and criminal behaviour both in and out of school highlighted by alarm at soaring exclusion rates and high profile crimes like the murders of London head teacher Philip Lawrence and Liverpool toddler James Bulger (the capture of whose final movements by CCTV has also been credited as the precursor to the expansion of surveillance technologies in the UK).

Indeed, the term ‘anti-social’ came to denote ‘the thin end of the wedge’ of criminal behaviour as it was applied to acts that should be subject to state sanctions, rather than rudeness or thoughtlessness that it had conventionally implied. The idea of the ‘pedagogical state’ (Hunter 1996) therefore became important in British debates about educating for citizenship. New Labour’s governing style of that time has also been described as the ‘therapeutic state’ (Furedi 2003) for its concern with ‘emotional literacy’ and a value-driven approach to *intervention* in discourses of health, welfare, criminal justice and education.

This language of ‘healing’ helped a government of outspoken advocates of citizenship to put citizenship education on the political agenda. Their model drew heavily on civic republican ideals of virtue for the rejuvenation of Britain’s foundations of liberal democracy. The ‘civil renewal’ agenda used ideas of re-cultivating social capital to re-install habits and norms of participation and collective action – associated with the dying out of the generation that ‘re-built’ Britain after the Second World War – amongst future generations (NCVO 2005). In David Blunkett’s (2003) pamphlet, *Civil Renewal: a New Agenda*, he stated that he had always advocated civil renewal as the ‘centrepiece’ of the government’s reform agenda, and that this would necessitate the redefining of the relationship between the citizen and the state (Blunkett 2003). Blunkett draws on the idea of the Ancient Greek polis as spawning the ideal manifestation of formative citizenship, where a sense of responsibility is borne out of a feeling that ‘the community is worthy of loyalty and patriotic commitment’. Active citizenship therefore ‘brings with it the

cultivation of civic virtues, and the free acceptance of duties and obligations to the rest of the community' (Blunkett 2003).

Blunkett goes on to list five themes of the civic republican model he identifies with: that individual freedom is only fully achieved through public participation; that the community must actively maintain democratic institutions; that participation is engendered by education for citizenship; that citizens must embrace civic virtues, committing to the common good, freely accepting obligations and demonstrating patriotic devotion to shared values; and prizing the public realm as the platform for community achievements (Blunkett 2003). Blunkett makes explicit his sympathy for this form of republican thought whilst problematising the broader concept of liberty, the philosophy of which, he believes, neglects the crucial component of social order. In keeping with his left-wing credentials, Blunkett shows concern for the theory of Marx and yet makes a notable departure as he rejects the romantic Marxist concept of freedom for its failure to appreciate the role of social ties. Instead of such purely 'negative' forms of liberty, Blunkett perceives a need to prescribe what exactly individual freedom should be used for: it should have a direction – as freedom *to* rather than freedom *from* – a form of positive liberty that recognises the co-dependent relationship of citizen and democratic state. In this view, the values of the state and the active citizen are inseparable. He sees education's role as imparting political knowledge and skills but also engineering 'dispositions' to this effect. Blunkett arrives at this position on the basis that some free choices are more worthwhile than others, situated as they must be within a context of value judgments, and he sees a moral consensus emanating from a set of policies which 'promote, structure and reward' active engagement (Blunkett 2003:12). Blunkett concedes that, in the interests of legitimacy, liberal 'negative' freedoms must be protected, but it is positive freedom that he sees as the transformative force capable of changing behaviours, and he ambitiously seeks to achieve a form of social order that repudiates hierarchy and inequality in that it is nurtured from community level upwards.

4.3 Crick's Views on Citizenship

When Bernard Crick was Professor of Political Theory and Institutions at the University of Sheffield, David Blunkett was one of his most vociferous students. As Home Secretary, Blunkett looked to Crick as an advisor on citizenship issues, appointing him in 1998 to devise the so-called 'Britishness test' for immigrants seeking British citizenship, and Crick continued to advise the Labour Government

on issues of integration and naturalisation until 2005. But Crick's highest profile government role was as chair of the Advisory Group on Citizenship, appointed by Blunkett to shape the agenda for citizenship education.

Crick sympathised with the Frankfurt School Marxists who claimed that capitalism ruled by cultural degradation. Drawing on his extensive study of George Orwell, Crick used the concept of 'prolefeed' to characterise the disposable media that proliferate in post-industrial society and called the 'popular press' the 'great dis-educator of our times' (Crick 2001). His was an analysis that made a powerful case for the promotion of citizenship in order to reverse the effects not only of the academically acknowledged disengagement of the masses from meaningful public discourse but the 'dumbing down' of the content of the tabloid press and the proliferation of celebrity culture that spawned countless gossip magazines. Such 'prolefeed' has become a substitute for the tradition of locally-rooted gossip, which formerly formed part of the social bond of communities and encouraged solidarity around matters of common interest; a precursor of active citizenship.

Writing in 2001, Crick commented that, if there had ever been a time when sections of British society were moving towards a 'citizen culture' in which people normalise and take pride in contribution to public life, things were now moving rapidly in the opposite direction (Crick 2001). Although influenced by Dewey and mindful of the American experience of community breakdown, Crick did not believe that the cosmopolitan and consumerist individualism that characterises today's society meant that this was our fated destination. Making his opposition to the neo-liberal conception of the superficially 'active' citizen clear, he stated that 'market pricing need not involve market values' (Crick 2001). Rather he wanted to build on the ideas of civic republicanism and social capital. In searching for a solution to the cycle of working harder and spending harder, Crick accepted that traditional values like thrift had been lost, but he rejected consumerism as a valid substitute for the good life.

Crick thought that there were two big problems with the political sphere in Britain – the use of soundbites rather than legitimate political debate and the alienation of the young from politics. He believed that rhetoric and spin should be banished from political debate, and that there was a need to raise public expectations, and increase provision for and trust in participation. He observed that, unlike the ancients, we do not equate public life with virtue (Crick 1999:338) and since this resonance has been lost, he accepts that civic virtue must now be divorced from

the idea of a universal moral consensus. Like Fromm (1964), he believed that this would only alienate young people and add to social problems like anti-social behaviour.

Although opposed to creeping market values, Crick looked favourably on the 1990 report by the Commission on Citizenship. *Encouraging Citizenship* took Marshall's three elements as its starting point, putting greater emphasis on the reciprocity between rights and responsibilities, and spoke not just of social rights in terms of access to welfare but social responsibilities of 'active citizenship' through volunteering. Crick approved of this and agreed that voluntary bodies should be the main vehicles for creating a citizenship culture but noted little emphasis on political citizenship and rights, which should not be taken for granted (Crick 1998).

Like Rousseau, Crick extolled the enlightenment benefits of education and experience: 'the object of the journey is not to learn to speak proper, but to understand and explain general relationships; and also to understand the probable consequences of following inferences drawn from one set of values rather than another' (Crick 1999). He believed too much emphasis was placed on gauging children's understanding of adult political concepts, ignoring the potential to explore the language and concepts that may already be developing from children's own interactions with the world. Precise in his terms, Crick advocated active citizenship and for this reason preferred the term 'freedom' to 'liberty' (liberty can be inferred as the freedom to do nothing). He thought toleration – 'the degree to which we accept things of which we disapprove' – was an underrated concept that should be encouraged over mere neutrality or permissiveness (again, favouring a more 'active' concept) as a better way to foster mutual respect. There are clear implications here for the treatment of irreconcilable cultural differences emergent in human rights, multicultural and global interpretations of citizenship. Toleration could, for example, revert to a preference for a Marshallian model of merely 'knocking the worst edges off' deprivations to be tolerated on cultural grounds. Crick believed that the UK must now be 'conceived and managed as a multi-national state' although he was wary of group rights and the dangers associated with a language of citizenship which could afford groups rights against their own members (2001:6) – The Crick Report's success in balancing these concerns will be discussed in the next section.

Crick thought Rawls' conceptualisation of justice lent itself well to considerations of fairness that might take place in the classroom and believed that the original

position could even be used for very young children to make their own rules. Because he supported such interactive methods, he was opposed to an American-style pure civics curriculum that requires pupils to do little more than recite facts about the constitution and political institutions. He recognised the danger of 'the most simple form of authoritarianism'; 'the extension of legitimate authority into topics and areas in which it has no relevance and competence' and believed that such indoctrination could be combated by the promotion of respect for reasoning (1999:348-50). It was because of these values that Blunkett selected Crick to chair the group that would lay the foundations of English citizenship education.

4.4 The Light Touch of the Crick Report

By the time the Crick group started work on their objectives, ideas of civil renewal and active civic participation were ingrained in political discourse; and the three strands of citizenship education the group identified reflect this.

6.7 The strands

6.7.1 ***Social and moral responsibility***

Children learning from the very beginning self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom, both towards those in authority and towards each other (this is an essential pre-condition for citizenship).

6.7.2 ***Community involvement***

Pupils learning about and becoming helpfully involved in the life and concerns of their communities, including learning through community involvement and service to the community.

6.7.3 ***Political literacy***

Pupils learning about and how to make themselves effective in public life through knowledge, skills and values. (Crick 1998:40-41)

In order to achieve the aims of the three strands, the Crick group unanimously made thirteen essential recommendations and associated claims. They recommended that citizenship education should be introduced as an educational entitlement and statutory requirement worthy of no more than five percent of

curriculum time and that schools should consider common themes with 'whole school issue' and other subjects with which it could be sensibly combined. Specific learning outcomes, rather than detailed programmes of study, should be set out by the statutory entitlement. These should be phased in over 'a number of years' but ultimately be 'tightly enough defined' to be effectively inspected by Ofsted. The report defined its approach to the curriculum as 'light touch', in that it did not prescribe what social issues were to feature in citizenship teaching (and nor did the subsequent Citizenship Order). Crick explained this approach as 'both principled and pragmatic' (2003:4), with a nod to both 'political sensitivity' – a liberal fear of political encroachment on schooling – and 'community relevance' – premised on trusting teachers to enthuse about issues they feel are close to their pupils' hearts.

The Crick Report's recommendations for the delivery of citizenship teaching do not go into great detail. Deference to 'tightly defined learning outcomes' constitutes an 'output-only model' that departs from established National Curriculum practice (Faulks 2006). This light touch approach sought to offer 'flexibility to schools in relation to local conditions and opportunities' with 'the possibility of different approaches to citizenship education, involving different subject combinations'. This suggestion of combining citizenship with other subjects was perhaps pragmatic, given its allotment of five percent of curriculum time and the insistence that 'our recommendations should not be at the expense of other subjects' (1998 para. 4.6). Instead, it was left to schools to find time in the school day to educate for citizenship. The Crick Report therefore moves the citizenship agenda on from the cross-curricular status established by the National Curriculum Council in 1989 but leaves fundamental aspects of teaching and learning open to interpretation, and this was reflected in the Order that introduced compulsory citizenship education.

The English Citizenship Order 1999 established the entitlement and declared that citizenship education should include 'knowledge, skills and values relevant to the nature and practices of participative democracy; the duties, responsibilities, rights and development of pupils into citizens; and the value to individuals, schools and society of involvement in the local and wider community'. Educators should be given a clear statement of what citizenship education involves and their role in it. The three strands should be used together in 'habitual interaction' to constitute 'active citizenship'. The citizenship curriculum should therefore encompass not just political knowledge but skills, values, understanding, attitudes and dispositions. It should also be cross-curricular and use resources from within and outside school. Due to the subject's political nature, it was stated that there should be guidelines for

teaching controversial issues with balance. The Secretary of State was asked to consider how best to extend the entitlement beyond compulsory education. The group also recommended that the pressure of a new subject be accounted for by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA, latterly QCDA, now defunct) in its advice on the review of the National Curriculum, and that a standing commission on citizenship education be established.

Throughout the Crick Report, reference is made to the six 'guiding principles': *breadth and balance*, whereby educational experiences as a whole are complemented; *coherence*, in terms of 'concepts, values, dispositions, skills and aptitudes and knowledge and understanding to be acquired' (Crick 1998:35); *continuity and progression*, which should be evident within and between key stages; *relevance*, 'to address the immediate and future needs and interests of pupils in the context of the social, moral, cultural, political and economic environment; and to contribute to pupils' development of positive attitudes to teaching, the school and society in general' (Crick 1998:36); *quality*, with appropriate reference to pupils' differing abilities; and *access and inclusion*, with opportunities to engage ensured to be unrestricted by any disadvantageous characteristics.

Although chaired by an outspoken advocate of civic republican citizenship, deliberately installed by Blunkett to advance this agenda, the Crick group comprised members from across the political spectrum. More traditional liberal views on the role of education could be expected from contributors such as Lord Kenneth Baker of Dorking, who had been a Conservative MP for nearly thirty years and was responsible for the privatisation of British Telecom as well as authoring the 1989 Education Act that brought in the National Curriculum, and Elaine Appelbee, who was the Bishop's Officer for Church in Society for the Diocese of Bradford. Nevertheless, in describing 'the way forward', the report stated that 'active citizenship' is 'our aim throughout' (Crick 1998:25) and spoke of the need for supporting structures to be established to include involvement from local communities as well as public bodies such as local politicians, police, faith groups and voluntary bodies. Community forums were proposed as a possible platform for young people's participation in 'service learning and community involvement' (Crick 1998:26) and the recording of such activities in the National Record of Achievement was recommended for the purposes of reflection and careers planning. While opportunities to involve bodies outside the school will undoubtedly differ, the report stressed that resources within schools should be used to create a supportive ethos, where pupils are involved in the running of the school and whole-school activities

promote active citizenship. Evidence of the group's active leanings, therefore, abounds in the Crick Report. Indeed, it did not shy away from making grand declarations, setting a tone of thick citizenship at the preface:

We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally: for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life and with the critical capacities to weigh evidence before speaking and acting; to build on and to extend radically to young people the best in existing traditions of community involvement and public service, and to make them individually confident in finding new forms of involvement and action among themselves. (Crick 1998:7-8)

The use of a civic republican perspective that echoes aspects of Blunkett's views is clearly at work here, although, as Crick stated elsewhere (Crick 2003), the Report's overall approach was more of a compromise between traditional and active models of citizenship than a purely maximal one like Blunkett's.

Nevertheless, critics like McLaughlin (2000) have problematised the suggestion of moulding inherent in forcing pupils to adopt an active approach to citizenship and points out that the report's treatment of assessment stops short of suggesting learning outcomes for 'dispositions'. This raises ethical questions concerning the desirability of assessing pupils' character. Questions also remain over how 'tightly defined' learning outcomes can be, like how an understanding of right and wrong can be assessed and how diverse responses can be incorporated in other areas. McLaughlin thinks that three arguments of bias can be levelled at Crick's concept of citizenship: that his use of language is left-wing and anti-capitalist; that the report contains illicit bias through omission, particularly through the lack of multicultural perspective and consideration of gender and human rights; and it is too 'maximal' in its presumption that active citizenship is the best form of citizenship. This final criticism exposes Crick's sympathy with the tradition of positive freedom evident in his earlier writing, despite his reference to compromise.

McLaughlin's analysis is interesting because he is an advocate of maximal approaches. He identifies four features of citizenship on which one may take a position on a continuum between 'minimal' and 'maximal' interpretations of citizenship and citizenship education. To begin with, one's *identity* as a citizen may be minimal – purely a rights-based legal status – or, in maximal terms, this may

depend on a conscious affiliation as a member of a community with a shared democratic culture that is the subject of continuing discourse. The *virtues* associated with citizenship may be minimal, with loyalties to the immediate locality and established familial and social ties, or, at the opposite end of the spectrum, commitments may be ever-expanding as social improvement is actively sought; this in turn determines the extent of *political involvement*. A more minimal or maximal approach will also define the particular *social prerequisites* for citizenship, whether this is thought to be a status granted universally or critically viewed as attainable only by those free from social disadvantage (McLaughlin 1992). There is a clear lineage from ideas of negative and positive liberty to minimal and maximal views of citizenship and citizenship education. McLaughlin is conscious of the power of education to exert influence far beyond the classroom. He refers to the fine balance that must be achieved in inspiring unity by fostering commitment to public virtues that engender solidarity without practising social engineering or indoctrination to uncritical acceptance of the status quo. Interestingly, McLaughlin observes that the original National Curriculum Council guidance exhibited largely minimalist conceptions of education for citizenship (McLaughlin 2000).

4.5 Implementing Citizenship in Schools

The statutory Order that established the entitlement to citizenship education was said by Crick to follow the report of the advisory group 'to an unusual extent' and actually went further in its emphasis on community involvement. There were semantic differences in that controversial issues were termed 'contemporary issues and problems' but the group's core values were not deviated from, although Crick stated that the Order should be read in conjunction with the report in order for the rationale to be appreciated (Crick 2003).

The report's focus on *outcomes*, which would demonstrate competences in the absence of a recognised qualification, was translated by the Secretary of State's Proposals (DfEE/QCA 1999) into a 'basic framework' for *The National Curriculum: Handbook for Secondary Teachers in England*, within which schools were free to determine their own practice. This framework set out 'what pupils may be expected to know, understand and be able to do but leaves the decisions about detailed content and delivery ... to schools' in the conviction that 'It cannot, by its nature, specify the many aspects of school life which contribute ... such as school ethos, out-of-school activity, community involvement, teaching styles and organisation' (1999:14). Programmes of study and attainment targets were drafted, however, for

Key Stages 3 and 4. They define key skills as pertaining to enquiry, communication, participation and action, and specify targets for knowledge and understanding as well as *effective participation* and the demonstration of responsibility (Harland 2000).

It has been suggested that the light touch of the Crick Report, and the subsequent filtering down of non-prescriptive guidance for schools through the Order and vagaries of programmes of study and attainment targets, precipitated a form of citizenship education that sits uncomfortably with Crick's assertion that 'citizenship education is important and distinct enough to warrant a separate specification within the national framework' (Crick 1998 para 1.1); to the extent that the subject has not been successfully embedded in many schools that struggle to reconcile a focus on values and dispositions with the core precepts of the National Curriculum.

Research in the first two years of compulsory citizenship teaching found that many schools had not planned effectively for its implementation (Kerr and Cleaver 2004; Kerr et al. 2004). Kerr and Cleaver (2004:21) described 'the majority' of schools as 'beset by confusion, ambiguity and uncertainty'. For example, a dearth of teachers trained in citizenship teaching was one cause of uncertainty – and one that has led to resource constraints in other subject areas. This lack of specialisation also proved to be harmful to the status of citizenship in schools and arguably contributed to the low priority accorded to the subject in many schools. In what is something of a vicious circle, this lowly status in turn damaged the prospects of teacher training for citizenship, when this was made more widely available, because teachers did not want to specialise in a subject that was not valued by schools, and indeed may transpire to be a passing fad come the next round of education reforms. Such confused or apathetic responses in schools clearly endanger pupils' capacities to take the subject seriously and take on coherent messages about citizenship.

In particular, leaving the delivery of citizenship up to schools could be seen as tantamount to discouragement from teaching it as a discrete subject. By the time the Order was published, the narrative of the over-burdened school timetable was well established and schools were unlikely to move existing commitments aside to accommodate a new subject if they were not told that this was necessary. Studies have duly found that 'renaming' or 'rebranding' aspects of personal, social and health education (PSHE) as citizenship is common practice (Kerr and Cleaver 2004). Unsurprisingly, the quality of teaching suffered in this climate of 'bolted on' understandings of citizenship and the subject became notorious for its

inconsistency. In 2005, The Chief Inspector of Schools claimed 'Ofsted evidence shows that citizenship is the worst taught subject at Key Stages 3 and 4. Schools are seldom judged to deliver very good teaching in this subject' (Bell 2005).

A consistent message from research into the implementation of citizenship education is that the light touch curriculum has led to inconsistent pedagogical approaches whereby 'citizenship elements are implicit, there is no tangible programme overall and pupils are not necessarily aware that they are studying citizenship' (Ofsted 2003). Little research has asked what messages *are* received by pupils, however, and how they coalesce with influences from other sources to inform the understandings that *are* constructed in the minds of young people. To increase this knowledge base, an understanding of the wider discourse affecting young people in British society is important.

4.6 A Changing Policy Context

In addition to the Crick Report, two other reports were significant in adding to the development of policy initiatives in the broad area of citizenship. In the year that the Crick Report was published, the Runnymede Trust set up the Commission on the Future of Multi-ethnic Britain, chaired by Bikhu Parekh. The commission was asked to: analyse the state of Britain as a multi-ethnic country; suggest ways in which racial discrimination and disadvantage can be countered and; suggest how Britain can become 'a confident and vibrant multicultural society at ease with its rich diversity' (Parekh 2000). To these ends, the Commission conducted extensive empirical research in regions across the country, consulting with a variety of organisations and reporting on its findings in 2000.

Building on the Crick Report's account, the Commission's understanding of citizenship is underpinned by the goal of reducing inequalities, and they begin their report by examining the criminal justice system through this lens. The report then tackles immigration and asylum policy, the role of government, religion and education, and associated issues. While the Crick Report has been argued by some to take a universalistic and somewhat assimilationist view (Osler 2000), the Parekh Report incorporated elements of differentiated citizenship as seen in the writings of those such as Iris Marion Young, focusing on differences among cultural groups. The Commission demonstrated sympathies with a liberal critique of group rights, however, in upholding principles such as a common system of justice. Their ideology could therefore be linked with that of proponents of multicultural citizenship

such as Kymlicka (1995), who advocates 'external protections' but not individual freedom-limiting 'internal restrictions'.

The Parekh Report was ultimately influential in that over a third of its recommendations were adopted as government policy in the three years following its publication, but the Commission was immediately controversial in its criticism of the dominant discourse on the experience of British minority groups. Most notably, the report made headlines by suggesting that the concept of 'Britishness' was detrimental to inter-cultural relations and was not conducive to advancing the citizenship agenda. The Parekh Report can be seen to contradict some of the principles of the Crick Report and, whilst these differences are not so fundamental that the Crick Report could not be updated to take on Parekh's recommendations, numerous observations of the Crick Report's neglect of diversity in education are rather damning (Osler 2000; Olssen 2004). This failure to fully recognise cultural differences has been attributed to the liberal elements of Crick's thought that see difference as inherently divisive and sub-cultures as detracting from the unity of national culture. Critics find this position unrealistic and, especially since 9/11, a denial of important issues that could have wider consequences (Olssen 2004).

Those who support the Parekh Report's recommendations therefore see citizenship education as a crucial opportunity to expose young people to as diverse a range of values as possible, in the belief that only through understanding can appreciation and toleration of difference – and informed respect for 'British' values – be achieved. The idea of all being equal before the law can then be recognised as inclusive of sub-cultures and the value of ongoing dialogue between social groups can be seen in universal contribution to basic mutual interests among humans. The insight the Parekh Report adds to the discourse on citizenship education, then, promotes equal participation in democratic society based on the recognition of diverse individual identities. Reliance on purely liberal values that favour assimilationist approaches to exclusively and disingenuously promote the dominant discourse as revealing 'common sense' misses opportunities to benefit from authentic debate: as Taylor (1994:39) would have it 'the politics of difference grows organically out of the politics of universal dignity'.

Recognition of Britain's status as a multicultural society reveals the limitations of a Rousseauian conception of an essentially homogeneous population that can be bent to the general will, and demands that the complexity of the diverse groups that make up Britain become an integral part of, not a mere footnote to, education for

democratic citizenship. This debate continued throughout the first decade of the twenty-first century and in 2007, an independent review of Diversity and Citizenship in the curriculum (the Ajebo Review) was charged with investigating the profile of diversity across the schools curriculum and particularly within citizenship education.

After the 7/7 terrorist bombings in London, the issue of diversity in education came into sharper focus (Osler 2010) and the Ajebo Review was a direct response to concerns about domestic unrest and terrorism and has been seen as an articulation of the power of citizenship and history to promote unity through shared values (Osler 2008, 2009). The Ajebo Review's key findings were that education for diversity was inconsistent across England (the extent of its remit), with negative perceptions of UK/English identities abounding amongst 'indigenous white pupils'. Learning objectives were found to be unclear and relevant knowledge, resources training and cross-curricular awareness were lacking. Improved consistency in the messages of the relevant authorities and organisations was said to be needed.

Looking at the effectiveness of the three pillars of citizenship education established by the Crick Report, the Ajebo Review was also especially concerned with whether these should be complemented by an additional strand of 'modern British social and cultural history'. They found that, partly because of the government's light touch approach, there was massive inconsistency in the teaching of citizenship. With the subject often falling to non-specialists, citizenship objectives were rarely prioritised and relevance to current issues was not strongly enough expressed to engage pupils. In tackling controversial issues, the topics of ethnicity and race were more often addressed than those of religion, with issues of identity and diversity seldom contextualised or even referred to.

Further challenges were identified where issues of identity and diversity were not directly connected to political understanding and active participation. The abstract concept of Britishness was found to be problematic, sometimes incongruent with plural identities and perhaps better grounded in a meaningful context of its history and a sense of belonging; although combining citizenship education with history raised concerns about adopting a civics-style curriculum. Overall, it was suggested that an inclusive perception of citizenship could only be achieved through a process of dialogue, rather than by didactic methods. The review made explicit recommendations for education for citizenship:

17. Given that the evidence suggests Citizenship education works best when delivered discretely, we recommend this as the preferred model for schools. We recommend greater definition and support in place of the flexible, 'light touch' approach.

18. If demand for Citizenship teachers rises as a result of recommendation 17, we would ask the DfES to review the number of initial teacher training (ITT) places available for Citizenship teachers. In line with other statutory National Curriculum subjects, it is important that continuing professional development (CPD) is not seen as a substitute for ITT.

19. Headteachers and senior management should prioritise whole-curriculum planning across the school and develop ways of linking Citizenship education effectively with other subjects, with the ethos of the school, and with the community.

20. ITT and CPD should explicitly address and develop clear conceptual understanding, in part by focusing on and strengthening treatment of issues relating to the 'political literacy' strand.

21. A full GCSE in Citizenship should be developed, alongside the currently available half GCSE. The full GCSE should comprise a range of topics that link Citizenship to other relevant subjects. We suggest these be developed to include issues of identity and diversity as outlined above, in addition to a number of other options. This would allow for the development of a number of joint GCSEs, for example, a joint Citizenship with History GCSE, a joint Citizenship with Religion GCSE, a joint Citizenship with Geography GCSE.

22. A fourth 'strand' should be explicitly developed, entitled Identity and Diversity: Living Together in the UK. This strand will bring together three conceptual components:

- Critical thinking about ethnicity, religion and 'race'
- An explicit link to political issues and values
- The use of contemporary history in teachers' pedagogy to illuminate thinking about contemporary issues relating to citizenship

The following areas should be included:

- Contextualised understanding that the UK is a 'multinational' state, made up of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales
- Immigration
- Commonwealth and the legacy of Empire
- European Union
- Extending the franchise (e.g. the legacy of slavery, universal suffrage, equal

opportunities legislation)

(i) Any new changes or additions to Citizenship must be presented clearly and explicitly, with a clear rationale, alongside appropriate support for schools and teachers.

(ii) There should be explicit links between the Programmes of Study for History and Citizenship education.

(iii) QCA's revisions of Programmes of Study at Key Stage 3 should include 'Identity and Diversity: Living Together in the UK'. In addition, Programmes of Study at Key Stage 4 will need to be revised to account for this fourth strand.

(iv) The QCA's Citizenship stakeholder discussions should continue to be supported. Their role should include establishing the structure, content and delivery of this new strand. QCA must ensure that any such discussions include teachers and other experts in the educational fields of History and education for diversity as well as Citizenship. (Ajegbo et al. 2007)

The recommendations of the Ajegbo Review fed into a wider discourse that saw the policy context of citizenship education evolve beyond the recommendations of the Crick Report. Keating et al. (2009) identify five fundamental policy shifts:

- A re-focusing of the narrative around the concept of 'citizenship' to include notions of identity, diversity, cohesion and integration.
- A re-evaluation of the aims and purposes of citizenship education to further understanding of issues of identity, diversity, cohesion and integration in relation to schools and their local communities as well as engendering political socialisation.
- Student participation and pupil voice becoming more ensconced in school practices.
- An extension of citizenship education policy and practice to include further and higher education as well as local communities.
- An increasingly cross-governmental policy approach to citizenship and citizenship education, incorporating a range of government departments, including the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), the Home Office and the Ministry of Justice. (Keating et al. 2009).

The practical application of the first three of these policy shifts was of particular interest in formulating the research questions for this study. Analysts of the Ajegbo Review, however, have suggested that it fails to apply the critical thinking on race that it advocates. Osler (2010) contends that structural disadvantage, including that which is reinforced when schools fail to comply with equalities legislation, is not acknowledged. Critics also point to the dilution of classroom references to an inclusive society by conflicting messages in the media that reinforce xenophobic constructions of immigrants and asylum seekers (Finney and Simpson 2009).

Drawing on the Ajegbo Review, the second version of the citizenship curriculum came into being in 2009. This revision re-emphasised the value of history for the promotion of a national identity. 'British' values and culture were reinforced as central to social cohesion. It therefore represented something of a return to the Crick Report's liberal, assimilationist principles and recognition of difference was posited as a step in the process of integrating minorities into mainstream culture by encouraging understanding of the 'British way of life'. With its foregrounding of Britishness and British history, the new curriculum prioritised values advocated by Prime Minister Gordon Brown. Brown perceived a need for the renewal of patriotism:

[T]o address almost every one of the major challenges facing our country – [including], of course, our community relations and multiculturalism and, since July 7th, the balance between diversity and integration; even the shape of our public services – you must have a clear view of what being British means, what you value about being British and what gives us purpose as a nation. (Brown, 2006)

Brown's concern for 'balance between diversity and integration' reveals the opposing evils that lurk where the scales are tipped: constant vigilance is required to ensure maximum integration – essentially oppression of difference – does not occur; and diversity must be an equally 'managed' risk because of its 'common sense' connection to terrorism. Brown's overriding conviction was that British history, constructed in schools as a 'grand narrative of progress towards liberty and democracy' (Osler 2010:6), was key to the aims of citizenship education. This approach illustrates how far thinking within the Labour Party has departed from the values of educationalists on the left in the 1970s and 1980s. This process, which encompassed a shift to the centre ground that saw New Labour win huge popular support leading up to the 1997 general election, can be seen as an example of the

operation of various cultural and temporal contingencies to stimulate a change in discourse (Foucault 1989).

4.7 The Construction of Citizenship Education a Decade on

Many recent policy developments can be seen as having a direct or indirect link with the aims of citizenship education. An obvious relationship can be seen with the Ministry of Justice's 2008 move to establish a Youth Citizenship Commission to investigate and enhance young people's understanding of citizenship and increase their political participation (Keating 2009). Less closely related is the government's agenda, as part of the Contest strategy, to combat terrorism on the axes of *Pursue, Prepare, Protect* and *Prevent*. *Prevent* has funded initiatives to inhibit violent extremism through the promotion of community cohesion and responsibility to increase community cohesion has fallen to local authorities and schools as part of the statutory duty on schools to promote community cohesion, which came into force in 2007 and was inspected by Ofsted. Citizenship education has been identified by teachers as a 'key tool' in their work to promote community cohesion (Rowe et al. 2012:95).

These changes have manifested in significant revisions of the original 2002 citizenship curriculum, included in the new National Curriculum brought in in 2009. The new National Curriculum pledged to enable all young people to become: 'successful learners who enjoy learning, make progress and achieve; confident individuals who are able to live safe, healthy and fulfilling lives; and responsible citizens who make a positive contribution to society' and thus placed a third of its emphasis on political literacy, political socialisation, active participation and values such as a commitment to human rights and appreciation of the benefits of diversity (QCA 2007). This represents something of a dilution of the active elements advanced by Blunkett and Crick. The main changes to the curriculum for citizenship were a greater emphasis on concepts such as democracy and justice and rights and responsibilities – with less stress on *activity* – and the addition of a major new strand, as recommended by the Ajebo Review, entitled *Identities and Diversity: Living Together in the UK*. Under this heading, pupils' understanding is developed by:

- a) Appreciating that identities are complex, can change over time and are informed by different understandings of what it means to be a citizen in the UK.

- b) Exploring the diverse national, regional, ethnic and religious cultures, groups and communities in the UK and the connections between them.
- c) Considering the interconnections between the UK and the rest of Europe and the wider world.
- d) Exploring community cohesion and the different forces that bring about change in communities over time. (QCA 2007:29)

4.8 Research on Citizenship Education

Throughout citizenship education's time as a compulsory subject, studies have sought to measure its impact. Davies and Evans' (2002) early study anticipated the continuing theme of citizenship's low status within schools while, paradoxically, finding it to be perceived as fundamental to the overarching aims of education. Davies and Evans were also among the first to voice the unease of teachers lacking guidance on *how* to teach citizenship, and to attribute this to the light touch curriculum. They found that teachers were left without answers to questions of what aspects of citizenship should be given precedence, leading to a neglect of 'reflective critical engagement' and a preoccupation with mundane community service such as 'mowing lawns' (Davies 2003)

Citizenship's status has also been found to be undermined where a formal qualification was not offered, suggesting that a new subject will be taken more seriously the more it conforms to established patterns of assessment. One factor that contributed positively to citizenship's status, however, was its being inspected by Ofsted from a year after its inception, and Ofsted also carried out some case study research. Twenty-five supposedly exemplary schools were visited by Ofsted to showcase their efforts in implementing citizenship but over half were found to be unsatisfactory. Disorientation resulting from mixed messages at the policy level was found to be at fault, with citizenship's National Curriculum status jarring with an absence of guidance on implementation resulting from the light touch approach. This conflict has left some commentators to conclude that leaving schools to construct citizenship on their own terms has failed to deliver a construction that can be recognised as resembling the policy prototype (Faulks 2006). As was proposed in Chapter One, however, these evaluative accounts do not create a picture of what models of citizenship *are* being produced.

Osler and Starkey's (2001) review of policy, research and practice provides a useful overview of research that has sought to engage with understandings of citizenship at the school level, which has tended to focus on measurement of awareness of pre-defined 'political' concepts. Farmer and Trikha (2005), for example, reported on levels of 'trust' in public institutions from quantitative survey data. On cross-tabulating variables of ethnic background, Farmer and Trikha's results from their Home Office-funded study agreed with Cleaver et al.'s (2005) findings from a survey that highlighted more positive attitudes to volunteering among respondents from ethnic minorities.

Qualitative research has also been employed to capture young people's views of citizenship. Roker et al. (1999), Lister et al. (2003), Osler and Starkey (2001) and Holden (2004) have all used qualitative methods in studies that found a general willingness to engage with politics amongst young people. Interestingly, Holden's (2004) inclusion of parents' perspectives in her case study of attitudes in three schools in a small town exposed a tendency amongst teachers to view parents as fitting a deficit model, whereby ignorance of school subjects detracts from their children's learning. In the case of parents from ethnic minority backgrounds this deficit may manifest as conflicting views from those of the school, and both ethnic minority and working class parents were assumed to be deficient in social capital.

Other studies have investigated classroom practices. Summers et al. (2003) and Oulton et al. (2004) have addressed teachers' methods in dealing with controversial issues, suggesting that lack of confidence and consistency in approach has dogged delivery of fundamental aspects of the citizenship Curriculum. Mead's (2009) study of conflicting concepts of participation in secondary school citizenship examined how classroom concepts of active citizenship could be made meaningful in schools' democratic processes. Mead's enlightening research shows how decisions taken by teachers for pragmatic reasons can undermine democratic values when pupils' voicing of controversial issues requires sensitive treatment. His analysis of the 'management' of pupils' thoughtful anti-war protest highlights the danger of cognitive dissonance *within* a school when young people seek to put their learning into action and are met with an authoritarian response that reinforces their subordinate position and leaves them feeling disillusioned.

The single largest study of citizenship education in England is NFER's Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS). Reporting annually for eight years, this research was concerned with the impact of the new subject on a cohort of children

who were among the first to experience statutory citizenship education throughout their time at secondary school. Commissioned by the former Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in 2001, the study pursued the following research aims:

- Assess the short-term and long-term effects of citizenship education on young people in England;
- To explore whether different processes – in terms of school, teacher and individual-level variables – can have variable results and produce different outcomes; and
- To consider what changes could be made to the delivery of citizenship education in order to improve its potential for effectiveness. (NFER 2010 iii)

Quantitative data were gathered from a longitudinal survey that returned to a cohort of sample schools every two years from Year 7 to Year 13, and a cross-sectional survey that used tutor groups from a new sample of schools for years 8, 10 and 12. Qualitative data was drawn from 12 case study schools, whose staff and pupils were interviewed every two years.

Reporting from 2003, the CELS research team has focused on the dimensions of school policy and practice before and after the Citizenship Order; pupil attitudes, experience and knowledge; and factors influencing decision making processes in schools. Their seventh and penultimate report, published in November 2009, looks at the evolution of citizenship education policy and practice in schools, posing the question: *how far has citizenship education become embedded in secondary schools in England since 2002, and what does the future hold?* It draws on the fourth and final cross-sectional survey of Year 8, 10 and 12 students, their schools and their teachers, from a nationally representative sample of 317 schools across England, as well as their longitudinal research in 12 case study schools. Their findings relate to the core issues of models of delivery; teaching, learning and assessment; staffing, monitoring and evaluation; and participation outside the classroom.

CELS found PSHE to be the most popular method of delivering citizenship education, although discrete time slots were on the rise. Positive impacts of citizenship education were increasingly recognised by teaching staff but despite this, its relatively low status, weak leadership, implementation and co-ordination and pressures on curriculum time undermine effective delivery. Students were

reported to be less aware of citizenship when discrete time slots were not used, leading to confusion between citizenship and PSHE. Active teaching styles were found to be best suited to the teaching of citizenship and active participation was indeed observed to be more prevalent than in other subjects. A growing acceptance of incorporating the student voice into school practices was witnessed and older students in particular were confident about making themselves heard. Students on the whole were moderately positive about the classroom climate. Less active teaching methods, however, continue to predominate, with considerable variation in teaching styles and depth of topic coverage within and between schools.

While more citizenship specialist teachers were found to be emerging, the NFER's (2008) survey data suggested that half of staff teaching citizenship had received no training on the subject. Ofsted inspections were found to have some impact on the status of citizenship education but evidence suggested Ofsted had failed to pick up on weak practice in some cases. CELS found examples of good practice in student participation outside school, with staff feeling largely positive, and pupils moderately positive, about the level of democracy within their school. Despite this, student take-up of extra-curricular activities was found to be disappointingly low, especially in areas of 'vertical' participation that involve engagement with school decision making processes. The report quotes areas of Ofsted's extant *Framework for Inspection* as already providing for inspection of 'the broad foundations of citizenship education':

- (a) (Section 4.2) – Attitudes, Behaviour and Personal Development requires inspectors to evaluate the contribution made by pupils to the life of the community, including the degree to which they show initiative and are willing to take responsibility;
- (b) (Section 5.3) – Pupils' Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural Development, requires inspectors to evaluate the extent to which the school encourages pupils to relate positively to others, take responsibility, participate fully in the community, and develop an understanding of citizenship;
- (c) (Section 5.5) – Partnership with Parents and the Community, requires judgements on the degree to which the school's work is enriched by links with the community (primary), including provision for voluntary service (secondary). (NFER 2010)

The final CELS publication reported that young people's citizenship practices and attitudes had changed over the course of the study, with civic and political

participation increasing and concern for their communities and fellow citizens weakening. The authors claim that, while many complicated variables influence 'citizenship outcomes', the volume of citizenship education young people receive has the strongest impact on these outcomes. The report goes on to recommend changes to the delivery of citizenship education: clearly demarcated citizenship lessons presided over by 'CE teachers', resulting in a recognised qualification, was the approach deemed most effective (NFER 2010).

The studies described above demonstrate how research into English citizenship education has tended to focus on its *outcomes*, in terms of monitoring its 'success' as a policy. As outlined in Chapter One, the present study seeks to contribute to understandings of citizenship education by drawing on qualitative accounts from teachers and pupils at a range of schools across England, with the aim of illuminating how the *process* of citizenship education is experienced by young people and how the construction of certain conceptions of citizenship in the classroom affects pupils' understandings of themselves as citizens. The following chapter explains how the study's methodology serves this aim.

Chapter Five: Methodology

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the methodological approach taken by this study, describes the methods used and explains the choice of these methods. An overview of the general research principles and theoretical framework is followed by a detailed consideration of the research design, which draws out the key concepts that guided the analysis of data. An account of the research process describes how methods were chosen to support the integrity of the research questions and how these methods were employed in practice. Finally, ethical considerations are reflected upon.

5.2 Theoretical Framework: a Critical Approach

As described in Chapter Four, citizenship education was introduced to English secondary schools as a social policy that sought to bring about cultural change in encouraging active citizenship. The aims of this research are therefore to explore how active citizenship is understood in schools and to investigate what informs these understandings. The research was informed by the general theories of democratic citizenship discussed in Chapter Two, which illuminate the contested nature of citizenship, and the theories of education described in Chapter Three, which present critical accounts of the recognition and practice of key elements of active citizenship in educational contexts. Drawing on this literature, this project was approached with scepticism about how these active elements might be incorporated into teaching and learning in state schools in England, alongside other National Curriculum subjects. Research questions were formulated to explore how teachers' and pupils' understandings of policy aims, the aims of state education more generally and their experiences of citizenship education might inform their understandings of active citizenship.

From this position of scepticism, the work of hooks (1994) offered lenses with which to focus on accounts of classroom practices as a sources of oppression as well as opportunities for liberation. In her book *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*, hooks argued that teachers' use of power over learners reduces natural enthusiasm for learning to obedience to authority. She therefore called upon teachers to 'transgress those boundaries that would confine each pupil

to a rote, assembly-line approach to learning' and approach learners as individuals 'even if the situation does not allow the full emergence of a relationship based on mutual recognition' (hooks 1994:13). hooks (1994:14) criticised the 'banking system' of acquisition of knowledge as a transferable commodity, in the belief that learners should be active participants, rather than 'passive consumers'. hooks cited Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren's (1993) work on critical thinking and pedagogy, which suggests that the critical thinking central to active citizenship must be demonstrated by:

... pedagogical practices engaged in creating a new language, rupturing disciplinary boundaries, decentering authority, and rewriting the institutional and discursive borderlands in which politics becomes a condition for reasserting the relationship between agency, power, and struggle. (Giroux and McLaren 1993, cited in hooks 1994:129)

Constructing Citizenship

While hooks' treatment of the oppressive and liberating possibilities of higher education set the tone of the exploration of the main research aim, her invocation of critical pedagogy offered a link to those theorists who provided a scaffold (Goffman 1959; Walsham 1993, 1995) of concepts that would address the research questions by guiding the analysis of teachers' and pupils' accounts of their experiences. The approach to the data was therefore informed by issues in education to which critical pedagogy had drawn attention, and which were identified in Chapter Three as significant for the teaching and learning of citizenship. The key concepts of: education as a public good or private right; co-intentionality and praxis; and the valorisation of common sense and the accommodation of adversaries helped to frame elements of teachers' and pupils' experiences the research sought to explore. The significance of these concepts was not expected to be revealed by respondents' use of these specific terms, rather research instruments were designed to elicit reflection on examples of classroom practices, the emergent themes of which could then be subject to critical analysis informed by theoretical concepts.

Youdell (2006) draws on Butler's use of *performativity* to understand how the roles of teachers and pupils are constructed through discourses in schools. Her work is useful in terms of applying the above concepts to this study's participants. For

example, Youdell (2006:514) describes how school practices may involve intentional and unintentional discourses:

On the one hand, [Butler's work] suggests that subjects do not necessarily regurgitate discourse unwittingly. On the other hand, however, it suggests that discourses are not necessarily cited knowingly and that they are not necessarily known explicitly to the subject and/or audience. As such, subjects need not be self-consciously alert to the discourses deployed in order for their familiar and embedded meanings to be inscribed. Furthermore, the analysis suggests, again after Butler (1997a), that discourses do not need to be explicitly cited in order to be deployed. Rather, multiple discourses are referenced through the meanings, associations and omissions embedded in the historicity of apparently simple and benign utterances and bodily practices.

Therefore, a pupil may talk about their citizenship education in terms that validate it as a private right, or as a public good, unaware that they are contributing to that particular discourse.

Using the concept of education as a private right allows for the interpretation of data presenting themes relating to the instrumental nature of schooling in terms of a Freirean understanding of 'banking' (Freire 1970) or the professionalisation of education in terms of coded forms of knowledge (Bernstein 1973). As Giroux uses Gramsci to illustrate, such an understanding of education constructs those most able to succeed as 'a mere container in which to pour and conserve empirical data or brute disconnected facts which he will have to subsequently pigeonhole in his brain' (Gramsci 1916, cited in Giroux 2011:55). Bernstein's (1973) term 'educational knowledge code' describes the set of principles that shape a curriculum, the appropriate forms of pedagogy and the means of evaluating teaching and learning. Bernstein describes the English National Curriculum as a collection type curriculum, made up of subjects with strongly classified content and a strongly framed pedagogical relationship. Teaching and learning in citizenship lessons could therefore be expected to be influenced by what Critical Race Theorists call the 'business as usual' (Delgado and Stefancic 2000) of schooling.

Co-intentionality and praxis are useful concepts for the interpreting of data that relates to emergent themes of whether pedagogy reflects Freirean understandings

of communication and co-production or more closely resembles 'narration'. This research agrees with Freire's (1970) contention that the realisation of opportunities for learners to truly reflect upon, and become active participants in, their learning would be an appropriate approach to pedagogy for active citizenship. Praxis, rather than coercion, is then the drive for changing understandings, as a truly participatory learning experience must be co-intentional, rather than dominated by a particular position. Any 'cultural and political baggage' teachers bring to the classroom should therefore be declared and ideally used as a 'theoretical resource' (Giroux 2011:75), whereby the teacher allows her teaching to be informed by naming the conflicting discourses at work within and beyond the school and opening them up to debate.

Using the concepts of the valorisation of common sense and the accommodation of adversarial debate allows for the interpretation of data presenting themes that build on the idea of participation to question the adoption of models of knowledge whose content Bernstein (1973) would determine to be 'strongly classified', as well as the adherence to a strongly framed pedagogical relationship that precludes adversarial debate. Youdell found that educational forms such as the banking model created, not merely reproduced, inequalities, which she saw as having consequences 'that reach far beyond the school and are a key reason why education ... is a site of political struggle' that rejects the common-sense privileging of market values (Youdell 2011:14). Giroux's (2011) interpretation of Mouffe's work is also useful in its rejection of common-sense connotations and connections between complex, discrete concepts such as civil freedoms and market freedoms. A Mouffean adversarial approach would require these ideas to be opened up and engaged in agonistic combat, which affirms the true freedoms of each adversary to be heard and respectfully challenged. In this way, learners' views and experiences from within and outside formal education are legitimised as valid knowledge and as helping to build a radical imaginary.

Constructing Young People

The methods of this study therefore challenge dominant constructions of the child as a lacking subject, an 'immature' adult, less able to behave rationally or demonstrate self-discipline or reflexivity: a risk to society (Nolas 2011). As Allred and Burman (2005) note, analysing accounts in terms of the status they occupy is especially significant when studying 'adults' interpretations of children's experiences. Children's 'voices' cannot be heard outside of, or free from, cultural understandings of childhood and the cultural meanings assigned their

communication' (Allred and Burman 2005:177-178). Allred and Burman saw a Foucauldian understanding of the power of expert knowledge as especially pertinent when considering discourses of 'child', 'adult', 'pupil' and 'teacher' (it could also be applied to the framing of 'researcher'). Critical pedagogy's Foucauldian treatment of power dynamics in the classroom (Giroux 1983; McLaren 1995) is then useful in countering the subjectivation of pupils in a subordinate role. Beyond the teacher-pupil relationship, the hierarchy of disciplines, within the hierarchy of members of the school, within the hierarchy of institutions of the education system is a particularly visual, if not visible institutional structure. Order seems so fundamental to education in England and as Deacon (2006:183) points out –

... it is worth bearing in mind the degree to which modernity's vision of a progressive accumulation of scientific knowledge, the grouping and partitioning of curricula, the evolutionary differentiation and classification of learning cycles and phases, and the separation of ages and standards, so central to modern systems of education, are products of historically contingent disciplinary procedures.

The stratification that has resulted from the phenomena Deacon describes has been accompanied (as it has coalesced with) a discourse of deficit that defines young people as lacking and in need of expert intervention. Nolas (2011) calls for a more nuanced understanding of what young people get out of their participation. She describes how the idea of 'drift' has shaped youth development policies that focus on 'constructive activities' to reduce delinquency, whereas her own work with youth supports the findings of quantitative studies that find promoting young people's agency within their communities is more effective in tackling social problems than 'forensic' approaches based on outcomes to do with drugs and teen pregnancy. This study's focus on the processes of citizenship education in cultivate understandings of citizenship was not concerned with 'forensic' outcomes and aimed not to reinforce an instrumental vision of education.

This research therefore made no assumptions about the relationship between the pupils' education and their participation in society as active citizens. The issue of whether students had applied their citizenship learning "in real life" was therefore last on the interview schedule, to be asked if examples of active citizenship had not already been expressed. Responses to this question were also revealing in that it had the desired effect of accessing pupils' reflections on active participation outside school, even where they explicitly denied that this was in any way 'inspired' by their

citizenship education. Framing the interview as about pupils' experiences of citizenship education, as the subject of the research, therefore elicited responses that spoke directly to the core themes of how teaching and learning is experienced without precluding important discussion of its wider impact.

As well as recognising the validity of young people's knowledge generally, this research also sought to include diversity in the broad terms of gender, ethnicity, (dis/)ability, and socio-economic background, as section 5.5 will discuss. Following a Mouffeian anti-essentialist approach, however, the aims of the research would not be complemented by the categorisation of respondents in terms of their distance from the normativity of Whiteness (Du Bois 1973) or privilege of 'passing' for 'default' identities (Robinson 1994). Documentation of these characteristics did not therefore inform the analysis of interview data and the use of gendered pronouns merely follows the convention of the English language. Feminist theorists of education in particular have observed that white, middle-class, masculine, heterosexual, non-disabled forms of knowledge tend to be normalised and privileged in schools (Walkerdine 1989; Paechter 2001). It could therefore be anticipated that young people perceived as belonging to other identity categories are likely to experience domination in multiple forms, not only the form of lacking power in relation to teachers, but a commitment to valuing the unique contributions of young people determined the pursuit of an equitable approach that aimed to interpret accounts without making essential assumptions.

Corresponding to this in engagement with teachers, the concept of pupil voice was an important area of inquiry that spoke to the themes of co-intentionality and praxis, and the valorisation of common sense and accommodation of adversarial debate. Ellsworth describes how pupil voice (1989:308-9) functions to:

... efface the contradiction between the emancipatory project of critical pedagogy and the hierarchical relation between teachers and students. In other words, it is a strategy for negotiating between the directiveness of dominant educational relationships and the political commitment to make students autonomous of those relationships (how does a teacher "make" students autonomous without directing them?). The discourse on student voice sees the student as "empowered" when the teacher "helps" students to express their subjugated knowledges. The targets of this strategy are students from disadvantaged and subordinated social class, racial, ethnic, and

gender groups — or alienated middle-class students without access to skills of critical analysis, whose voices have been silenced or distorted by oppressive cultural and educational formations. By speaking, in their "authentic voices," students are seen to make themselves visible and define themselves as authors of their own world. Such self-definition presumably gives students an identity and political position from which to act as agents of social change. Thus, while it is true that the teacher is directive, the student's own daily life experiences of oppression chart her/his path toward self-definition and agency. The task of the critical educator thus becomes "finding ways of working with students that enable the full expression of multiple Voices' engaged in dialogic encounter"...

The scepticism evident in Ellsworth's account suggests the complexity of theoretical and practical issues that might coalesce to enable or threaten the practice of pupil voice. In-depth qualitative research therefore offers opportunities to explore this complexity from the two sets of perspectives of teachers as potentially 'empowering' and pupils as potentially 'empowered'.

5.3 Research Design

As was raised in section 5.2, the critical framing of this research extended to an anti-essentialist approach that aimed to not categorise respondents based on characteristics of gender, ethnicity, (dis/)ability or socio-economic background. An anti-essentialist approach dictates that no assumptions should be made about how pupils might experience citizenship education differently and the unique contribution each participant was anticipated to give was reflected in the choice of individual interviews as the primary tool for data collection (informed by different aims and theoretical commitments, an alternative study might use focus groups dividing respondents on the basis of these characteristics). One important element of the research design was therefore the use of language in the research instruments. Interview questions were carefully crafted to raise the concept of conflicting perspectives without referring to essentialised subject positions, such as the simple proposal of the idea of "different views".

The research instruments were designed to uncover ways in which citizenship education is distinguished from other school subjects: whether and how it is seen as a departure from the school's 'business as usual' (Delgado and Stefancic 2000).

Questions were therefore framed to access respondents' experiences of what Youdell (2011:72) calls 'deterritorializations', instances of the educational knowledge code (Bernstein 1973) shifting to accommodate new forms of knowledge, if only briefly. Thus, while interview questions steered away from reinforcing the instrumental view of education that Nolas (2011) identifies as crudely highlighting its forensic aims, pupils were directly invited to think critically about relationships of power by recalling or imagining what would happen if they disagreed with a position put forward by their teacher, for example.

This study draws on qualitative data generated from in-depth, semi-structured interviews conducted across six case study schools. The research took an interpretive approach to the interview data as part of a general inductive methodology. An inductive methodology emphasises the value of data garnered by empirical research and recognises the benefits of formulating theory as an outcome of research rather than seeking to test inflexible pre-determined hypotheses (Bryman 2008). Unlike grounded theory, this approach was guided by purposive reasoning around themes that the project sought to explore.

A general inductive approach allows for the summarisation of a large and diverse set of text data, for the investigator to show clear relationships between the research questions and summary findings, and for the development of a model or theory about the 'underlying structure of experiences or processes which are evident in the raw data' (Thomas 2003). The inductive approach is used to cultivate findings from emerging themes without the constraining assumptions of more structured methodologies, which can ignore or misrepresent themes that do not easily fit with a hypothesis or experimental framework. This flexible approach ensured the research addressed the concerns it set out to investigate whilst remaining open to findings that were not necessarily implicit in the core research questions. This is an important consideration for this research, whose topic is currently under-researched and therefore lacking in even rudimentary assumptions about the multitude of sociological factors that may be influential. Considering the breadth of issues that may be covered by participants and the scarcity of similar research, it seemed appropriate to use only non-directive questions, approach the data unbound by predictions of outcome and allow the findings to be the product of developments within the research. An interpretive epistemology rejects positivist assumptions that the complex social phenomena that are the subject of the social sciences can be explained by deferring to an epistemological model that emulates the natural sciences. Instead, interpretivists argue, an appreciation of the subjective

meanings of social action is fundamental to understanding the social world (Bryman 2008).

5.4 Case Studies

Using each school as a case study allows for depth of insight into their unique environments. A case study approach also promotes a focus on relationships and processes at work within social settings and the involvement of both teachers and pupils of citizenship education makes for a holistic understanding of the exchange between the two stakeholders in the teaching and learning of citizenship. This is vital in exploring both the *outcomes* and *social processes* with which this study is concerned. In this way, causal factors – and how they relate to each other to contribute to certain outcomes – can be examined in detail. Other qualitative and quantitative methodologies can reveal outcomes but the strength of case studies lies in the rigor of investigation of details which explain which contingencies were in play in a situation that resulted in a particular outcome. This level of discovery can then be enhanced by comparisons across cases, to uncover how differences and similarities between settings impact upon findings (Denscombe 2007).

Choosing appropriate cases propitious to the production of answers to the research questions under study is vital to the success of this kind of research. For this reason, random sampling is not a suitable method of selection. Unlike those of large surveys, experiments and studies using quantitative methods, cases are chosen for their distinctive characteristics so that a more specialised narrative can be focused on and explored in greater detail.

5.5 Sampling

For interview-based qualitative research, a purposive approach to sampling is widely favoured over random or probability sampling techniques (Bryman 2008). This method seeks to ensure a strong relationship of relevance between research questions and cases studied. Snowball sampling may be employed for populations where a sampling frame is absent. In this study, however, the population of schools is known and data on their relevant characteristics are readily accessible from the Department for Education and Skills Annual Schools Census. The richness of this dataset makes the construction of a sampling frame possible, which allows for theoretical sampling. Using the research questions identified by the original aims of the study, a sampling frame was constructed by identifying state maintained

schools in England that occupied a range of points on the scales of three variables commonly used as proxies for socio-economic background, ethnic diversity and inclusivity of disabled people: proportion of students claiming free school meals, percentage white British and percentage identified as having special educational needs (Hobbs and Vignoles 2009).

Once the sample had been identified, it was possible to determine a number of cases that would provide theoretical saturation. This involved calculating values for each of the three variables for all schools in the population and taking the mean average of each. Cases could then be selected on the basis of their conformity to or deviation from the norm in each measure of socio-economic diversity. Once a school had been identified as meeting the requirements of the purposive sample, an online document search yielded further information in the form of Ofsted reports and from these it was possible to construe a group of potential case studies that demonstrated breadth in characteristics including regional location, geographical setting, and size and nature of the communities they served, as well as the three key variables. This was also informed by considerations of accessibility, in that teachers with whom the organisations involved with the study had had previous contact were approached if their schools fell within the parameters of the sampling frame. The schools selected were therefore drawn from an opportunity sample, in that the widely acknowledged difficulty of gaining access to schools (Harrell et al. 2000) was overcome by drawing on professional relationships that were an asset of the study, but the ultimate sample was the result of purposive selection based on the criteria outlined above.

The next step was to make contact with head teachers by letter and follow-up telephone call, introducing both the researcher and the aims of the project and detailing exactly what would be expected of participants and the benefits and risks involved in their taking part. Access was then negotiated with a date set for the researcher to visit the school at the convenience of its staff and students, by which time consent forms for all participants were to have been completed.

The table below shows the schools that took part in the study (under pseudonyms for reasons of confidentiality) after being selected to provide pupils from a diverse range of ethnic, special needs and socio-economic backgrounds. Data were derived from the 2008 DCSF census, and used to measure socio-economic deprivation (percentage of children taking free school meals - FSM), levels of special educational needs (SEN), and proportions of ethnic minority.

	Pupil Headcount	% FSM	% SEN	% White British
Northern Academy	905	34%	38%	66%
East Coast College	1,178	5%	23%	95%
Midlands Community	1,523	4%	21%	59%
South East High	997	5%	10%	80%
Hilltop School	87	20%	100%	-
North West School	938	5%	20%	98%

Northern Academy opened in 2007. Students and almost all staff transferred from the predecessor school. It has a specialism in citizenship with enterprise and is an average-sized secondary school. It serves an area of very considerable social and economic disadvantage. The town it serves has one of the highest rates of unemployment in the country. Around a third of the population is recorded as of Black or ethnic minority origin (BME) and over half of the BME population is unemployed. Some of the school's pupils are from some of the most deprived areas in Europe. The proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals is well above average. About two thirds of the pupils are White British, the second largest ethnic group is Pakistani, and a small number of pupils are refugees or asylum seekers. About a quarter of the pupils speak English as an additional language. The proportion of pupils with special educational needs and/or disabilities is above average and special provision is made for twenty-five physically disabled learners, some of whom are profoundly disabled. As a consequence, the percentage of pupils with statements of special educational needs is more than twice the national average. There is also a higher than usual number of looked after children on roll. It was judged to be a satisfactory school by Ofsted in 2010.

East Coast College is a larger than average secondary school near an industrial town. The BME population of the county is very small but more concentrated near the town. Unemployment is above average. The proportion of students with special educational needs and/or disabilities and those with a statement of special educational needs is above average and the majority of students are classified as White British, with other ethnicities making up only 5%. A lower than average number of children claim free school meals. Overall attainment is average. Ofsted judged the overall effectiveness of the school to be good in 2010.

Midlands Community School is a larger than average sized comprehensive school serving suburban and central areas of a small city. About a quarter of the town's population is classified as BME and its unemployment rate is average. The proportion of students with learning difficulties and/or disabilities is below the national average and attainment on entry is above average. 60% of students are of White British background, and other pupils are from a variety of ethnic backgrounds, including Indian (16%) and Pakistani (12%). The proportion of students with English as a second language is higher than the national average. It is a high-achieving school with attendance well above the national average. Its overall effectiveness was rated outstanding by Ofsted in 2007. The researcher is a former pupil.

South East High School is an average sized school situated in a town on the south east coast of England. Unemployment is below the national average. The town's population is nearly 95% white and one of the oldest populations in the country. Less than 20% of the school's pupils are from minority ethnic backgrounds and for about half of these pupils, English is not the first language. A lower than average proportion of pupils has learning difficulties and/or disabilities. Overall attainment is above average. It was categorised as a good school by Ofsted in 2008.

Hilltop School is a community special school in the North of England with 87 pupils on roll. All students have special educational needs in the form of severe or profound and multiple learning difficulties. Almost all pupils are of White British heritage. A small proportion of pupils are in the care of the local authority and 20% receive free school meals. It was rated a good school by Ofsted in 2010.

North West School is situated in a village near the Scottish border, close to its county town. Only around 5% of the town's population is classified as BME, which is the highest proportion in the county. There is a high rate of hate crime per capita. Unemployment is well above the national average. The school is of average size. Most pupils travel to the school from the surrounding rural areas, some of which are isolated. A large proportion of pupils travel from the county town. Almost all pupils are of White British background and live in areas of mixed social advantage, although a number are affected by rural isolation and/or disadvantage. The number of pupils whose first language is not English is very small. The proportion of pupils entitled to free school meals is below average. The number of pupils with learning difficulties and/or disabilities is broadly average. The school was found to provide a

satisfactory level of education by Ofsted in 2008. The supervisor of the research has had previous contact with the school.

5.6 Data Collection

On first contact, teachers were told that the interviewer was a research officer at the Citizenship Foundation and a PhD student at the University of Leeds and that the research project sought to explore the values citizenship teachers drew upon in secondary practice and how citizenship education is received by pupils. It was stressed that recent studies had suggested a need for more detailed research into how this relatively new and contested subject is taught and received in a diverse range of settings – the reason for their school's selection – and how teaching might vary from and link to that of subjects more embedded in the established curriculum.

The briefing document added that it was hoped the study would give teachers the opportunity to reflect on their practice and that the findings would be of practical use to all those involved in citizenship education. Teachers were also assured that objectives were purely exploratory and the study was not concerned with assessing the quality of citizenship teaching. In the consent forms sent out ahead of visits to schools, parents were informed that their child's school had been chosen to participate in a collaborative research project between the Citizenship Foundation and the University of Leeds, investigating perceptions of citizenship in England. It was explained that their child had been selected to take part in an interview because of his/her experience of citizenship education, and that interviews would 'explore what citizenship means to teachers and pupils in English state secondary schools'.

At each school, the teacher responsible for co-ordinating citizenship education and a selection of those teachers who were involved in teaching citizenship were invited to take part in an interview. The focus of the interview schedule for these respondents was the extent to which each teacher's own background and beliefs and their perception of the social and cultural backgrounds of their pupils has 'shaped' the ways in which they have implemented and/or interpreted the citizenship curriculum. A series of interviews with pupils then explored their views of citizenship. Ten thirty minute interviews were conducted in each school with pupils from years eight and ten. The contact teacher at each school was asked to identify pupils from each of the year groups, to include as far as possible a sample of students that reflected the characteristics of the school's student population in

terms of gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background and ability/disability. This necessitated the use of teachers as 'gatekeepers' and this method introduces additional practical and ethical considerations as the researcher is not in full control of the selection of participants and cannot demand a cohort that is completely representative (Bryman 2008). This is, however, an obstacle which is likely to present itself regardless of the use of gatekeepers, insofar as the population from which a sample may be drawn will vary depending on the logistics of the fieldwork; the ideal candidates to represent the student body may not be present or available for interview on the day of the researcher's visit to the school. Visits had to be arranged around the teachers', rather than the pupils' optimum convenience to accede to their multiple roles of interviewees, gatekeepers and facilitators of the research in general, providing as they did the accommodation, refreshments and schedule for the day. The tension between accessing participants who matched the study's desiderata and those who were available was summed up by one teacher who regretted that one boy whom he had hoped to take part to redress the balance from 'model students' was a truant that day.

The researcher sought to erode something of the 'outsider' status by meeting with teachers informally prior to interviews, often having lunch with teachers and pupils and spending time in staffrooms. In the case of Hilltop school, the researcher accompanied the young people on their weekly trip to the local supermarket and spent time with them in lessons. This integration had the dual benefits of putting the pupils at ease with the presence of the researcher and allowing for greater appreciation of their complex needs, which facilitated communication.

5.6.1 Interviews with Teachers

Interviews with teachers sought to address the research questions of *how active are teachers' and pupils' understandings of citizenship?* and *what forms of knowledge are engaged with to construct conceptions of active citizenship in schools?* Interview questions were therefore crafted to translate these areas of questioning into invitations for teachers to relate a narrative of their experiences and views, analysis of which might yield understanding of significant themes. To locate their conception of citizenship, teachers were asked "what were your ideas of citizenship when you were your pupils' age?" The participant was then probed as to where these ideas "came from" to uncover the significance of their school, family, community and the values of society at the time. They were then asked whether

this conception had changed, and probed as to why, to elucidate any concerns with which they might now identify.

After anchoring their account in their personal attitudes and experiences, the question of “what do you think the government is seeking to achieve through citizenship education?” was asked (and clarification was given by reference to the recent change in government). They were then probed to specifically consider why political literacy, community involvement and social and moral responsibility might be emphasised and probed as to whether they viewed such an approach as a solution to a problem, or aiming to create a certain type of citizen. After providing a description of the government’s policy aims, teachers were asked to reveal something of their position on the policy with the question “does Britain need what you’ve just described?” They were asked to explain their answer and probed on the relevance of each of the three strands. The utility of the strands was again probed after the question “is this a need you’ve identified with reference to the children you teach?”

Teachers were then encouraged to reflect on the reflexive nature of their practice with the question “how does your teaching of citizenship address this (*need*)?” and the following probe “would you adopt a different approach with a different group of pupils?”, which sought to prompt teachers to draw distinctions between different needs to be addressed with different (socio-demographic) groups of children. It was then explicitly noted that citizenship education had been introduced with light touch guidelines, and teachers were asked how this affected teaching practice in relation to other, more prescriptive, curriculum subjects. Probes included “do you draw on your own values more as a result?” and “how do you avoid bias?” Teachers were then asked “how do you empower different types of pupils to promote pupil voice?” This question sought to draw responses that spoke of the use of different approaches with children from different backgrounds.

The original interview schedule ended with the question “do you think pupils apply what they learn in citizenship lessons to their lives outside the classroom?” as a natural end to the narrative of the learning journey. The aim of this question, and its subsidiary probe, “do you see this in school?”, was to precipitate reference to ancillary benefits to the school that may have arisen and served to substantiate citizenship’s status. The assumption behind this line of enquiry was that references to “good citizenship making for a happier school”, or similar, were antithetical to the critical content of the curriculum.

From the first interview with a teacher, it was evident to the interviewer that the interview schedule overlooked a question which was implicit in many of the participants' responses. The issue of the change in government, and the resultant vulnerability of citizenship to being dropped from the National Curriculum as part of a 'back to basics' drive in line with Conservative educational policy, was felt to be an 'elephant in the room' that should be acknowledged. A final question was therefore included in all interviews with teachers, asking "if citizenship were to be 'scrapped', what difference would it make?" This question took advantage of the subject's precarious position to investigate the true status of citizenship within the school (because of course, whether or not teaching citizenship was a statutory requirement, schools would be at liberty to continue their teaching of it). This issue occasionally presented a rather negative note to end interviews on but it often served as a 'springboard' for reflection on any themes teachers had not felt prompted to discuss in response to earlier questions, and the rapport developed by this time ensured that the interviewer could subsequently lift the mood, so the benefits of including this question greatly outweighed the risks.

5.6.2 Interviews with Pupils

Informed by the theoretical considerations discussed earlier, a key concern of this project was its endeavour to facilitate respondents' accounts to be voiced to in their own terms. As such, while concepts such as the different functions of education, praxis, and common-sense debate were important in theorising the research, care was taken not to transfer these ideas to respondents as assumptions about how citizenship education might be experienced. This was particularly crucial for interviews with pupils, who could not be assumed to have considered the concepts that might lie within and behind the citizenship curriculum (whereas teachers could be expected to have engaged with these concepts to at least the level necessary for planning their teaching). Interview questions therefore provided signposts to elements of citizenship education of interest to the research.

Interviews with teachers sought to address the research questions of *how active are teachers' and pupils' understandings of citizenship?* and *what forms of knowledge are engaged with to construct conceptions of active citizenship in schools?* Interview questions were therefore crafted to reveal the significance of active citizenship and different forms of knowledge to pupils' narratives. Pupils' conceptions of citizenship were located by the question "what does citizenship mean to you?" – compounded with probes of "where do you get those ideas from?"

and, if necessary, direct suggestions of their school, family, community and/or the values of society – and the similarity of this opening question with that used with teachers allowed for the role of the school in representing citizenship values to be assessed.

Most pupils spoke of citizenship as a school subject before any reference to personal perceptions but they were then explicitly asked how their citizenship lessons had affected the conception they had put forward. In order to gauge their engagement with core concepts, pupils were then asked to describe what they understood the terms political literacy, community involvement and social and moral responsibility to mean. A probe, usually phrased: “thinking about those areas, what do you think your teacher is trying to achieve in a citizenship lesson that isn’t covered by other subjects you learn about in school?” then prompted pupils to consider wider implications, such as whether it might be seen as a solution to a problem, or whether it was aimed at creating a certain type of citizen.

Once they had been given the opportunity to spontaneously propose sociological reasons for the existence of citizenship education, pupils were directly asked “do you think that’s something we need in Britain today?” and asked to consider each strand in turn and explain their answers. The relevance of each of the three strands to any national need was then probed, usually with the question “do you think any one is more important?”, if the participant’s answer had not already signalled their inclination towards a particular strand. Pupils were then asked to narrow their focus to the needs of their immediate peers by addressing the issue of whether their class “needed” what they had just described. Again, the relevance of each of the three strands was directly probed. The question of whether classmates with different backgrounds might need this more than others was indirectly probed by concentrating the participant’s mind on their particular class.

The question “how does the way citizenship is taught compare with teaching in other lessons?” encouraged pupils to draw distinctions between citizenship and other subjects so that any ‘unique’ features of citizenship pedagogy might be described. Probes were often necessary to establish the existence or absence of significant differences, including the interviewer’s direct reference to the “set-up” of the classroom, the positioning of participants in the lesson, the use of teaching and learning aids and, quite often, the imagining of the perceptions of an observer denied knowledge of the content of the lesson.

In order to directly prompt discussion of 'active' citizenship and the community involvement strand that was less likely to be considered in responses to the earlier questions about lesson content, pupils were asked whether their citizenship education gave them "opportunities to get out and "be a citizen" – "put into practice what you've learnt?". This question was somewhat 'two-tailed', in that it enquired as to children's 'active' endeavours *and* the presence or absence of their citizenship education functioning as an enabling or driving force in any such activity.

As a counterweight to the role of their school in their civic life, pupils were asked whether there were "any issues covered in citizenship that you have discussed with friends or family?". Although phrased as one-directional, this question actually uncovered the dynamism of 'citizenship issues' between different domains of their everyday life. Issues considered relevant to citizenship may have been discussed at home as a result of, parallel to, or independently of citizenship lessons; and the resulting depictions served to illustrate the place of citizenship in young people's lives. Answers to this question fed into the enquiry of whether, if an issue was "important to" the young person, and she/he felt it was relevant to citizenship, they felt they could "bring it up in class". As well as furthering the narrative of how the young person might independently show interest in a social or political issue, this question directly questioned their sense of agency in school. This also linked back to the participant's description of the characteristics of a citizenship lesson.

The concept of agency was then further explored in order to investigate whether classroom discussion exhibited the deliberative nature expounded in the Crick Report. Pupils were asked "what happens when you are having a discussion and people have different views?". The "people" referred to in the question were deliberately left unidentified and respondents were free to interpret the enquiry in line with their description of a typical classroom discussion. They were then directly asked what happened when they disagreed with their teacher's view. Pupils' portrayals of the nature of debates in citizenship lessons were crucial to addressing the study's central themes of the encouragement of critical reflection and respect of pupils' autonomy.

The final question for pupils, which in some cases provided the opportunity to end the interview on a note of a small personal achievement and in any case drew the conversation to a natural conclusion that reflected that of teachers' interviews, prompted the young people to think of a time that they had "used" something they had learnt in a citizenship lesson "in a real-life situation". Pupils were thereby

encouraged to widen their focus from the specific, school-based experiences they had been concentrating on and think again of the broader themes with which they had begun the discussion. Responses provided a check on teachers' perceptions of whether pupils "applied" their learning and gave evidence in support of or against the *active* nature of young people's citizenship.

Ultimately, it was the interviewer's task to encourage pupils' reflection on their experiences that went deeper than the 'self-regulation' (Walkerdine 1985) they were used to conforming to in school. This was a challenge as interviews were conducted in school, with pupils in uniform, usually fresh from a time-tabled lesson, who – despite the interviewer's conscious efforts to create a more balanced dynamic – treated the interviewer as they would other adults in school who expected and rewarded their deference (in fact, some used the experience of being interviewed to rehearse formalities such as shaking hands). This positioning was exemplified by one pupil who whispered "was that right?" after completing her response to a question. Deeper reflection was encouraged, however, by questions that asked pupils "what happens" in instances such as disagreements in lessons, which invited them to take a critical approach to dynamics of power and consider how their experience might be otherwise.

5.7 Data Handling and Analysis

Interviews were recorded with the consent of the respondents and transcribed verbatim. It is another strength of the research that fieldwork was conducted, transcribed and analysed by a single researcher, thus retaining the integrity of the data through continuity in data management. In line with the study's inductive approach, the interview data was explored for recurring themes that furthered understanding of the phenomena in question. The first stage of analysis consisted of "open coding" the data; identifying instances that shared emerging analytic themes so that those that spoke of similar themes could be ascribed to a certain category (Denscombe 2007). Over the course of further, detailed analysis using NVivo, initial codes were refined and axial coding highlighted relationships between categories. The focus of the analysis then shifted to the most significant themes by way of selective coding; identifying core categories that exposed the key concepts that help to explain the forms of citizenship education that were experienced and the views and feelings they inspire.

Inductive coding evolves from close readings of text and deliberation over meanings. The investigator then assigns labels to sections of text according to meanings. As labelled categories grew, their significance became clear and relationships between categories also became apparent. Coding allowed for the analysis of interviews on a certain theme, the significance of which for a particular group of participants could then be gauged and differences between participants' perspectives came to the fore. In this way coded forms of knowledge that determine what is deemed appropriate in the classroom context (Bernstein 1973) can be reconstructed (Dewey 1916; Barber 1984).

McLaren (1995) demonstrates a reconstructive approach in his analysis of an account from Fine's (1989) work in which social studies students were asked to sit on one side of the room or the other depending on whether they agreed or disagreed with the actions of 'subway vigilante' Bernhard Goetz. Those students who remained in the middle of the room were chided by the teacher as 'lazy', 'passive' and having no opinions (McLaren 1995:44). A student legitimised the middle group by asserting that she had multiple opinions on the complex scenario and had chosen to take neither a pro- nor anti- stance. McLaren applied the concept of praxis to describe this account as an example of a teacher unreflectively privileging her own ideological position, undermining and delegitimising the student's reflective position. McLaren describes how, even when teachers intend otherwise, learners' views and experiences are frequently devalued and the one-way nature of the exchange is exposed.

Proponents of critical pedagogy have been criticised for placing teachers at the centre of consciousness-raising activity, however. Ellsworth (1989:311) cites McLaren's claim that *because* teachers did not adopt a critical pedagogy, students in his research were not *provided* with critical thinking skills, leaving their lives without meaning. As the pupils in this research are not conceptualised as lacking, its aim is to theorise from the data itself, rather than privileging any set of responses over any other by making assumptions about how power dynamics are experienced. Where the data suggest these themes, theoretical concepts such as co-intentionality, common sense and accommodation of adversarial debate may then aid detailed analysis, which addresses the research questions of how active participants' understandings of citizenship can be said to be and what forms of knowledge were engaged with to construct conceptions of active citizenship in schools.

To ensure the rigour of themes identified as emerging from the data, a constant comparative method (Glaser 1965) was employed when analysing the data, with instances within and across categories constantly being compared to further define their properties as well as expanding the memos attached to them in NVivo so that the researcher may increase their understanding of connections and contrasts between groups of data. Even the most unsophisticated of ideas about the data should be recorded as part of the process that contributes to explaining the phenomenon under study. This ensures that the researcher stays in close touch with the data, without losing its connection to its empirical source.

5.8 Reflections on the use of Semi-structured Interviews

Ellsworth (1989:230) cautions against the use of research instruments that explicitly privilege a radical agenda in research into young people's experiences of their education as it imposes its own (potentially restrictive) definitions, 'which operate at a high level of abstraction'. The work of radical theorists like Mouffe (1993) was therefore useful in framing questions but when it came to wording questions simple exploratory questions with probes that accessed examples from respondents' experiences were more appropriate. In line with Chapter Three's consideration of the importance of critical thinking to citizenship, this study endeavoured not to load interviews with assumptions about how pupils experience their education. Pupils were first asked what citizenship meant to them and what they understood by the terms that define the strands, with no suggestion as to what these might be about. Only later did the interviewer explicitly raise the idea of what Britain might *need* this curriculum for and the level of the country was deliberately chosen so that pupils did not infer any assumption that they might need citizenship education. Only at the end were they asked to think of how they might have *used* it. This approach speaks to a more general commitment of the research, described by Miller and Glassner (1997, in May 2011:140):

Those of us who aim to understand and document others' understandings choose qualitative interviewing because it provides us with a means for exploring the points of view of our research subjects, while granting these points of view the culturally honoured status of reality.

The methodological tool of semi-structured interviews complements this study's epistemological position, which values people's knowledge, experience and values

as a subject of exploration. The flexibility of semi-structured interviews has been employed as a way to 'give voice' to those whose views had not previously been consulted, as with feminist research (Byrne 2004). As such, this type of interview could provide a platform for pupils to demonstrate their knowledge about citizenship as well as to express how they relate to the forms of knowledge presented to them and the issues they raise. Semi-structured interviews therefore provide the opportunity to analyse meaning in a context that is less restrictive than structured interviews and sensitive to emerging themes, while still allowing for comparability with their format of standard questions (May 2011). Research interviews have been observed by some as enjoying particular resonance in today's society because of their parallel in popular culture, in talk shows and celebrity interviews. Indeed Silverman (2005:111) has argued that we are living in an 'interview society in which interviews seem central to making sense of our lives', and this seems particularly germane to young people, exposed as they are to the latest interactive media.

Unstructured or informal interviews can be seen as more conducive to authenticity in giving voice to participants without the filter of researcher bias that may be present in a standardised interview schedule (Bryman 2008). Where there is a total lack of standardisation, however, differences between interviews can be said to result from inevitable differences between these social situations. Structured interviews provide the most rigorously comparable technique; deviating from the script only to re-word questions for greater clarity, and so are the most suited method to mass surveys that prioritise generalisability. The nature of this study, however, does not demand statistical significance to justify findings, but instead is more concerned to access responses that may only be yielded through 'open' probing that encourages the respondent to reveal the reasons behind their answers to standardised questions (May 2011:129). Similarly, since this research privileges attitudes and motivations rather than considering experience and behaviour in isolation, non-directive questions: those which call for more than a Yes or No answer; are most effective (Bryman 2008). Semi-structured interviews allow a form of dialogue that is unlikely to flow from a standardised script, and invite participants to answer on their own terms. The presence of an interview schedule maintains structure to provide a level of comparability greater than that of an unstructured interview. Although the voices of all interviewees are of equal value to this study, it is worth noting that an important function of interviewing two sets of subjects with different roles in the discourse of citizenship education – teachers and pupils – was the resulting capacity for comparing claims from one set with the experiences of the other.

With the social setting of the interview in mind, it is important to record the nature of the encounter and for this reason it is a strength of this project that a lone researcher served as interviewer for the whole of the fieldwork. Also, because of the age of the participants and the study's assumption-free approach to their prior knowledge, a method of data collection that allowed the researcher to provide some degree of guidance was deemed vital. Although such a method may lack a sense of peer exchange and run the risk of leaving some avenues of discussion that would be opened up by the freedom of an informal interview unexplored, the limitations on the participants' ability to express themselves on a subject with which they may not even be engaged must be acknowledged. For this reason, the general inductive methodology of this study occupies the middle ground between a pre-determined approach to data collection and grounded theory.

It is also for reasons of pragmatism that the research instrument was modified slightly for fieldwork at Hilltop School, for which a focus group led jointly by the researcher and a senior member of the school's staff with whom the young people were familiar, and who lent more specialist communication skills to the proceedings, was conducted. While data from the focus group was ultimately found to be incomparable with the depth of discussion achieved with pupils in other schools, engaging with these pupils was critical to the inclusive values of the study and for locating the rich contribution of their teacher's account. Flexibility of this kind was essential for the gathering of meaningful data, as was setting the scene for interviews through the interviewer's personable and detached (from the institution of the school) demeanour, the interview's non-threatening tone and environment and even the interviewer's neutral, 'smart-casual' style of dress. These elements were maintained throughout interviews with staff and students, with just a slight change of tone appropriate for encouraging respect for and confidence in the interviewer, in line with the different expectations of the two groups. Expectations were managed by the clarification of the interviewer's and participant's roles before each interview commenced. This was crucial for both data quality and ethical reasons.

5.9 Ethics

The most vulnerable participants in this research were the young people who were taken out of their regular schooling to take part in interviews. Disruption to their education was kept to a minimum by using form time where possible and ensuring scheduled slots ran to time. Year groups eight and ten were selected because there are no major national tests or examinations taken within these school years.

Interviews took no longer than thirty minutes in total and most were completed within fifteen minutes. No child was interviewed without the completion of a consent form by a parent and before the recorder was switched on, the interviewer explained their role, the participant's role and the purpose of the exchange, in order to obtain informed consent, which the British Sociological Association defines as requiring the explanation –

... as fully as possible, and in terms meaningful to participants, what the research is about, who is undertaking and financing it, why it is being undertaken, and how it is to be disseminated and used. (BSA 2002)

Disruption to staffing was also kept to a minimum; interviews with teachers were undertaken at a time of their choosing and took between thirty minutes and one hour. Participants' interests were protected at every stage from the crafting of interview questions that were exploratory but not intrusive, to the familiar setting in which the interviews took place, giving participants a sense of security. Data was anonymised and stored securely, and analysed in accordance with detailed qualitative data protocols, supported by the use of NVivo. Deception and misrepresentation was avoided in the treatment of the participants, with interviewees being given full details of the research prior to their participation in order to give informed consent. Once completed, the results of the research will be shared with participants and they will be given the opportunity to feedback on how their contribution has been represented.

It is hoped that teachers' and pupils' involvement in the research will increase opportunities for praxis in their ongoing experiences of citizenship education. Respondents' generosity in offering their accounts as research data, analysed as case studies of the impact of a particular education policy at a particular point in time, should not detract from their continuing capacities to critically reflect on issues of teaching and learning and their shifting roles in the discourse as they continue on their educational journeys.

5.10 Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the methods through which this research was carried out and has explained the rationale for the choice of these methods. An account of the research process has given a background narrative to the data that forms the basis of the rest of this thesis. The theoretical framework that has guided the latter stages of the study has been described and the contribution of this

framework to the analysis of data has been detailed. The results of this analysis will now be discussed in detail in the following chapters, which further demonstrate the utility of the concepts and methodology that inform this research.

Chapter Six: Teachers' and Pupils' Experiences of Teaching and Learning Citizenship

6.1 Introduction

Chapter Two discussed the various kinds of citizenships a state might seek to create and Chapter Three discussed ways in which models of active citizenship might be realised through education. In Chapter Four the policy context in which active citizens might be cultivated through a national curriculum was explored. This chapter turns its attention to teachers' and pupils' experiences of citizenship education in schools and how these affect, and are affected by, perceptions of the role of citizenship in schools and in society. Teachers' interview data are presented to demonstrate the key themes of their accounts, which were: that citizenship education is a tool to tackle social problems; that it should empower young people; that it should focus on 'balance'; and that it should promote pupil voice. Pupils' interview data are then presented to demonstrate the key themes of their accounts, which take forward the themes of 'balance' and pupil voice.

There then follows a discussion of how teachers' commitment to 'balance' comes at the expense of the promotion of authentic pupil voice and it is argued that this approach contributes to a construction of 'common sense' by teachers, which undermines the practice of active citizenship. Finally, it is observed that this 'common sense' took two different forms, which relate to teachers' identification of their pupils as representing either a potential social problem or empowered citizens.

6.2 Teaching Citizenship

6.2.1 A Tool to Tackle Social Problems

Teachers spoke about citizenship education's relationship to the social world as central to their personal interest in it and their decision to become citizenship teachers. Many teachers spoke with passionate conviction about citizenship education's potential for positive impact on wider society as a result of its capacity to instil certain values in the next generation that might help to overcome social problems. Schools' role in shaping young people's understandings of citizenship was seen as having a different type of impact on society than their substantive role of producing educated citizens with a grounding in certain disciplines that enable them to navigate the social world on common terms with other adults. Teachers

were aware that, in bringing in citizenship education, the government had looked to them to tackle issues at the root of social problems:

I think citizenship in some ways has either grown out of that or the community cohesion strand has grown out of the idea behind citizenship ... there was a general sense of apathy after the eighties, that it was more about the individual or about greed – “greed is good” – to quote Wall Street. And maybe there was a reaction against that, particularly during the Labour years, to try and readdress that balance, to try and bring communities together. Quite often communities that had fractured during that period [of] the decline of industry, and the role of men in the family and in the communities fragmenting, new immigrants coming into the country; there was a genuine need, I think, for an attempt to sort of say well what is Britishness, you know, decide who you’ll be as a citizen. Teacher, North West School

This kind of detailed analysis of the origins of citizenship education was common amongst teachers. When asked directly what they thought the New Labour government that introduced citizenship education was trying to achieve, most talked about an agenda of tackling social problems. A general idea that there was a “bit more selfishness creeping in, bit more ... personal aims over taking aims for the collective” (Teacher, Northern Academy) was widespread. Some teachers thought the introduction of citizenship education was an overt attempt to address a lack of certain values, with the design of the new school subject a secondary consideration to the aim of instilling values:

... I think it was Tony Blair – who suddenly brought citizenship in because of the increase in intolerance, terrorism, erm unrest? ... but I think since then they’ve begun to see that, is it civic and civil citizenship where obviously they can learn how to act in their own neighbourhood, their own community and what to do what’s right, what to do, what’s wrong, but also then you can look at the politics side of it and government side of it. And since then it’s branched off into its own subject. I don’t think it was introduced as a subject like geography would be, I think it was a possible solution to problems that we were facing. Teacher, East Coast College

This teacher shows her conviction that the New Labour government was focused on bringing about social change beyond education in her description of the “sudden” implementation of citizenship education as responsive to perceptions of social need. She sees its identity as a school subject as forming somewhat organically once installed in schools. It is particularly interesting to note her

conception of the substantive content of the curriculum as concerned with learning certain behaviours and the remaining content that covers how these norms relate to political processes as supplementary. She notes how it only became recognisable as a subject once messages about “how to act” were augmented by this content. Some teachers felt this focus was damaging for children, as this respondent argued:

... my personal viewpoint is that they were trying to do a very middle-class education and they were trying to sort of cram that into an education that covers a whole range of classes and ... I felt like they were forcing an agenda that wasn't child-centred and that wasn't going to help the children, they weren't thinking 'what do the children need?', they were thinking 'what would suit our agenda as a government?' Teacher, East Coast College

Despite sympathising with the idea of educating young people in citizenship values, this teacher disagreed with citizenship's guise as another National Curriculum subject, rather than a less prescriptive form of learning that would be more responsive to young people's needs. Many teachers were reticent about the problems of the nation directing the way they engage with their pupils, although one respondent needed to be prompted to consider the aims of the policy after commenting that it was concerned with “how to be good citizens”, which involved informing young people “about certain laws that exist and why they exist and how to behave and how to look after yourself” (Teacher, North West School). After some contemplation, she suggested this was linked to Britain's *need* to tackle alcohol and drug abuse and teen pregnancy. Although this teacher did not immediately relate the teaching of citizenship education to national priorities, she did consider tackling social ills valid justification for teaching young people how to behave.

There was a consensus that, if the policy was driven by a desire to benefit not just society at large but the lives of individual young people, then it was a valid effort, and whether or not teachers saw it as falling within schools' remit, they supported the teaching of citizenship because its aims were congruent with their own reasons for becoming teachers: to influence the lives of young people for the better. One teacher suggested:

... maybe teaching them about law perhaps keeps some of them out of trouble and they'll understand how the courtroom works and so on but hopefully won't use that knowledge cos they'll keep out of trouble. Teacher, East Coast College

Her colleague found these sorts of outcomes to be the only way of monitoring impact:

I mean we can only kind of go by the fact that we get a lot of compliments from our local neighbourhood and we have the police in a lot and they always comment that it makes their life easier. Teacher, East Coast College

There is therefore less emphasis on what pupils might derive from their citizenship education when taught from this 'social problems' perspective, as its beneficiaries are seen as located beyond the classroom.

6.2.2 Empowering Young People

Not all teachers, however, felt that the key aim of citizenship education was to tackle social problems. Some teachers believed teaching young people about their rights and responsibilities was a more valuable facet of citizenship education than instilling values for the sake of social cohesion. Some teachers were conscious, however, that there may have been some slippage in the curriculum's aims over time. This teacher demonstrated his understanding of the policy context and recognised that the model of citizenship education that he was familiar with may not exactly match the original policy aims:

I personally think they equated citizenship education with civic responsibility as a kind of main driver ... every citizen to do their duty, no rights without responsibilities, volunteering in the community being a big element of it erm I think it set out, originally, didn't it, under Bernard Crick as something slightly different, perhaps with that kind of political democracy at the heart of it... That kind of political angle I think probably got lost a bit along the way ... Teacher, Northern Academy

He saw the idea of the empowerment of young people as overshadowed by curriculum content concerned with a Thatcherite version of civic responsibility, which revolved around volunteering. This was felt to represent a loss of a political "heart". This shift in focus was thought by some teachers to miss opportunities to recognise young people's strengths, as evident in this respondent's analysis:

... pupils have these skills, pupils are politically aware, they might not be able to tell you what the wool sack is or who the cabinet minister is for this ministry but they're very, very astute and they know how to organise and how to plan things. The

difference is they've chosen not to acknowledge that, they've decided that they don't want to change the system ... Teacher, North West School

This teacher is obviously frustrated by what he perceives as a clash between his support for encouraging young people's political participation and the "system" that precludes their involvement as agents of social change. In his opinion, unless young people are allowed to participate in ways that are meaningful for them, rather than following established channels of engagement, they will not feel that their involvement is desired or valued and so cannot be truly empowered. Key to this was a sense that the nature of academic disciplines did not encourage young people to use skills across different subjects (let alone between school and home), which the teacher quoted above exemplified in complaining that pupils seeking advice on personal finance had "left" their mathematical skills "in the maths room".

The importance of engaging with established norms of participation was expressed across the sample, however, and failure to participate in public life was also seen as the result of a cycle of ignorance whereby some parents "struggle" to convey "*how to take a part in society*" (teacher, North West School), and the resulting lack of participation precluding an appreciation of how democratic channels can be used to bring about change. It was suggested that this phenomenon was linked to young people's social backgrounds and that where parents lack a certain capital in their own knowledge, their children may be condemned to disenfranchisement unless they are formally educated in the ways of democratic citizenship. Making citizenship a compulsory school subject was seen as a way of sending a message that the government was serious about changing attitudes, as one teacher described, so that it was not assumed to happen "by osmosis but it was actually a taught lesson, [a] really, really, really, really important lesson that people should be active members of the community that they belong to" (teacher, Northern Academy).

It was therefore seen as important to formalise the teaching of citizenship, and that lessons should not be *about* formal participation but should rather emphasise myriad ways of *being* an active citizen. The distinct benefit of citizenship, therefore, would be its use of its place on the National Curriculum to inspire young people to think about the importance of skills outside of the norms of academic disciplines, which might serve to 'round off' their education. Citizenship was seen as lacking the status enjoyed by other subjects and this was often attributed to a lack of understanding of how citizenship issues could be learned about within the parameters of a school subject. As one teacher elucidated, parents "think it's about

being a good person and they don't understand why their kids need to study citizenship" (teacher, Northern Academy). Teachers therefore felt the need to explain how citizenship could be 'studied' or 'taught about', to dispel ideas of children being trained to be "a good person", which would lack the legitimacy of the format of other National Curriculum subjects. For teachers, citizenship straddled a divide between teaching young people about society's expectations of them and encouraging their democratic participation. Both these goals were seen as served by fostering an appreciation of balanced discussion that would exemplify the behaviour of rounded citizens.

Some teachers at Northern Academy saw their pupils as being held back by a lack of confidence that would help them to express themselves so a priority for their teaching was "boosting" "real world" skills that would allow them to assert their opinions. This was seen, in a context of one of the most deprived areas in Europe, as "particularly important for our guys" (teacher, Northern Academy). This focus on building confidence shows how fundamental skills may need to be established before citizenship skills like critical thinking can be developed and suggests that schools whose pupils are not perceived as having this need may have a head start by virtue of not having to work on building up to this base level. As this teacher from Midlands Community attested:

I do think that I'm very lucky in that I've got a lot of young people who have what I would consider to be the answers of good citizenship already. Now why is that? ... well, we come from a very privileged area of the city ... overwhelmingly our pupils come from economically benefitted backgrounds and therefore their parents are interested. We have a lot of parental involvement at the school. Huge turnout at parents' evening, which shows you that they care about their children and what they're being taught and what kind of results, and there's a lot of ambition ... and ... those golden tickets of how to succeed in our society: keeping yourself out of the negative views of the police, to be non-anti-social, I think they're supported by their parents. Teacher, Midlands Community

These "golden tickets" would appear to be what the teacher from Northern Academy believed his pupils were missing and this teacher sees them as associated with a positive form of ambition and, crucially, with parental knowledge of "how to succeed". Their inherited credentials therefore negate the *need* to empower them to participate, as they can simply channel the "answers of good citizenship" taught to them by their parents. This implies that the *outcome* of the

production of a good citizen was more of a priority than fulfilling a broad entitlement to the *process* of education for citizenship that would champion pupils' active participation for its own sake. At Northern Academy, teachers felt that pupils' input into lessons was key their development of rounded characters, as pupils:

... feel disenfranchised, that they don't get listened to or they don't have a voice, that the political parties have nothing to say for them, so we try and make them active citizens so we put a much greater emphasis on the moral and social elements of citizenship: if you are a good citizen, what kind of things do you do – it's about, yes, you've got rights but equally you've got responsibilities ... I would certainly say that in the school as a whole develop the whole citizen, rather than just the political citizen. Teacher, Northern Academy

For this teacher, it is the process of citizenship lessons that offers the greatest learning opportunities for young people, especially the "disenfranchised" pupils of Northern Academy. The idea of a learning process that encourages a rounded character, rather than a focus on specific outcomes, was repeatedly expressed when teachers considered elements of their pedagogy through which they could foster young people's potential to become agents of social change, amongst other goals. When considering their pedagogy, teachers reported that they were guided by the needs of their pupils and the opportunities and challenges of working within the framework of the National Curriculum, which another Northern Academy teacher described as pressuring teachers to "*get results*", which amounted to:

... training pupils ... You can ask them a question at times and you can see them try to guess what's in your head, and it takes an awful long time to say to them there is no right answer, the answer that's valid is the one that's inside your mind... Teacher, Northern Academy

This teacher therefore felt constrained by his pupils' expectations of their learning, which impeded their grasp of citizenship concepts, in particular the perception that another Northern Academy teacher expressed as "Sir's giving us the right answer". He was frustrated by this conception because he felt it obstructed his goal of providing a forum for young people's views and critical abilities. Across schools, there was a consensus among teachers that their teaching aimed to develop rounded citizens, which required pupils to take an active role in their learning rather than passively absorb knowledge *about* citizenship. This was further complicated by a desire to promote citizenship education as a legitimate National Curriculum

subject that could be *studied*. As their accounts show, differences in how their pupils' backgrounds were perceived represented different challenges to the aim of enabling active participation but contributing to balanced discussion was considered a vital element of citizenship learning that would encourage a citizenly outlook.

6.2.3 Balanced Discussion

The pursuit of balance was described by a teacher from Northern Academy, who approached the role of bias in debates with the attitude that it was inevitable and pupils' attention should be drawn to it:

... I showed them a documentary from Animal Aid and I got the students to tell me what they thought it was going to be about first ... and they were quite convinced it was going to be biased, and they understand what that is, and afterwards they said "god, Sir, that was biased, we agreed with it but it was biased" ... so I try and kind of make them aware that if I come at them with a subject and a certain slant, I'll always say "am I being balanced, am I being fair?" ... and quite honestly sometimes I'll play devil's advocate sometimes anyway so I'll just come in and say something and "woah hang on Sir, where you coming from with that?" and I'll just say "why, don't you agree?" So I think they're kind of used to my style and as long as you make sure that you throw in the balance I think you can get away with it and it's quite positive ... Teacher, Northern Academy

Controversial statements are therefore regarded as an effective tool for stimulating debate, although "balance" should be restored by the teacher so that no one view is felt to dominate. Taking a broader view of how pupils might be helped to critique their education in general is therefore seen as pertinent to pedagogy for citizenship. A kind of dramatisation of bias is then seen as a way of diffusing assumptions young people may make about their learning and, in this teacher's view, pupils' ability to identify bias will allow them to navigate different standpoints with a view that all are equally problematic and decide for themselves their position on an issue. Setting out principles of anti-domination was seen as crucial, as this teacher conveys:

... when it comes to something that might be controversial we do reiterate: ... no personal questions, no bias. But the kids, to be fair to them, they just get used to them really quickly and today for example, a girl asked me and even before I said "that's a personal question", the class told her. Teacher, East Coast College

Pupils were therefore trained to 'spot' bias and anything else they are told goes against the rules of the lesson. This teacher felt that bias was then removed from the equation and teachers on the whole were confident that even their youngest pupils had a sufficient grasp of bias to critically reflect on their lessons as a source of knowledge that should not be relied upon without question. One teacher at North West School, who described explaining to her pupils the ubiquity of bias, rather than trying to eliminate it from the classroom, simply reminded her class that they had covered this issue of bias in history. Teachers' cognizance of the danger of unbalanced influence is understandable in light of their statutory duty to avoid overt bias, discussed in Chapter Four. A view of this danger as most obviously mitigated by pupils' knowledge of the concept of bias, however, raises questions of critical consciousness. As was outlined in Chapter Three, critical pedagogues argue that critical consciousness is achieved through engaging with certain social practices, cultural narratives and ways of thinking, which develops an awareness of institutional practices that define (otherwise taken-for-granted) social norms (McLaren 1995). Practices of 'spotting' bias and playing devil's advocate, rather than removing undue influence from the classroom, present a theatrical illusion of balance that pivots on issues introduced by the teacher. Pupils are encouraged to rock the boat a little before it is steered on with the teacher at the helm. This suggests a classroom dynamic that is conventionally didactic.

Teachers in the sample commonly expressed, however, that they were flexible in their teaching style, and could comfortably move between roles, as this respondent illustrated:

Even with this hat that I wear as an assistant head, that's irrelevant in the classroom, I'm just me and the youngsters sharing information, and for the most part they'll say "oh really Miss, I didn't know that" ... I would say the youngsters don't know my feelings or opinions on anything Teacher, South East High

With all the ease of changing a hat then, this teacher believed she was able to leave behind the authority pupils were expected to acknowledge in their interactions outside citizenship lessons, so that she could impart information as an equal. The example she described, however, posits "sharing" as directed from herself to the pupils, rather than an exchange that flows both ways. This suggests that the imagining of teacher and pupils on one level is more of a pedagogical device than an alternative framework adopted to position the nature of teaching and learning in citizenship lessons as fundamentally distinct from the norms of other National

Curriculum subjects. Viewed through the critical pedagogy of Freire (1970), the *culture of silence* that suppresses pupils' agency is maintained because they are still positioned as subordinate to the teacher. Even where a deeper commitment to portraying values of equality is said to be at the core of a school's ethos, the difficulty of encouraging pupils to see themselves as empowered citizens, capable of effecting change, was highlighted:

I think we take a more minimalist approach ... I think that our kids here understand citizenship as ... doing as you're told, effectively following the rules, the laws, having responsibility, helping other people, and I think we try and give them the other pathways, that's important but it's also about them developing skills to go out there and question the status quo, and if they disagree with the way things are being run, giving them the confidence that they can change things and that's something that I think the students struggle with a little bit ... Teacher, Northern Academy

Taking pupils' empowerment in discussion beyond the superficiality of *right answers* was seen as one of the greatest challenges for enacting a curriculum of active citizenship. Whilst teachers were assured of their ability to convey "minimalist" elements based on knowledge, the *practice* of citizenship was threatened by challenges in embedding pupil voice.

6.2.4 Pupil Voice

Teachers often spoke about constraints that impeded their use of active methods of teaching and learning and how elements of the values of the citizenship curriculum could be found in extra-curricular activities, but that the nature of *lessons* was not predisposed to reflecting those values. This respondent claimed:

Within lessons, we have a lesson on the school council quite early on. What a good student representative would be and what kind of things the school council discuss. Within lessons ... we do lots of re-enactment kind of activities like how to set up a pressure group where we write letters to the council and so on but we don't actually send them or we maybe have a mock election ... Teacher, East Coast College

The *theory* of how to be an active representative was important for this teacher because only a small proportion of pupils would be able to take up these roles. Even where the extra step of posting letters was all that stood between the theory and practice of active citizenship, this opportunity is not taken. Although the school had structures in place to support a school council, pupils who served in these roles

were not elected by their peers as “mock” democratic processes are presented as learning resources to be observed, rather than fully participated in. Pupil voice was widely reported to be incorporated into schools but not necessarily as a driver in decision making processes. At North West School, letters were sent, as pupils were encouraged to write to local politicians or the head teacher. According to teachers, pupils therefore exercised lobbying skills through traditional media with the goal of having their voices heard by adults in power. As suggested in considerations of bias, the expansion of pupils’ experiences of different learning resources was seen as linked to their ability to form their own views:

... wherever possible I get views from other media ... so that you have different views presented ... you are allowing people to see ‘if that’s what I think then I’m allowed to say it’ ... if I’m getting something from the class where just one viewpoint is coming across then I’ll play devil’s advocate ... get them to argue about what they actually believe – because I think that’s how you develop your view, by hearing different views ... Teacher, Northern Academy

Creative teaching methods were therefore seen as key to stimulating a thoughtfulness in pupils. Certainly, acts of creativity have been advocated by those concerned with developing pupils’ critical consciousness (Freire 1970) but teachers’ presentation of issues, followed by the use of devil’s advocate, seems to miss an opportunity to use pupils’ experiences to drive debate that has been seen as key to educators’ efforts to shift classroom power dynamics and encourage authentic debate (McLaren 1995; Giroux 2011). Indeed, another Northern Academy teacher was not sure that creativity within citizenship lessons, combined with extra-curricular activities, could succeed in creating a true sense of democracy at the school:

I think there are some mechanisms within the school ... that exist. I’m not a hundred percent convinced that the opportunities are totally equitable amongst all students, we have to work hard to avoid that syndrome of the keen students always being put forward to represent the views of the majority. How you do that I’m not exactly sure ... I’m aware that some students are more confident in speaking in class, some like writing it down so I need to be careful about knowing my class ... Teacher, Northern Academy

It was therefore seen as difficult to reconcile individual needs with a whole school approach to create an environment in which pupils are truly empowered, rather than

subjected to structures that represent token involvement. This was a matter for some considerable contemplation at Northern Academy. At South East High, however, teachers were less perturbed:

... I'm probably not the best person to ask cos as a school [pupil voice] is done by one of the assistant heads ... Because citizenship is a discrete lesson, we do it as a lesson and we do raise their awareness in the lesson that they have a voice and the ways that they can express their voice ... we don't do much on the active citizenship in lessons because it's often too difficult, you know, logistically, to organise and arrange these things, which is something we could do better but it's always a bit of a headache. Teacher, South East High

Pupil voice was seen here as a concept for pupils to be “aware” of but the “active citizenship in lessons” that would realise a commitment to its expression is lacking. It is particularly interesting that, although this teacher designed the school’s citizenship curriculum, he sees pupil voice as isolated in the remit of another member of staff. His colleague confirmed that citizenship and pupil voice are not necessarily connected at South East High, indeed, he had not “consciously thought about whether I’m empowering them to do anything within school”. He related this to teaching citizenship classes only fortnightly, which meant pupils were less familiar to him and, in any case, pupil voice was formalised in a “committee almost” that served as a forum for the whole school. He reported that “obviously the citizenship lessons aren’t really linked to that at all” and had not thought of pupil voice in the context of (citizenship) lessons. Not “knowing” pupils is an understandable barrier to addressing their empowerment (as knowing one’s class is seen as an essential part of encouraging participation at Northern Academy) and this teacher therefore saw pupil voice as better delegated to extra-curricular activities.

At Midlands Community School, pupil voice was spoken of as a more considered element of learning. This teacher identified the importance of recognising and valuing pupil voice within school as setting young people’s expectations of being listened to:

... to enable someone to feel empowered they need to feel they are valued and that comes through encouraging them to volunteer their opinion and then to seek to val- not validate – that opinion – to make that person feel that whatever they’ve said has got a valuable contribution to play in the conversation that we’re having ... then

they're more likely to say what they think as their opinion to everything, whether it be deciding to be bothered to vote in a general election ... if that person feels that their opinion is going to be listened to ... that there will be change as well ... then hopefully they'll take that away from this school and use it in their adult life.
Teacher, Midlands Community

In this teacher's view, her pupils were therefore invested with a confidence that allowed them to become agents of social change through their belief in the relevance of their own opinions to the world around them, which allowed them to see themselves as valued citizens. It was generally observed, however, that the lives of present-day pupils did not provide these opportunities, as this teacher opined:

Schools don't get it, they don't understand pupil voice ... You might be able to influence and have a say, perhaps we could talk about lobbying and pressure groups, but it would be foolish to try and set that up. I think at times, citizenship education, if it's not careful, opens the door for pupils only to slam it in their face ... if we're not careful they'll become disaffected because they've started to engage only to find that they're not allowed to. Teacher, North West School

For this teacher, pupil voice must pervade both school learning environments and young people's experiences outside school. He believed pupils should feel free to express whatever was important to them rather than choose from a menu of issues of interest to adults. It is interesting that his interpretation of raising expectations requires a particular climate of valuing young people's contributions in society, whereas the teacher at Midlands Community School saw expectation of being part of public life as, in itself, opening doors to participation. Another teacher at Midlands Community School, however, points out inconsistencies within the school that may hamper such empowerment when pupils felt change was needed:

... a lot of the things we do are maybe imaginary letters but sometimes if they're focused on something within our community – cos obviously we can't always do the taking action part of it because you know, sometimes you don't have the time or the resources to put into that within a lesson framework so that will pass on to the school council ... we encourage the kids to translate it into life, which is hard with citizenship in this way cos the school council is sort of not curriculum-bound ... sometimes we find lessons restrictive on the action that the kids can take and so

that's why we create fictional places and relate it to our own society and our own community... Teacher, Midlands Community

In this way, *lessons* are seen as fundamentally incongruent with the promotion of pupil voice and this is devolved to the school council. This process is described as driven by a genuine desire for issues to be properly tackled, for which there is no scope in citizenship lessons. Any disaffection from not being able to pursue particular concerns is then avoided by restricting discussion in lessons to fictional scenarios, and where these transgress into issues that are meaningful for pupils, these issues are picked up by their school council representatives in extra-curricular activities.

Teachers saw citizenship education as offering benefits either as a tool to tackle social problems or by empowering young people. Regardless of their goal, a persistent theme of teachers' experiences of citizenship education was the tension between authentic pupil voice, which teachers tended to express a commitment to, and a preoccupation with 'proper' classroom conduct, most notably the need for 'balance'; which was considered a particular challenge presented by the subject's attention to opinion. Across the sample, balanced discussion, with clear boundaries for what may be said and an understanding that it would go no further, was considered key to teaching citizenship. Together with a theoretical understanding of pupil voice, this was thought to foster the attributes of a rounded citizen: one who understood that a variety of perspectives on a topic might co-exist. Pupils were not depicted as having any particular commitment to a perspective as discussion, initiated by the teacher, was merely a learning exercise to introduce young people to the supposedly adult concept of the political. The relevance of personal views or pupils' suggestions of alternative methods of participation in public life was therefore limited and hence these were either said to be discouraged or did not figure in teachers' accounts.

6.3 Learning Citizenship

6.3.1 Right Answers

Pupils' accounts confirm the transmission of a conception of the purpose of citizenship education as a tool to tackle social problems. Talk of empowerment was, however, lacking, as ideas of citizenship as a subject to be studied, rather than practised, predominated. The idea of *right answers* was therefore fundamental to

pupils' understandings of citizenship, and this set the parameters for their considerations of balanced discussion and pupil voice.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, pupils' understandings of citizenship were very closely linked to their experiences of citizenship education. The expansiveness of the subject was often characterised by references to "society" and "life", which one pupil related to "different things that you have to do like pay taxes. How not to act in different situations" (year eight pupil, North West School) For this pupil, citizenship was synonymous with activities one is *compelled* to participate in, as well as learning to conduct oneself according to a negative framing of undesirable behaviours in certain contexts. He identified school as the origin of this understanding and the school ethos was invoked by another pupil to explain his understanding of citizenship as "being part of a community ... like a school or the world or anything like that", elaborating that "it's a community school, so that's what we've been taught" (year eight pupil, Midlands Community School). Again, this pupil saw his understanding of citizenship as a direct translation of his school-based learning, but he expressed this view as derived from his *relationship* with the school, rather than abstract knowledge about rules of conduct. Others provided a fuller account of where values might come from, as in this pupil's response:

Well I guess some are like personal, how I feel how I should be, and then I guess school kind of reinforces it as well ... like how my parents say how you should act towards others ... I guess everyone needs to learn it at one point cos then it's like they know how they should be and if they act the wrong way then it's their own decision, they can't blame anyone else, so I kind of go by it cos I understand it as well, and I agree with it, some of the stuff. Year ten pupil, Midlands Community School

This pupil felt the main source of his ideas of citizenship was his parents, with school serving to "reinforce" their message. His primary reason for using this 'moral compass' was to avoid the "blame" inherent in knowingly committing social misconduct; secondary to this was his own sympathy with some citizenship values. Another pupil talked about citizenship education's concern for responsibility as focused on:

... the responsibility you have as just being a human, sort of, not doing anything bad, kind of, living how you were brought up by, if you had acceptable parents that

taught you, you know, the right morals and kind of sticking by that and living by that.
Year ten pupil, South East High

This interpretation suggests elements of both reinforcement of parental values and possible supplementation of values for those whose parents who lacked the capacity to impart “the right morals”. In teaching these *right answers*, citizenship lessons were largely seen as fulfilling a purpose with outcomes concerned with a positive impact on young people’s future lives, as these pupils reveal:

... now I know if I want to choose a job I’ll know which ones will make more of a difference. Year eight pupil, Midlands Community

because you’re obviously going out into the community, learning new skills about how to work and like, I don’t know, becoming a citizen really; a normal, average worker. Year ten pupil, Midlands Community

It’s like basically how – not how to live your life but, what’s right from wrong, in your life, in the future and kind of basically, doing the right and wrong choices and learning about life really. Year eight pupil, North West School

These pupils’ interpretations demonstrate the differing degrees of agency young people assumed would characterise their futures. Midlands Community pupils were concerned with how they would be defined by work. Although she stopped herself from describing citizenship education as prescribing a way of life, the respondent from North West School saw her future as best understood in terms of normative values of “right” and “wrong”. One of her peers was concerned about a lack of responsibility:

I’m not picking people out cos I might need a bit more but I think we all need [a greater sense of] responsibility and need to learn a lot more about, like life. Year eight pupil, North West School

This respondent was keen not to exclude herself from a deficit model of education for social and moral responsibility and, interestingly, she saw an increased sense of responsibility as a product of receiving greater knowledge about the world, rather than stemming from assuming different roles in it. Inherent in some pupil’s accounts were notions of a need for more active citizenship and that Britain had experienced a nationwide phenomenon of decreased public engagement. One pupil commented that she felt the most important strand of the curriculum was social and moral

responsibility because of its positive potential for individuals; a change of focus from judgemental overtures that tended to be made to young people as a group:

... I mean some people in our school, they think oh I can do this and they don't know the consequences that's gonna happen so they need to learn to take responsibility as a person and how to be around others ... because it's quite rewarding if you've got responsibility and it actually goes through something positive, that's a rewarding experience rather than the actual law side of it cos, I hope they won't but they might learn about the law in another way (!) but it might stop that from happening if they actually feel like an important part of the community ... I think if you've got responsibility you grow up faster and you're a more rounded person. Year ten pupil, East Coast College

It is interesting to observe this young person's construction of a "more rounded" character. She saw this 'grown-up' incarnation, rooted in a sense of responsibility, as beneficial to both the individual and society. Being given responsibility is seen here as providing a rewarding diversion from activities that harm society. Responsibility was also seen as instructive by this respondent:

... cos if you're not responsible, you don't know what trouble you'll be in, so you have to take responsibility to insure your life. Year eight pupil, North West School

It is the pupil that is cast as the principal beneficiary of taking responsibility for her actions in this context. Pupils commonly reported that their citizenship education taught them how to stay out of trouble, as this pupil explains that without it:

I'd be missing out on facts on how life runs, because I think citizenship is a good way to teach us, what happens, how it happens and when it will happen ... you've got a lot of bad things happening in Britain at the moment and I think to learn about this it gives us a warning. Year eight pupil, Northern Academy

Theories of citizenship were then far from abstract, as they were seen as dealing with real-life "bad things" that many pupils identified as the dangers of alcohol and drugs identified by their teachers and, perhaps most interestingly, "people not having any money because of all the stuff they spend it on" (year ten pupil, East Coast College). School's role is therefore seen as tackling the norms of some pupils' home lives, which might be lacking in certain values. One pupil from South East High did not see much added value from citizenship education as she highlights other sources that serve to reinforce appropriate messages:

I think the things that we need to know that we get from the citizen lessons can easily be supplied by parents. And lessons go into a bit more detail about it, then at the same time I don't think we need that much information on it. If there wasn't any citizen lessons anymore then I don't think it would be too much of a big problem ... cos we have the news, we have the internet, we have parents again, so if you wanted to know something you could ask your parents... Year ten pupil, South East High

Drawing on her own experience, this pupil concludes that parents are a constant, available to be tapped for citizenship information, and that utilising resources at home is a matter of choice. Learning *about* citizenship in school is not then seen to represent any uniquely enlightening opportunities. When considering their experiences of learning and teaching, however, pupils reported some differences between the pedagogy of citizenship and that of their other lessons that might justify citizenship's inclusion in the National Curriculum. In this respondent's view:

It's a lot more pupil-involved. There's not as much writing, there's not as much listening and textbooks, it's more about the way you think and the way you act ... you'd see a lot more talking between teacher and pupils. Year eight pupil, Midlands Community

This pupil saw citizenship lessons as less focused on absorbing information from the teacher and traditional resources. Not all young people in the sample felt their lessons differed significantly from other learning experiences, however, as this pupil's testimony illustrates:

We watch more videos than in other lessons but otherwise it's much the same cos we still work off the board. Year ten pupil, East Coast College.

Pupils' responses suggested differences in teaching methods were negligible. Across the sample, pupils reported little novelty in the style of lessons:

I: So would you have the teacher at the front talking or would it be more like you're talking to the teacher?

R: ... Both, like if teacher's saying something like asking questions, we communicate more with each other and if there's something we don't understand he's going to come up and tell us. Year eight pupil, Northern Academy

Although there may be more discussion, the teacher's role is still one of delivering right answers. At Midlands Community School, there is little difference between the format of the lesson and that of other subjects:

R: ... *sometimes Miss has got the posters out or something on the interactive whiteboard so you've got pictures to explain it as well.*

I: *And do people interact the same as in other lessons?*

R: *Yeah, yeah, people still put their hands up and ask questions and stuff... Year ten pupil, Midlands Community*

The use of more visual content is considered a slight novelty here but the teacher's task of *explaining* and pupils' task of *asking questions* of the teacher are reinforced. The young people did not expect to take on a different role when they entered their citizenship lessons so any sense that citizenship was more about their active contribution may have been the result of what Peter McLaren (2013) called small victories, an element of novelty to pique their interest in a subject of a supposedly different nature, which allayed any real questioning of its presence on the timetable. So small were these victories that some respondents struggled to find features of citizenship lessons that set them apart from those of their other subjects. Some, however, reported occasions that reflected an ethos of social awareness:

R: ... *[Sometimes] we get in groups and then we work together, which I think is a good idea, cos ... it helps us to get along with each other – it gets us together like a community basically.*

I: *So what happens when you are having a discussion and people have different views?*

R: *Well everyone has the right of free speech and if I'm saying something like I believe and then they say something they believe, I respect their views and I think to have different views ... is good.* Year eight pupil, Northern Academy

In his reference to the concept of free speech, this pupil demonstrates an ability to apply citizenship values (at least within citizenship lessons) fostered by a collaborative environment that replicates the public forum of a community. Teaching methods were widely reported to be inconsistent, however, rather than driven by a desire to foster a particular learning environment. Perhaps most revealing was one

year ten Midlands Community pupil's comment that she had experienced a variety of approaches, from "book-based" to more open discussion and preferred the latter. She went on to describe the many community projects she volunteered for, which she did not feel were connected to anything she had learnt in citizenship lessons.

6.3.2 Balanced Discussion

Where pupils had experienced such an atmosphere of debate, the teacher's role was often seen as less dominant than in other subjects, as this pupil reflected, "She agrees with everybody, she's not biased" (year eight pupil, North West School). This respondent was aware of the dangers of bias he had been taught about and validated his teacher's approach accordingly. Not favouring a particular view point was seen as good practice, as in this respondent's understanding:

Normally our teacher would put forward a view that they've come at with lots of other teachers but I don't think they'd put forward their personal view. Year ten pupil, East Coast College

Expressing a view that was validated by other teachers was therefore considered less controversial than a "personal view". Across the sample, pupils reported their teachers as keen to appear *balanced*, a principle that was observed unless there was a *right answer*, as this respondent explains:

Miss probably wouldn't like go off on the other side, she'd just say well you can think your views and that'll be it or if there is a right thing she'll tell us that we're all wrong or something. Year ten pupil, North West School

In this way, pupils' views were only focused on if they needed to be contradicted by the teacher. In some cases, pupils reported that their teacher would present their view, as in this account:

... one of my teachers, yeah, she erm she like, if somebody has a different opinion she'll see why they've chose that ... and she'll say you're not wrong, it's just your opinion and everyone has an opinion. Year ten pupil, East Coast College

Opinions in this context were not points of contestation, it was accepted that there are as many opinions as individuals and as they are equally valid they do not warrant volatile dispute. In this understanding, views are harmless and may be presented or not, with little change of effect. As another East Coast pupil saw it

when asked if the teacher would put forward a particular argument: “maybe, it depends... if they want to or not” (year eight pupil, East Coast College).

The presence of a view put forward by a teacher is not then seen as a vital driver of a lesson but, as another East Coast pupil illustrates, the teacher’s position in relation to the content they deliver is not thought about in any great depth:

I: *So what happens when you are having a discussion and people have different views?*

R: *Normally, most people agree with the view. Not many people put their hand up and then disagrees but if they do ... It just kind of like shows how everyone’s like thinking and everyone’s opinions so it does make you accept other people’s point of view.*

I: *And would your teacher put forward a view?*

R *Not normally no... just in the middle!* Year ten pupil, East Coast College

This respondent’s interpretation of the “different views” the question alludes to as ‘different from the teacher’s’ is revealed in her assertion that “most people agree with *the view*” and that expression of different views would involve a formal voicing of disagreement with what has been presented by the teacher. The teacher is then, unsurprisingly, positioned as “in the middle” of that argument. Another account from East Coast College implies that the teacher does represent a point of view:

[The teacher would] either give us a clue on her opinion and we’d work it out for ourselves so that gives us a bit of thinking time as well ... she tells us our opinion, she tells us all we need to know, she doesn’t tell us too much, we normally work it out for ourselves. Year eight pupil, East Coast College

In this context, the challenge of working out the teacher’s opinion is part of the lesson, with the concept of opinion a mere substitution for ways of referring to the right answer used in other subjects. Freire (1970) critiqued this style of teaching as a ‘ready-to-wear approach’ that ‘serves to obviate thinking’ (Freire 1970:50) as it requires pupils to adapt to the purposes of the teacher. These pupils’ accounts suggest their participation in discussion was limited to demonstrating their understanding that citizenship was *about* people having different views, characterised by *bias* and *balance*, rather than contributing their own thoughts.

Pupils were asked to consider their capacity to initiate discussion to explore teachers' claims about opportunities for pupil voice in more depth.

6.3.3 Pupil Voice

The teacher's role was not seen to differ greatly from other subjects and pupils' roles were therefore equally familiar. Accounts of active participation at Midlands Community School were mixed:

I: *Do you feel that if an issue was important to you and you felt it was relevant to citizenship, you could bring it up in class?*

R: *Not as much, because she usually has something set to learn and, there is a lot more involvement than other lessons but not so much the pupils talking back, it's more us getting involved in what she's already set out.* Year eight pupil, Midlands Community

In this pupil's experience, his input was not necessary for the achievement of the lesson's objectives and he felt that a spontaneous contribution would be seen as unexpected and distracting from the teacher's planned activities. Another Midlands Community pupil reported a different perspective, however, in response to the same question:

R: *Oh definitely, Miss is always welcoming to those views and then maybe she'll, like, help you express those views so you feel confident so you're not scared to say anything, cos you know, no-ones gonna laugh at you.*

I: *Is that something you've done?*

R: *Yeah, I've brought something up ... I think it was like drug abuse and stuff like that, I felt that it was like, wrong and that most drugs should be banned if people are just using them for harm, and then other people agreed as well, and the teacher agreed – well she agreed, like, neutrally!*

I: *She neutrally agreed?!*

R: *She told us in a neutral way – ha ha!* Year ten pupil, Midlands Community

While keen to portray his teacher as supportive in helping pupils to express their own views, this respondent ultimately revealed that the lesson environment was

one that fostered harmony through a kind of consensus that essentially trivialised debate. In this example, once pupils have reached an acceptable agreement, the teacher signifies the attainment of her planned goal by subtly validating the consensus. It is transmitted to the pupils that the validation they are used to receiving in other subjects should be more covert in citizenship and the respondent amends his reporting of the situation accordingly; but he has betrayed his understanding of this game. Debate was also reported as lacking an element of argument at East Coast College:

... miss will normally say "who thinks it should be legal?" or something and "who thinks it should be illegal?" and she'll listen to people who've stuck their hand up for both sides. Year eight pupil, East Coast College

A mundane ritual of orderly expressions of opinion was therefore validated by the teacher's attention to "both sides". Elsewhere, the teacher's domination of classroom discussion was more overt. The power of the teacher was seen as easily exercised:

I: And what if you disagree with teacher's opinion?

R: Well we could voice our views but at the end of the day they're kind of the teacher! So kinda the bigger person.

I: They'd have the last word?

R: Well I guess they'd just say it's over and get on with the lesson! Year eight pupil, Northern Academy

"Voice" in this sense is not defined as something that must be listened to, though it may be tolerated. The power to demand that the lesson be 'got on with' is crucial here as it sets the parameters of debate and, however free a discussion may be, pupils were aware that their normal roles must be returned to. The logic that there is a right answer and that it is his teacher's job to help the class discover it often framed debate as a prelude to this discovery, as in this example:

I: So what happens when you are having a discussion and people have different views?

R: We kind of argue a bit like in the class but then Mr Strummer tells us like, like what it really is and just corrects us.

I: *So what happens if your teacher has a view and you disagree?*

R *He'd allow that ... erm ... and he'd just say that's your opinion or that is an opinion and that's it really.* Year eight pupil, South East School

Argument in these terms suggests a device that serves to demonstrate pluralism but the lesson must then be taken back by the teacher so that he can impart the message that is the day's learning objective – “what it really is” – while reinforcing a notional commitment to debate through tolerance of pupils' opinions. Pupils were familiar with being steered towards a particular outcome, as this respondent recounts:

... we talk about it and if we still disagree, he tries to explain it and in the end we all just come to one conclusion. Sometimes they can be wrong, we can be right, but more or less they're more always right than we are, cos we see it from a different aspect as what the teachers do. Year ten pupil, Northern Academy

It is perhaps a striking illustration of the power of schooling to define young people's view of disciplinary knowledge (Bernstein 1973) that this pupil saw the propensity of his teachers to align themselves with what turns out to be the “right” answer as unrelated to their role in judging this contest. Most pupils did not therefore associate their lessons with opportunities to influence their class, as this pupil pointed out:

A lot of people have different views but people tend to just go along with it, no-one tends to strongly disagree with no-one, they tend to just listen to it. I mean out of the classroom I do hear people saying “oh that wasn't really right” but I don't think there's major arguments about things like that. Year eight pupil, East Coast College

In this way, debates were not seen as relating to real issues or impacting on real life but more as role-play – that is, taking on a role one does not normally identify with – and pupils are not, therefore, personally invested in such a process. Indeed, one pupil felt that citizenship lessons did not offer him a role through which he was able to broach serious matters:

... say if I brought something up, people'd laugh and joke and it might disrupt someone and make them feel a bit bad so if I told the teacher and if the teacher'd be able to say it not from me then obviously it's from the teacher's point of view really... Year ten pupil, Northern Academy

Although citizenship lessons represent an opportunity to acknowledge certain issues then, the entrenched rules of the classroom dictate that a point of view must be recognised as the teacher's to be taken seriously. A pupil's spontaneous contribution would be such an unexpected novelty, it would be *disruptive*. The distinctive features of citizenship lessons are not then to be found in greater pupil empowerment, but a reduced focus on subject-specific knowledge, as one pupil sees it:

...in a maths lesson people would be, like, thinking about the correct answer, whereas in citizenship they'd already know the answer. Year eight pupil, Midlands Community

This lack of 'academic' knowledge is seen as offering greater freedom in lessons. Certainly, pupils' deep familiarity with their schools' dominant practices help them to identify differences in teaching methods employed in citizenship lessons but these differences can often be reduced to a slight departure from didactic pedagogies, which involves little more than the recognition of pupils' views and the introduction of opportunities for rudimentary peer learning.

Differences between teachers' and pupils' experiences of citizenship education therefore suggest that the themes of balanced discussion and pupil voice were ultimately understood as methods of conveying the *right answers* of good citizenship. Pupils cannot be said to be empowered as active citizens through this understanding, which was one goal teachers identified (though some observed it may have "got lost" from the curriculum), but this reductive form of learning may serve as a tool to tackle social problems, as focuses on reinforcing cultural values rather than promoting young people's agency.

6.4 Discussion

6.4.1 "They *have* a voice" – a pedagogy of citizenship?

As only twenty percent of citizenship teachers in England have been specifically trained to teach citizenship (NFER 2010) and, for the vast majority, their specialisms lie elsewhere, citizenship lessons are founded on the general principles common to National Curriculum subjects. Of course, though some of its architects may have had radical ambitions, the citizenship curriculum was designed to fit the format of schools' timetables, terms and academic years, and to allow its learners' progress to be monitored and measured alongside other curricula. The fundamental positioning

of pupils' roles as active learners by the citizenship curriculum, however, calls for a shift in the relationship between teachers and pupils and a re-balancing of their roles in generating discourse; and this can only be achieved through innovative pedagogy.

When asked if interaction between teachers and pupils in citizenship lessons was different from that in other classes, pupils responded that it was "much the same" in most respects. Characteristics of citizenship lessons that were identified as different from other lessons mostly related to the use of teaching resources that were more visual, such as increased use of video, but this did not stimulate a departure from pupils' experience of working within the margins their teacher has set out for them. Many pupils used "work" to refer purely to writing tasks, a distinction that demonstrated how little teaching methods would need to deviate from that of other classes to make an impression on pupils. Despite this, the opportunity to encourage more active learning is not taken: pupils commonly complete a writing task which is then validated by the teacher. As is perhaps inevitable in light of teachers' admissions of how their own conceptions of education have come to be framed according to inflexible curricula, a core tenet of the citizenship curriculum has become secondary to material knowledge comparable with other disciplines.

This was epitomised by reference to pupil voice. Teachers skirted around the concept of active citizenship: with *acknowledgement* of core principles taking the place of *encouragement* to make them manifest; and teachers so overwhelmed by the magnitude of the paradigm shift necessary to truly involve young people in their learning that they lost any perspective on the micro level changes to their practice that would show sympathy with an active model of citizenship, so that their commitment began to seem superficial. Citizenship's dual domains of 'lesson' and social action placed it in a paradox that teachers perhaps struggled to relate to their job description. Constrained by the amount of energy they could spend on their role of 'citizenship teacher' (one of a number of roles they are constituted in) and steered by the dominance of the norms of the National Curriculum, it is unsurprising that some teachers preferred to define their role as limited to traditional classroom teaching. One teacher demonstrated how pupil voice lay outside her remit since there was a formal forum with the title of pupil voice and so no connection between this and her theoretical lessons was to be expected.

Thus, as pupils were *allowed* a voice in a forum designated to contain it, which bordered on resembling an adult platform and "*obviously*" was not connected to the

theory of citizenship they learn about in lessons, this school's duty to promote active citizenship had been discharged; and teachers could get on with the real business of teaching self-contained subject areas. Of course, a forum for pupil voice is essentially associated with education for citizenship, but its identity as extra-curricular places it outside the focused concerns of the teacher who is concerned with *teaching*. This inflexibility in the construction of the teacher's role aborts possibilities for an interactive learning environment in which active citizenship can be made meaningful. Pupils' experiences of active learning were overshadowed by passive experiences, which left them unable to think of ways in which citizenship was taught differently from other lessons.

The relevance of young people's contribution to the debate is therefore lost. Despite teachers espousing their support for the spirit of active citizenship, in practice the cultivation of an environment likely to produce such a level of agency is stifled by inconsistencies between their messages and their pedagogy. Pupils revealed a thoughtful awareness of the appropriateness of different teaching styles and yet, without teachers' validation that the essential values of a subject should guide pedagogy more strongly than teachers' predilections, pupils rejected the significance of their own experiences. This passivity, of course, allows for the reproduction of norms of teaching and learning, with pupils' observations little more than a footnote to the maxim that teachers will use whatever methods they please.

One pupil went on to state that her citizenship education had not given her any opportunities to put into practice what she had learnt. Unlike many respondents, however, she had no problem articulating how citizenship *could* be practically applied – as she actively served on both her school council and a youth opportunity fund panel, as well as doing voluntary work at a residential home. It is possible that this pupil was selected by her teacher to participate in the research because she was an exemplar of an active citizen, however, when asked if her citizenship education provided opportunities to practise active citizenship, she stressed that it did not, and that her extra-curricular activities were not related to anything she had learnt about at school. The irony in this pupil's experience of citizenship education is that she had the desire to be an active citizen and had to look elsewhere to fulfil it, which may well feed into the skill she demonstrates in her critique of her teachers' pedagogy, and yet these critical skills often go unused because her potential contribution to citizenship lessons is eclipsed by her teachers' by virtue of their roles in the lesson. As discussed in Chapter Three, teachers' control of the learning environment through techniques of classroom management was observed by

Dewey (1916) and others to neutralise the dynamism of education and particularly the deliberation needed to bring about structural change. Pupils' passivity in the classroom is then perpetuated.

6.4.2 “Sir’s giving us the right answer” – passing the citizenship test

Although some young people had been exposed to co-operative forms of learning that encouraged discussion with peers and practising tolerance of each other's opinions, schools' commitment to pupil voice lacked depth. Northern Academy prided itself on offering opportunities for pupil involvement and active citizenship and its students reported their experiences of citizenship lessons as providing a forum to express their views and consider those of their peers but teachers' roles were fixed along conventional lines. If there is no change in how a school, as the institution that constructs the roles of teacher and pupil, sees those roles, relations between the two will remain fixed and we must conclude that young people's agency within citizenship education is delimited by the same parameters as apply to their participation in school more generally. In this culture, pupil voice is merely a tool for teachers to use to illustrate the topic in their lesson plan. As several pupils explained, if a pupil uses their 'voice' in a manner that precipitates the planned learning objective, their action will be validated by the teacher.

The discrepancy between the pedagogy teachers purport to adopt and the learning experiences of pupils can be understood in terms of performativity (Youdell 2006), as while a teacher at Northern Academy showed his awareness of the appropriate discourse when he reported his conviction that debate and empathy took precedence over “Sir” supplying the right answer, this was not supported by other respondents. The premise of making no assumptions about the resemblance between pupils' received learning and teachers' pedagogical philosophy underpins this study – the two categories of participant providing checks on each other. Perhaps Northern Academy teacher's classroom methods were as empowering as he asserted but, if so, they have been overshadowed by a dominant framework that renders his efforts invisible to the young people of Northern Academy. Citizenship's light touch curriculum seems to have resulted in its only constant being its existence within the National Curriculum. The mechanisms of the institution are all geared towards passing through a standardised system of assessment; constructing learners who are best suited to passing tests devised under the macro culture of the National Curriculum, and a lack of critical reasoning is not a handicap in this pursuit.

As long as the macro culture focuses on tests that award marks based on the examinee's ability to remember what they have been told is the right answer, citizenship's relevance outside the classroom will be severely limited. Where does this respect for the tradition of the pursuit of predetermined answers leave Crick's aims of the light touch citizenship curriculum that teaches young people the skills to make up their own minds? This issue is particularly relevant when it comes to matters of 'balance'.

The rhetoric of balance was recognised by pupils across the sample but they reported that, in their experience of citizenship education, the teacher still held the answers. These students' experiences of teachers *tolerating* their contributions show evidence of one of Latour's (1987) tactics for the creation of a black box. Latour claims that nuclear scientists were able to *enrol* American politicians to support the development of nuclear weapons by *displacing* the Pentagon's original goal of winning World War II, a war of conventional weapons, by re-framing the problem as that of beating the Germans to the atomic bomb. By displacing one goal with another that more closely fits the solution one is offering, a purveyor of black boxes derails arguments that her method is not the best choice. In terms of running a school, teachers can be confident that an Ofsted inspection would confirm that they are encouraging their pupils to 'take an interest in topical and controversial issues and to engage in discussion and debate', in keeping with the statement of importance for citizenship (QCA 2007), but the meaning of this goal, to foster active participation in lessons and in the school, has been displaced by that of stimulating pupil discussion to signify a departure from the methods of traditional subjects. This device is then used as a resource for the teacher to show tolerance of opinion before encouraging the children to arrive at the planned learning objective and so remain within the black-boxed construction of how pupils should receive their education.

In some cases, even a cursory concession to the curriculum text was deemed unnecessary. In schools in more isolated areas, teachers' keenness to undo influences external to the school meant that some points of view were labelled as not valid and *anti-common sense*. One teacher, for example, said that she had encountered "some real antiquated issues", including a pupil who failed to see why Britain should offer aid to developing countries if his own country was "so poor" but she charted her progress by explaining that "he did change his mind by the end of the lesson". Unlike the disingenuous portrayal of 'balance' as an area of knowledge rather than a skill, this teacher looked outside the institutional norms of the school

to a cultural norm to justify her imposition of a value. Coupled with the desirable construction of 'balance', this constitution of a 'wrong' calibrates the 'right' answers pupils are pushed towards, giving the appearance of a spectrum of ideas that are up for discussion; but of course, right ideas and wrong ideas are met with very different responses, responses that closely resemble those pupils are used to receiving in maths and science lessons. Students easily understand that there is formula for their learning that must be followed.

As shown in the previous section, a strong awareness of the parameters of the over-arching framework of the National Curriculum can be seen as a threat to authentic pupil voice within citizenship lessons. When freed from the confines of the timetabled lesson, however, some teachers were keen to be creative. Pupil voice was seen as a thread that must run through the whole school in order to be an ingenuous endeavour and if empowering young people in this way was seen to serve a genuine need in the community then it was, at least notionally, embraced. This required a social awareness of the kind demonstrated by the Northern Academy teacher who saw inspiring youngsters to greater levels of confidence as "particularly important for our guys".

6.4.3 "God, Sir, that was biased!" – the construction of bias in schools

Although students struggled to identify ways in which teaching and learning in their citizenship lessons could be described as different from lessons on traditional subjects, some drew parallels with behaviours the subject sought to promote. One respondent saw pertinence in group work and demonstrated his ability to apply citizenship values by valorising a diversity of views.

Certainly, when values were juxtaposed with aspects of a lesson that were noticeably different from pedagogy familiar from other subjects, students picked up on the novelty and appreciated their exposure to alternative ideas. This was felt to be something unique to citizenship, indeed; the integrity of the citizenship curriculum would be weakened further if it was a feature shared with another subject. Citizenship lessons were recognised by some as the self-contained space on the timetable to explore ideas of free speech, learning from each other, valuing personal contributions, and discussing controversial points of view. Even so, these were characteristics of citizenship education that were teased out in interviews, usually after probing; there was no consensus on unique features of citizenship that the young people immediately identified when asked to describe the nature of their

lessons. This supports the findings of Davies and Evans (2002), Kerr and Cleaver (2003) and Davies (2004) that citizenship teaching lacked consistency and suggests that its identity as a subject is made problematic by an attempt to fit its uniquely wide-ranging content into a disciplinary mould considered to provide a desirable status. In this way, pupils' responses provided a check on the more idealistic visions of their teachers, whose portrayal of their own noble intentions could also betray conformity to the familiar steering practices of the dominant framework of the National Curriculum.

The Northern Academy teacher who spoke of his control of what talk is "*allowed*" provides a depiction that agrees with those of many who enthused about the transformational powers of citizenship and cited techniques they employed to stir up debate, such as playing devil's advocate. Such narratives imply artifice in the use of the term *devil's advocate* to characterise the teacher's role of offering *the other standpoint* to counteract views s/he does not agree with, rather than the commonly understood meaning of voicing an argument in spite of one's own position on a matter. Some teachers recounted examples of their use of devil's advocate to represent views that clearly did not reflect their personal beliefs. This practice would appear to contradict accusations of avoidance of controversial issues, but teachers' descriptions of the way in which they used the devil's advocate approach rendered it as very much a theatrical device, which almost had to be ridiculously contrary to have the desired effect of catalysing opposing opinions. In this way, voicing a controversial view in fact guaranteed a homogeneous response supporting the status quo, or 'right answer'. Therefore, while on the surface this technique might seem to invite debate, the subjects teachers chose to broach by this method actually suggest that it was a device for garnering support for the dominant view. Using devil's advocate to introduce and neutralise controversial issues in this way removes their essential contestability.

As one self-aware teacher revealed, the formulaic nature of the lesson dictated that she set the agenda and pupils were then allowed to contribute before she has the last word: "balanc[ing] it at the end". This contrived method of directing debate before providing the illusion of representativeness with a predetermined conclusion shows a lack of appreciation of the effect of the construction of pupils as subjects within the institution of the school. Although perhaps not familiar with a sociological reading of their environment, teachers are aware of their place in a highly ordered hierarchy whereby they are in a position of power over pupils. It is the teacher's *orientation* (Bernstein 1975) that guides interaction between the subjects of teacher

and pupil in the institution. This does not equate to indoctrination to the teacher's view but framing discussion of a controversial issue as a device for transmitting the core values of the syllabus, rather than fostering citizenship skills by truly engaging with controversial subjects, misses an opportunity to encourage young people to form their own views. As Star (1991:52) points out, 'power is about whose metaphor brings worlds together and what holds them there'. This is not what Crick (1998) envisioned when he sought to equip young people 'with the knowledge and skills needed for effective and democratic participation' but perhaps this shows a lack of foresight about how citizenship would fit into National Curriculum.

Although citizenship education's light touch nature encourages the reinforcing of cross-curricular messages, the presentation of assumptions that are not held up to be questioned clearly goes against the interactive aspect of teaching for active citizenship. This study found that young people had a good awareness of the principles of bias and teachers had obviously introduced the concept's relevance to citizenship. This relevance was treated, however, as a black box (Latour 1987), in that manifestations of bias were the trick questions to look out for in the 'test' that the citizenship curriculum is geared towards. It is usefully introduced as something to look out for in the learning activities teachers present, as in the teacher from Northern Academy's recollection of showing his class a documentary made by animal rights campaigners.

Whether or not there is an actual exam to be studied for, citizenship's place on the National Curriculum depends on being taught as if its students are being prepared for one. The critical dimension that was supposed to be at the heart of the educational experience is only consistently evident in one form; the recognition of bias in given exercises. Once instances of bias have been categorised as such, students have learned to treat them as a threat to the completion of their task of absorbing the message from the learning objective, and move past them towards an 'objective' conclusion. Learning to detect bias on cue is the beginning of a valuable skill. When asked about their teachers' methods, however, students were largely unable to engage with the concept of potential for bias in any depth. For example, a teacher's role in discussion was described as "not biased", as "she agrees with everybody". Pupils were often keen to stress that their teacher was 'impartial' but in almost all cases went on to express that this could be overridden when there was an issue of 'right' and 'wrong'.

Some children recognised that the practice of challenging views should be extended to all views in order to be properly observed but they did not feel that a teacher's standpoint was on the agenda for classroom discussion and their comments demonstrate pupils' subordinate role in classroom debates. Teachers' dominance was widely justified, however, by pupils' perception that it was used to impart the 'right answer'. This was viewed as their fundamental role as teachers, they were not regarded as expressing the kind of personal convictions that would fuel genuine debate. Giroux (2011) argued that any pedagogy that neglected to identify the interests that it was shaped by stymies learners' ability to participate meaningfully in an exercise; and such practice is elemental to Freire's (1970) concept of the *culture of silence* that simply upholds existing power structures.

The function of schools in producing culture is one that is so ubiquitous that it is often used as an example by theorists like Foucault and his followers and the role of teachers is described by Fairclough (1995) as dependent on adhering to the norms of the education system, as well as those of their institution, to reproduce ways of interpretation that reinforce those norms. Both these macro and micro level power structures construct the subject of the teacher as acting upon her pupils, a position of power that was not fully appreciated by this study's sample. One teacher at North West School failed to acknowledge how her power relationship with her pupils made her the most likely source of bias. Most other teachers talked about the strategies they used to encourage pupils to challenge the ideological representations that may underlie any source of knowledge, while acknowledging their position of power to some extent. This was not reflected in pupils' narratives, however.

Furthermore, the nature of education as a "political football" was identified by some teachers. This level of reflection is clearly preferable to what is perhaps a minority attitude of a teacher lacking in reflective practice but, as with the promotion of pupil voice, awareness of bias in education does not necessarily translate into enlightened practice. As previously noted, teachers displayed an impressive understanding of and commitment to citizenship values of empowerment; however, this is not commensurate with engendering active citizenship.

6.4.4 Right Answers and Golden Tickets: the Construction of Common Sense

As we have seen, for young people with what one teacher called "the golden tickets", citizenship was recognised as a label to be attached to values they already have, rather than providing new opportunities. Pupils in this more privileged

demographic tended to envision the world that awaited them beyond school as welcoming of the rounded citizens that their combination of academic and social schooling had made manifest, and believed that they would benefit from acceding to cultural norms. One year ten pupil, from a successful school with a high proportion of students from prosperous Asian minority families, defined citizenship on his own terms and extrapolated from this a positive reasoning for its place in schools in that young people could then make “their own decision” to adhere to or deviate from cultural norms. Although this student regarded the school’s role as a vanguard of values as somewhat secondary to his parents’, he recognised a value in shoring up messages of what society and communities expect so that, were an individual to default on their responsibilities, ignorance could not be used as a defence. In this context, citizenship lessons are an opportunity to demonstrate one’s knowledge of this *common sense*, which enables them to choose to either conform to expected norms or depart from them with full awareness of the consequences. This test of common sense was seen by others at the school as a defining characteristic of citizenship lessons.

Citizenship lessons were not, therefore, a forum for the airing of controversial views or mounting a real challenge to dominant norms, as one student’s reflection on the ‘open’ nature of classroom discussion revealed when he described an exchange with his teacher in which he played his part by suggesting “drugs should be banned”. The teacher duly validated this but, in keeping with a commitment to ‘balance’, did so “in a neutral way”. This dialogue betrays a conscientious championing of neutrality that construes “unbiased” discussion as naturally preferable to unruly debate as a mode of demonstrating one’s ability to engage civilly with others. This student’s account was an admission that this way of dealing with issues on the citizenship syllabus sat so comfortably in the domain of received opinion, established law and accepted thought that ‘debate’ constitutes more of a tick-box exercise – going through the motions of a process to justify arriving at an outcome – than the challenging, active learning environment envisioned by Crick. This displacement of engaging with ‘controversial subjects’ with accepted norms clearly co-operates with the displacing of active debate with constructed questions and answers through the disempowering practices that discourage challenges to social norms, which this study found to be prevalent. Freire (1970) referred to this process of narrating to pupils, instead of fostering the vitality of genuine debate, as perpetuating the ‘narration sickness’ (Freire 1970:45) he argued was endemic in formal education. This study found no cause for optimism that the teaching of citizenship in schools offers a challenge to this sickness.

No doubt Crick would have approved of a nurturing teaching style that truly ‘welcomes’ and ‘helps’ students ‘express’ views but, in such an example as encouraging a child who agrees with the current law and shows evidence of drawing on school subjects that seek to be cautionary of deviant behaviours, the teacher seems to be instilling a form of *manufactured choice* that promotes what is to be regarded as *common sense*.

6.4.4.1 “You’re not wrong, it’s just your opinion” – manufacturing choice

Pupils’ responses when questioned about their experiences of differences of opinion among their peers were revealing. Without being prompted, pupils consistently gave accounts of their teachers’ role in discussion as the most active – the source of validation – able to neutralise tension with the reassurance that “you’re not wrong, it’s just your opinion”. Gently undermining resistance to dominant views by the practice of tolerating instances of off-syllabus contribution and isolating them under the ownership of the pupil allows pupils to learn to sanction their own actions and use their ‘free choice’ to make decisions that are appropriate to their culture. Sequestering a statement as *just an opinion* recognises individuality whilst devaluing it, as a process of segmentation by which Foucault proposed the power of analysis is shown to be beyond the subject, acting upon it; it ‘individualize[s] the excluded, but use[s] procedures of individualization to mark exclusion’ (Foucault 1977:196).

This is an example of how ‘public’ agendas can be linked to ‘private’ codes of behaviour, and demonstrates how overt actions by which a government seeks to impose its values by linking public and private practices (by constituting certain practices as ‘anti-social behaviour’ and inventing new punishments and treatments for perpetrators, for example) are complemented by ‘internal’ actions that seek to constitute citizens as ‘free’ individuals (who have been warned about behaviours that are anti-social, are attributed with the ability to regulate their own behaviour and therefore have no-one to blame but themselves) (Foucault 1982; Rose 1998).

Rose (1998) cited the relationship between national government and self-government as explicitly established since the advent of policing. A citizen was to be taught ‘to control his own life by mastering his emotions and to subordinate himself politically without resistance’ (Rose 1998:77). This demanded education in practices of ‘self-scrutiny, self-evaluation, and self-regulation’ (Rose 1998:77), which included governance over one’s body, speech and movement in school. In common with

subjects of other institutions like factories and asylums, pupils were to internalise judgment of themselves against the values of their institution. These practises, therefore, do not aim to repress individuals but to produce individuals who subject themselves to moral judgments (Rose 1998). These practices are what Foucault called technologies of the self, 'which permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection or immortality' (Foucault 1988:18).

As one pupil explained that he did not feel he could bring up an issue he felt was relevant to citizenship, as this would be discouraged because his teacher "usually has something set to learn", his validated role of "getting involved in what she's already set out" constituted a more active role than he experienced in his other lessons. Pupils are therefore taught the theory of the merits of constructing and expressing one's own opinion, without benefiting from the practice of it. The manufactured choices they are conditioned to follow represent the level of participation that is reinforced by their learning in other National Curriculum subjects, affirming citizenship's place in the wider discourse of their school.

6.4.4.2 "Drugs should be banned" – the construction of a common sense consensus

As discussed above, pupils' perceptions of the source of the views they were exposed to were obfuscated by teaching methods, like extreme case formulation and devil's advocate, which sought to guide them to a pre-decided conclusion. In this way, pupils' manufactured choices may create a *common sense consensus* that is not recognised as the product of their teacher's methods. When pupils were asked if a teacher would put forward a particular argument as part of class discussion, it was seen as an arbitrary decision for the teacher, of little consequence. One pupil exemplified a lack of critique of her teacher's position in class debates by describing her position as "just in the middle!"

After teaching students to be vigilant for signs of bias in ideological positions, some teachers precluded debate by adopting a somewhat disingenuous approach that neglected to acknowledge their role in bringing issues to the classroom. The provenance of *the view* was not examined and the significance of being 'in the middle' of a scale of their own construction is not afforded genuine consideration. The real 'balance' here seems to be between what Bentham (1798) described as

too much or too little *observation*. In Bentham's terms, schoolchildren need not feel constantly subjected to inspection as long as they are aware that they may unwittingly be so at any time. In this way, instances of the exercise of power through inspection are unverifiable. When presented with a 'middle-view', or one whose expression is presented as dependent on the whim of the teacher, pupils are unable to verify whether or not power is acting upon them. Foucault believed this unverifiability to be central to panoptic discipline in institutions such as schools (Foucault 1995).

Rather like the teacher who 'neutrally agrees' that drugs should be banned, failure to seize opportunities to apply the values of transparency and informed, reasoned analysis that are taught *about* in the treatment of issues for class discussion is consistent with a rhetorical strategy that seeks to avoid any naturally-occurring confrontation in favour of a manufactured middle ground. Billig's (1987) work on the construction of 'common-sense' identifies limits that such a strategy places upon argumentation, either devaluing issues by establishing a norm of selecting issues to offer a view on based on "if they want to or not"; or, by not opening an issue up for genuine debate, denying the legitimacy of fundamental questions on the subject (Billig 1987). In this way, silence is never a neutral response. Pupils are used to looking for the right answer and are adept at reading between these lines to "work out" the common sense consensus they must arrive at to be admitted to the echelons of academic attainment.

Although all the teachers who participated in the study were conscious of the potential for political and personal bias in citizenship education, most expressed a view of education more generally as playing a valid role in shaping the kind of citizen a child would grow up to be. There was a consensus that personal views could be drawn upon in teaching, so long as they reflect widely held mainstream principles such as the inherent unacceptability of racism that had passed into *common sense*. This understanding of common sense – of the constructed limits of what is accepted and acceptable in the discourse – is one of the local processes of constituting and re-constituting social relations through which hegemony is achieved (Laclau and Mouffe 1985). Working at the macro level of policy formation as well as this micro level, such processes integrate subordinate subjects rather than dominating and suppressing them and exercise power through the generation of consent rather than coercion (Fairclough 1995:123) The idea that culture may be legitimately reproduced as long as there is consensus had some credence with

pupils, who saw teachers' positions on debates as arrived at "with lots of other teachers".

The role of teachers as conveyers of dominant values is therefore accepted and, given their vocal, determined commitment to applying citizenship values for the benefit of their students, the way would seem to be clear for the transmission of a model of citizenship closely resembling Crick's vision. As Youdell (2006) would remind us, however, it should not be assumed that intentions are translated into action as pure performativity. The principal component of educational training has been identified by many liberal theorists as the inculcation of certain practices in order to represent the continuity of the culture into which pupils are to be integrated. Dewey proposed that trainee teachers are trained in the art of *culture-as-management* to fundamentally control the learning environment of the classroom (Dewey 1916), what have been called 'factory' aspects of schooling (Latour and Woolgar 1986). Teachers are therefore trained to transmit the messages of the National Curriculum, which encapsulates elements of the national culture deemed most crucial to this tradition of integration, and to adopt generalist teaching methods appropriate to their role as reproducers of values.

Conditioned by their schooling in other subjects, pupils become used to seeking out the learning outcome that their teacher is steering the lesson towards. Even when pluralist principles are recognised as a key part of the syllabus, pupils were left in doubt as to the depth of their school's commitment to such values. As such, pupil voice within citizenship lessons is in danger of being reduced to another method of reinforcing students' confidence of speaking up only when they were sure of the 'right' answer. In this way, the norms of the National Curriculum perpetuates a pedagogy that limits learning to being *about* citizenship. The final section of this chapter explores two forms of common sense that were taught about in this study's sample schools.

6.4.5 What Kind of Common Sense Does Citizenship Education Teach?

Unlike the right answers of other subjects the 'light touch' of the citizenship curriculum appeared to leave some room for teachers' interpretations of the type of citizenship that was most relevant to their pupils' needs. This resulted in pupils'

views of citizenship clustering around two distinct themes, which the following sections discuss.

6.4.5.1 Citizenship is... learning to invest your capital: “becoming a normal, average worker”

As discussed above, participants from schools in more advantaged areas tended to regard citizenship lessons as a chance to demonstrate the knowledge they were expected to already possess. This required students to take a different approach from conventional lessons. The question “do you think those areas are something we need people in this country at the moment to learn about at school?” was phrased to locate the recipients of English citizenship education without being leading, but the most common response from pupils from areas of lower socio-economic advantage, addressed in the next section, was an assessment of present-day Britain as lacking, which often drew on media representations of social problems. Pupils from more privileged backgrounds tended to *disidentify* with narratives of lack. Skeggs (1997) uses the concept of disidentification to describe the act of intentional and marked distancing of oneself from identity categories, as implied with reference to those who do not contribute to their community and the role of “acceptable parents” in instilling the “right morals”. Those who are lacking in attributes associated with citizenship are then *othered*, becoming an object of knowledge, an example of those ‘in need’ of citizenship from which a good student must set themselves apart.

With the privileged position of being unimpeded by the lacks of the *Other* comes power that young people are encouraged to use wisely, whereby career decisions are made with the knowledge of which jobs will “make more of a difference”. This focus on responsibility comes with an understanding that, as long as they follow the codes they have been taught, they will enjoy the freedom to *choose* their future paths. This is manufactured choice made manifest, the pupil conditioned to sanction his behaviour to contribute to the lesson in line with the teacher’s expectations so as not to interrupt the flow, matures into a citizen who takes responsibility for exercising their free choice for the smooth reproduction of their community’s values. Not only were these young people aware of their responsibility to make an impact on the world but they saw their education as being very much geared towards preparing them to enter the marketplace as a saleable commodity. The onus was not so much on empowering them to be active members of society in their youth but to ready them to get the most out of their careers as economic citizens.

Midlands Community pupils tended to be more focused on their future as citizens than other participants. They spoke spontaneously of the “outside world” of public life – mainly in terms of work – they saw themselves about to become part of. Work experience was seen as vital by some pupils when asked if their school had given them opportunities to “be a citizen” and put into practice what they had learnt; this was seen by one pupil as becoming “a normal, average worker”. In fact, Midlands Community takes a cross-curricular approach to teaching citizenship, combining it with PSHE (hence an element of work experience) to squeeze it in to a packed timetable. Perhaps this opposite tack to seeking to affirm its status by imitating the delivery of other statutory subjects has the result of avoiding the negative effects of black-boxing (Latour 1987) disciplinary knowledge, allowing for such free associations to be articulated. Citizenship’s place on the timetable may have been diminutive but it was still there and pupils assumed it must have value.

The attitudes of Midlands Community pupils, however, raise questions of the nature of value, which Skeggs (2013) has recently explored. In investigating the potential for *Values beyond Value*, Skeggs asks if neo-liberal societies have diminished our capacity to speak about values without invoking a market understanding of monetary *value* (an interesting question for any scholar of Orwell, not least Crick). Skeggs argues that Britain is suffering from a blinkered view that ‘reduces ideas about what constitutes a person to the imperatives of the market’ (Skeggs 2013:3). Pupils’ eagerness to fit into this logic, to become ‘the living embodiment of capital’ (Skeggs 2013:3) is not, it is argued here, the result of a deliberative process in which they had the opportunity to consider their own values and potential role in society. A pupil’s projection of his future as an “average worker” provides no validation of a curriculum for active, democratic citizenship. Instead, it suggests that there is a long way to go to instil democratic values in the classroom, and that a much more radical approach to pedagogy must be taken if this aim is to be achieved. Freire (1970) argues that a radical approach should be concerned with liberating the learner from the imposed logic that has governed her previous learning experiences. The pupils of Midlands Community provide perhaps the most pertinent case for this argument because of their privilege. This study does not seek to advance the thesis that these pupils’ life chances are not well served by a reduction of their education to a commodity with a market value: on the contrary, this approach is likely to ensure they fit in to desirable social roles easily. What they may be lacking, however, which will be explored in the next chapter, is the critical consciousness to effect change in society that is at the core of citizenship in a democracy.

6.4.5.1 Citizenship is... learning to stay out of trouble – “cos we call it skills for life”

Like their colleagues further up the league tables, teachers in schools serving areas with higher levels of deprivation also used citizenship education as a utility for dealing with perceived barriers to success. The nature of this agenda, however, was recognised as more controversial, as the dual beneficiaries of the individual pupil and society at large came to the fore. One teacher felt that learning about the law might keep students “out of trouble”, while another attested to making “life easier” for the local police.

Indeed, some pupils spoke of their citizenship education as teaching them to look after themselves by staying out of trouble. The importance of staying within the existing laws and moral codes of the country was emphasised with a clear message that stepping outside these boundaries was an act of criminality and wrongness, not the work of an agent of social change. Young people were therefore informed of their rights, not so that they could proactively hold democratic society to account but so that, when they committed (with varying degrees of inevitability) infractions against the social order, they would know their rights. The social world was portrayed as a hazardous place, where the potential for one to betray their responsibilities lurked at every decision point. Students were urged to take responsibility for their actions in order to keep the threat of the state having to do it for them at bay, as one teacher’s interpretation illustrated, the policy’s key aims were the production of “good citizens”, aware of the law and “how to behave and how to look after yourself”. It was this reading of the curriculum that found greatest resonance amongst students, some of whom were almost fatalistic in their perception of the world waiting for them. As one respondent put it, citizenship education “gives us a warning”.

Staying on the right side of the law was the number one priority of this agenda, it was not only the most frequently referred to antecedent for citizenship education but pupils from schools where the law was focused on in this way were much more homogeneous in their agreement that there was such a key aim than those in other schools. Social and moral responsibility was then understood as insurance against getting into trouble. These pupils were keenly aware that they had been identified as an *at risk* group, likely to fall into criminal activity if not actively diverted from it. Surrounded by the ASBO discourse that depicts a ‘drift’ (Nolas 2011) into anti-social behaviour, denying even the agency of disaffected youth, these young

people were able to easily construct a narrative around the behaviour that was expected of them. This view of citizenship as corrective, designed to undo the work of conflicting discourses by denouncing choices that deviated from the “right path” as ‘wrong’, or ‘criminal’ was particularly prevalent at North West School. Unlike the Midlands Community pupils for whom *needing* citizenship was an abstract concept or, in one case, related to a form of lack that had been eradicated, North West pupils could draw on close-to-hand examples of candidates in need of correction “to insure your life”.

Citizenship was therefore about making the right choices to not harm the community and avoid sanctions: the *other* was then someone who failed to sanction themselves and ended up on the wrong side of the law. The positive benefits of discussing one’s social and moral responsibilities towards others were not espoused and some struggled to see the merits of engaging with different points of view. Although understanding of their fundamental responsibilities, and their rights when they failed in their responsibilities, was recognised as being of value, some North West students could not look beyond this function to a broader definition of citizenship as an end in itself. It is taught as Skills for Life and afforded more time on the timetable than at Midlands Community but ‘life’ is depicted more as a sequence of traps than a series of opportunities.

Of course, it is not the individual students at North West School who are singled out as predisposed to anti-social and inadvisable behaviour; rather, a projection is being made that their life choices are likely to echo those of previous generations of school leavers from similar backgrounds. The ‘failings’ of their forebears are recognised by the state and a connection is made to the reproductive function of schools, so that some tinkering with the mechanisms of education is seen as providing a solution in the form of ‘remedial’ citizenship education. The idea of the ‘model citizen’ who goes down the ‘right path’ was a part of the discourse that recurred frequently in conjunction with the interpretation that staying out of trouble was the most pertinent way of ‘looking after yourself’ and this could be achieved by taking note of each of the traps the teacher has informed you the world has laid for you. The language of the media and adults in general was frequently adopted to describe the perils of not aligning oneself with the established order by voting age. Pupils’ supposed freedom to make choices in their own best interests, therefore, was what Skeggs (2013) described as a trick that really dispossesses young people from the ownership of their own goals: values are only to be prized in terms of the *value* the adult world gives them. The reproduction of values in the form of a “model

citizen” as a panacea for social problems is discussed in greater depth in the next chapter but in this context it is symptomatic of what one teacher described as the major flaw in citizenship education; the imposition of an adult agenda on the youth population.

It is argued here that both these models teach citizenship as instrumental, eliding values with value to produce the internalisation of essentially individualistic dispositions in pupils, despite curriculum content that decries insular or selfish attitudes. That teachers’ commitment to tackling individualism has nevertheless produced this result might seem less surprising when understood in Skeggs’ terms. Skeggs (2004) argued that the logic of capital is so pervasive that critiques of greed commonly make their case by arguing for the pursuit of some alternative goal, essentially commodifying this goal and encouraging its acquisition. Taking this view, we might start to see the absurdity of hoping to change a culture by teaching about that culture. There is, however, a clear sign of hope that springs from this analysis: that if young people are not taught *about* the present state of citizenship in their country but rather enabled to learn citizenship through discussion of their own views – before particular values are permanently inculcated in them – perhaps a more authentic democracy, which champions the representation of a pluralism of perspectives rather than the reproduction of permanent (or ‘British’) values, might be achieved.

6.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, teachers’ perceptions of citizenship as a tool to tackle social problems and as enabling the empowerment of young people were described. These ideas provided the foundation for teachers to rationalise two themes they expressed as key to their pedagogy: balanced discussion and pupil voice. Pupils’ understandings, on the other hand, were framed by a perception that teachers sought to convey the *right answers* of citizenship. This preoccupation was found to impede an association of citizenship with empowerment. The themes of balanced discussion and pupil voice were therefore experienced as having more in common with pedagogy of other subjects than teachers’ accounts suggest. Pupils’ understandings of discussion and pupil voice in terms of *right answers* is then argued to limit young people’s understandings of themselves as active citizens ready to critically engage with public life as they are taught *about* citizenship concepts rather than offered opportunities to practice them.

The assumption that, if a school were to deliver a programme of citizenship education that truly represented active democracy and was shored up by empowering practices across the institution that saw pupils contributing to debates in reconstructive ways, young people could only be disillusioned by life outside school – where they experience inequitable opportunities to contribute to public life and witness unfairness and corruption in by the most conspicuous public servants – could perhaps explain why the lofty aims of the curriculum appear so watered down when interpreted by those teaching in the classroom. Teachers' decisions to funnel debate into what they consider most 'relevant' to their pupils, however, highlight a process of critical consciousness that their pupils are denied.

Rather than engaging with the values of democratic citizenship through critical debate, the young participants in this research were encouraged to adopt citizenship values by the negative reasoning that either: being a 'model citizen' would ensure a future that did not follow the path of the other, who failed to heed citizenship's warnings (necessitating taking responsibility "to insure your life"); or that citizenship knowledge would give the product of their education a final polish that would signal they had the full package of attributes to 'move on'. These negative understandings of citizenship are both reductive and reproductive. In such manifestations, citizenship education is disingenuous because it offers the appearance of transforming young people's participation but denies them real opportunities to define their own citizenship. Once the shallowness of their participation is revealed, young people might be expected to feel despondency which turns to political apathy by the time they are given real opportunities to participate but, as they did not expect to learn anything at school that had applications beyond passing exams, the effect is more worrying: they come through their schooling unaffected by notions of *active* citizenship, struggling to define it or, until probed, unaware that they have been taught it.

Even in areas where pupils seem to express greatest understanding, recognising bias for example, they have merely been adopted into the system and positioned to the orientation of adults. Young people are therefore unable to engage meaningfully because they lack what Fairclough (1995:220) refers to as 'an essential prerequisite for effective democratic citizenship; the capacity for critique of language'. Crick advocated the development of this critical capacity, and saw it as key to tackling cultural degradation by raising expectations of, and encouraging wider participation in, public life. In the same sense that a teacher complains they leave their ability to solve equations "in the maths room", however, pupils only apply their

understandings of citizenship in abstract exercises, which encourage the use of adult labels and the identification of the *other* that deviates from the *right path* of manufactured choice.

This chapter has engaged with teachers' and pupils' understandings and experiences of citizenship and citizenship education. It has suggested that pedagogical norms associated with established National Curriculum subjects define methods of teaching and learning in citizenship education. Core concepts of citizenship, including pupil voice, are acknowledged and learned *about* but pupils remain disempowered by neutered explorations of issues such as bias, in which they are not enabled to recognise or challenge their subjection to their teachers' power to define citizenship knowledge, which is constructed as common sense. Citizenship's precarious position in the National Curriculum results in active concepts such as free choice being reduced to 'a thing to be taught' and the learning of manufactured right answers therefore takes precedence over opportunities to exercise free choice. Once these right answers were learnt, young people felt they were expected to apply these to their future roles as responsible citizens, which they were invited to envision according to a particular moral code. In the next chapter, it will be shown how reducing citizenship to a subject to be learnt about results in schools' fulfilment of a reproductive role that is antithetical to the production of active citizens.

Chapter Seven: What Kind of Citizens Does Citizenship Education Produce?

This chapter explores ideas of the impact of citizenship education in terms of the kind of citizens we might expect it to 'produce' according to key messages in the accounts of teachers and pupils. Among the most prevalent of these messages involved: developing an overall 'rounded' character more disposed to making the 'right' choices; and the different preoccupations of 'getting by' or 'moving on', both achieved by 'looking after' oneself, performed either by 'staying out of trouble' or by capitalising on opportunities of privilege. Each of these interpretations of citizenship will be examined, followed by a discussion of what their promulgation might mean for education for democratic citizenship in the UK. Recommendations for how citizenship education might be made more meaningful for young people and inspire more active citizenship are then made.

7.1 Teachers' Perceptions of the Impact of Citizenship Education

7.1.1 Model Citizens?

As discussed in the previous chapter, teachers' methods of delivering the citizenship curriculum sought to maximise the impact it had on their pupils' futures and many considered young people's life chances to be best served by the development of the 'rounded' character. Creating a complete "person" was cited as an aim throughout the sample and was often seen to impact upon wider society, with a certain character encouraged by citizenship education seen as comfortably fitting into, and a benefit to, society.

The staff of Midlands Community School found its pupils had few barriers to fitting into society. Teachers linked their pupils' privileged backgrounds to those qualities the citizenship curriculum sought to instil. Although not all pupils were of high ability, challenges in their teaching were more likely to involve ensuring that "exceptional performance" pupils were stretched than accommodating lower abilities. "Other schools" were conceived as experiencing the challenge of a broader range of abilities, which would present a greater proportion of pupils lacking "social awareness". While the case was not put that this kind of cultural capital follows from academic achievement, teachers found that the majority of pupils exhibit both sets of skills. One teacher qualifies her account with a comment that, where she does

find herself teaching young people whose “home backgrounds are very different”, their inevitable lack of knowledge demands that she take an approach akin to those of teachers in schools with more lower ability pupils. She ultimately feels disconnected from these imagined teachers, however, as fundamental differences in their practice would be exposed if the teaching of citizenship was no longer compulsory:

In some schools where there's more of a need for, you know, for pupils to be more socially aware and aware of diversity, I think it would be difficult for them to make up the loss of it, definitely. Teacher, Midlands Community

Interestingly, at Midlands Community citizenship education is almost redundant, as citizenship values would live on regardless, embodied in the dispositions of pupils; whereas, in schools where there is a *need* for citizenship education, its legacy is more likely to be lost. Northern Academy adopted citizenship as a specialism in recognition of their need to invest in a range of areas of knowledge and skills, in order to both: “give them some heavy focus on teenage pregnancy, sex education, drink, drugs”; and acknowledge that school leavers tended to either settle for work with limited opportunities for progression or fail to find work, whereas the school “wanted to develop citizens who saw themselves much more as people who could ... actually set up a business that might employ people from their own community or ... have their aspirations raised enough so that could go to college or university”. The first part of Northern Academy’s mission therefore served to free pupils from those distractions that threatened to undermine their ability to realise their ambitions; the second part was concerned with the realisation of those ambitions, and the description of how they would ‘see themselves’ suggests both meanings of *realisation* would be crucial to these improved outcomes.

Teachers at Northern Academy were therefore confident about their ability to change the outlook of their young people. Of course, the test of these strategies lies in whether or not pupils apply their learning to life outside school. When invited to consider whether they thought their pupils used their citizenship education in this way, teachers at Northern Academy ranged in confidence; from citing evidence from questioning pupils in the classroom as representing an “understanding” that they will inevitably invoke in situations beyond school, to admitting that “insight” into how they “carry themselves outside the school gates” was missing. The nature of their ‘end product’ was therefore ultimately difficult for teachers to grasp.

The segregation of 'school knowledge' as detached from and irrelevant to 'real life' was cited as connected to an ability to think beyond the classroom, which one teacher at North West School believed correlated with 'intelligence'. A teacher at East Coast College blamed the framework within which the subject is taught for this phenomenon:

They would apply it a lot blooming more if the syllabus wasn't so stupid! ... if I could make it human. Pupils have genuine questions about immigration ... and they're really valuable questions and they can come across as very racist. But they're not, it's that thing about having the voice, you have to let them ask the questions ... what I would like to do is to have less content so the stuff they want to run with, we can run with ... I mean there are segments called something like ways in which the government promotes community cohesion and I think there's ways to do that that are so much more interesting than that but I struggle, I'm thirty-seven and I struggle to find it interesting and if I were fourteen It bores me and we have to rush through that because it's so dull. But how you can take such an interesting topic and make it that dull, I think that's impressive! Teacher, East Coast College

The *breadth* of content of the citizenship curriculum therefore stifled the freedom to go into *depth* on particular issues based on need, which in practice threatened the formation of a rounded character as learning is limited to *knowledge about*, rather than the development of skills. In terms of need, impact was seen by teachers as most profoundly felt in the 'undoing' of the effects of certain influences. As a teacher at South East High commented, "you can't teach someone to be a good citizen ... in one hour every two weeks", rather she could only gauge her progress in refining what she called her "raw material" on an individual basis. As her colleague described in terms of "antiquated issues" she had faced, she measured her success by pupils' receptiveness in terms of "changed [a pupil's] mind" by the end of the learning activity.

A teacher from North West School spoke about getting children to show more "empathy" for different views by referring to "the bigger picture" beyond the UK, often in order to counter other influences. Challenging the views of parents through pupils was a regular feature of discussion at South East High, where a teacher raised the problem of pupils reporting their parents' "racist" opinions as their own, and presented as common sense her view that negative attitudes to immigration must be undone, and that this was possible whilst not revealing one's own position on the matter.

Schools therefore differed in how they perceived their capacity to produce 'good' citizens and, as the last chapter demonstrated, at times teachers felt under-resourced by a curriculum that privileged knowledge over skills. This preoccupation with outcomes was variously resisted by teachers but was ultimately suggested to manifest in the production of citizens furnished with sufficient knowledge about how to be 'good' citizens.

7.1.2 Getting by

As discussed in the last chapter, some pupils reported their citizenship education to be principally concerned with "staying out of trouble" and this agenda of *getting by* was rationalised and identified with as relevant to their needs (especially by North West School pupils, where this interpretation was found to be inherent in the naming of the classes as Skills for Life). The need to challenge parents and other powerful role models was also seen to translate to an imbalance in perceptions of rights and responsibilities that threatened this agenda and some undoing of a 'claim culture' was therefore an aspect of the impact teachers wanted to see in their pupils. Again, these changing values were seen as difficult to measure, as a teacher from East Coast College observed: "we can only go by the fact that we get a lot of compliments from our local neighbourhood" and that the local police reported that their life was made "easier". The outcome of improving working conditions for the police was therefore seen as an end result of increased empathy and an indicator of progress towards active citizenship. Another teacher at East Coast College saw measurable impact as stemming from the knowledge-based part of the curriculum:

I would say a lot of them understand it but wouldn't do much with it outside the classroom, it's more of a here's the subject, here's what you should know. So maybe teaching them about law perhaps keeps some of them out of trouble and they'll understand how the courtroom works and so on but hopefully won't use that knowledge cos they'll keep out of trouble. But I wouldn't say all kids use the information. Teacher, East Coast College

In this respondent's view, there is little for young people to "do" with their citizenship learning outside the lesson as, like other disciplines, it is concerned with factual information *about* citizenship. This could well come into play, however, in reducing a young person's likelihood of committing and infraction against law and order or, failing that, ensuring they are well versed in the proceedings of a court.

Unsurprisingly, she does not feel that all her pupils will utilise this type of knowledge. This respondent was the only teacher to directly describe her role in teaching citizenship education as concerned with keeping young people “out of trouble” although, as the next section shows, this was a recurring theme amongst pupils’ responses.

7.1.3 Moving on

More common amongst teachers was the assertion that citizenship education empowers young people to make positive choices, as this teacher from Midlands Community School exemplifies in her concern for ensuring pupils are informed stakeholders in their learning:

... obviously it’s meant to be light touch but I think it’s very important that pupils are aware of the programme of study, that they’re aware of the levels of attainment, that they’re aware that these lessons that you’re doing are citizenship lessons ... before, we never did any levelling of citizenship, there was no assessment, and some people think that’s the way it should be – that it’s about the process, it’s about the knowledge that they get during it ... and the skills that they develop through it ... but I’m very much for formal assessment ... kids nowadays expect to be assessed and unfortunately whether you think that’s right or not, I think that’s the way we’re going and kids like to know well how did I actually do in that, and they don’t know where to move on to if they’ve not been assessed in it. Teacher, Midlands Community

In this account, pupils are active learners who are willing to participate, but they are used to being able to identify a return on their investment. This analysis therefore suggests that methods of teaching and learning, discussed in the previous chapter, *should* closely resemble those of other subjects. Even while acknowledging the value of the *process*, the teacher discounts the idea that citizenship might offer a unique contribution in its potential to inspire children to question the ruling orthodoxy they take for granted or “expect”. The same respondent goes on to express that she believes her pupils do apply their learning to life outside the classroom with a vignette about her year nine pupils talking to their local councillor on the street and raising issues they had covered in class. Recognising and confidently approaching their local councillor as an equal, it was suggested, demonstrated that these young people were already beginning to see themselves as citizens in year nine. It is possible that there were other factors specific to these children and their location that played at least as important a part in this situation as

their academic knowledge of citizenship but either way, pupils were using their knowledge and skills to their advantage and increasing their cultural capital by starting to engage with and make demands of society, in acknowledgement of their rights and responsibilities as citizens. This teacher's interpretation of citizenship is therefore very different from that which prioritises knowledge to help young people stay out of trouble.

Teachers' narratives, whether they speak of getting by or moving on, conform to an ideal of citizenship. These models then inform how teachers imagine the kind of citizens their pupils will be. As the last chapter elucidated, these projections seemed to suggest an idea of the *value* their learning represented in terms of its translation to a direct benefit to the individual, rather than offering an opportunity to explore plural *values*, and how these might relate to ways of practising active citizenship. Although getting by and moving on suggest different expectations of young people's citizenship, the essential message for pupils delivered by both these models was that conforming to their singular ideals of good citizenship would serve them well.

7.2 Pupils' Perceptions of the Impact of Citizenship Education

7.2.1 Model Citizens?

When pupils spoke about opportunities to practise citizenship they tended to frame possible applications in terms of using the knowledge that has been given to them, as an East Coast College pupil described: "cos it gives you the rights or wrongs in life and stuff that you should do and shouldn't do to other people". This respondent saw adherence to a particular code of conduct, rather than the application of certain skills, as evidence of citizenship learning. Others saw opportunities for active citizenship as a deficit that they would like to be addressed. At East Coast, several pupils reported a lack of focus on young people as active citizens, which suggested an element of instilling citizenly habits in pupils may have been lost in the translation of citizenship from policy to practice.

There were few concrete examples of pupils in the sample applying their citizenship education, with respondents viewing issues of bullying as most relevant to their lives. As one East Coast pupil reported she would tell her "mum and dad and they give me resolutions to sort it out but like not getting involved with fighting and stuff like that: to be a good citizen". A Northern Academy pupil related her experience of

dealing with racism by turning to a teacher, who happened to teach citizenship. Another Northern Academy pupil recounted: “I’m not being racist but – this black kid that no-one really knew cos he were new, he were getting bothered so I started making friends with him”. These accounts of responding to bullying suggest that for these pupils, citizenship has become a label that they apply to actions that demonstrate an ‘adult’ thoughtfulness, which often requires deference to teachers or parents. In the last example it is interesting to see the respondent is uncomfortable handing an adult discourse of ‘race’, and seeks to avoid being labelled ‘racist’ by the interviewer.

Such responses could often be a basic interpretation of ‘doing the right thing’ by virtue of ‘not doing the wrong thing’. As a label to be applied to certain chance experiences, it is not seen as fundamentally relevant to pupils’ lives. One Midlands Community pupil identified his use of “the helping out thing”, having helped someone up after a fall. Pressed on whether he had the idea of being a good citizen in his mind at the time, his response, “yeah (!), I should do!” is revealing as this action is tenuously linked to citizenship and the pupil hints that he feels obliged to define it as such. These accounts seem to lack authenticity as examples of citizenship education having had a direct impact on how young people see themselves as citizens. This absence of relevance to young people’s experiences is reflected in their reports of any impact as happening after school, as this pupil described:

... because you come to school and you’re obeying what the teachers say, then you get out of school and I think you could be sort of lost, cos you don’t really know, you haven’t learnt the proper skills to behave in our society today. Year ten pupil, East Coast College

This interpretation of the significance of citizenship reveals a rule-based understanding and a fear of not ‘fitting in’ to society. Others expressed a desire to be educated to be accepted by society – as one respondent described as “a normal, average worker”.

Some pupils perceive citizenship as a groove to slot into at some point on the path to adulthood and they therefore struggle to think of how they could have used citizenship while lacking adult opportunities. This neutralisation of any *active* component is exemplified by the comment: “if a conversation comes up, it’d be nice to be involved”. Citizenship is then a non-essential area of knowledge, not ‘useful’

for life as a young person, although, if the right situation presented itself, it may provide opportunity for the demonstration of understanding not gained elsewhere.

The provision of a moral code through citizenship education was seen by some, however, as useful. Some pupils saw this as relevant to their immediate life choices and how these might relate to their future, as the account from an East Coast pupil reflects after the statement that “Britain’s not that good” as an explanation for citizenship’s place on the curriculum: “like with drinking and drugs and like people not having any money and stuff because of all the stuff they spend it on”. He felt citizenship education should “make sure they go down the right path”. An awareness of the lifestyle one might be entering into through their choices is therefore seen as valuable and timely. Knowing the ‘rules’ is a theme cited across the sample, for example, in this pupil’s understanding:

Citizenship is basically teaching you how to be a good citizen and how the laws and stuff and how you’re meant to act in this country and what you can and can’t do.
Year eight pupil, Northern Academy

This understanding was often rationalised by the argument that young people needed to be taught how to live according to a certain code, which would not necessarily occur to them without schooling, for prosaic reasons such as learning the laws of the land, which they might otherwise break and be punished for their ignorance. For the sake of promoting fairness in society then, people must be formally educated in the law, as well as more nuanced ‘rules’ of citizenship. Many respondents supported the delivery of this education through school as other sources of influence were not thought of as corresponding with these kinds of messages.

There is then a familiar tone to pupils’ narratives when considering the kind of citizen their citizenship education might produce. The outcomes that preoccupied teachers are present in these accounts of ‘right choices’ based on knowing the ‘rules’.

7.2.2 Getting by

The idea of elements of young people’s lives outside school having a negative impact on their ability to make ‘good’ or ‘right’ choices was often presented as a contemporary and growing problem. Learning about “laws and rights” was therefore a useful counterweight to the temptations to transgress that influences outside

school represent. “Responsibility” was framed by a similar logic: “cos if you’re not responsible, you don’t know what trouble you’ll be in, so you have to take responsibility to insure your life”. It is the pupil that is cast by this respondent from North West School as the principal beneficiary of taking responsibility for her actions in this context.

Pupils commonly reported that their citizenship education taught them how to stay out of trouble, as this Northern Academy pupil explains: “you’ve got a lot of bad things happening in Britain at the moment and I think, to learn about this, it gives us a warning”. In this respondent’s view, pupils are being educated to look after themselves in a climate of social decay that threatens their likelihood of staying out of trouble. The worst case scenario of getting involved with the criminal justice system was cited by another Northern Academy pupil as evidence of the importance of citizenship and particularly understanding one’s rights and the rights of others “so if we ever did get in trouble, like with the police or something, then we’d know our rights”

In this sense, pupils saw citizenship as a practical subject, as it prepared them for a life of looking out for their own interests while being mindful of others’ rights for their own sake. For one North West pupil, morality was far from an abstract concept, as she described social and moral responsibility as “being honest with yourself or other people so you don’t get into trouble”. The key messages of citizenship education are therefore concerned with very real outcomes in terms of these young people’s futures and, for some respondents, a focus on negative consequences of certain influences that may already be a part of pupils’ everyday lives gives the subject relevance.

7.2.3 Moving on

Pupils who describe citizenship in more positive terms tend to focus on the privilege of democratic choice:

Like with the right to vote there also comes responsibility ... I mean anyone can vote for [the BNP] ... so for example the president has the responsibility to look after his country and do what he thinks is best to help his people, the big issues like Europe or terrorism ... Year ten pupil, South East High

Although this respondent may have confused the title of the head of government, it is significant that he equated the prime minister’s responsibility to act in the

country's best interests with that of individual citizens. Citizens were therefore empowered, and should not squander opportunities to "use what they have", as he went on to say, although these may not come until adulthood, as he concluded: "it'll be more useful when I'm older, cos I don't have much say at this age".

For some respondents, citizenship messages about 'looking after yourself' were concerned with positive projections of their futures. A Midlands Community pupil talked about the impact his citizenship education has had on his plans for life after school, in that he felt the responsibility to "choose" a job that would "make more of a difference" to his community. In this account, the pupil framed his actions in terms of positive choices, rather than the avoidance of negative consequences. The onus is therefore on the person as an active citizen through choice.

As such, another Midlands Community pupil reported that the school's role was not concerned with offering opportunities to practice citizenship until the later activity of work experience. Despite an approach to practical applications of citizenship concentrating on pupils' future economic role, this pupil reported that he had drawn on his citizenship education to enter a competition by writing about something he felt strongly about (the BNP), in which he came third. The impact of his learning about political issues could therefore be seen as manifested in a commodity, which he trades on in extra-curricular activities. Similarly, one pupil from East Coast College took his interest in citizenship forward into volunteering as a peer mentor, initially because he "thought it would look quite good on the CV". Having demonstrated his familiarity with areas of the curriculum that deal with plans for the future – which he had already taken the initiative to discuss with his parents in anticipation of going to university in two years' time, this pupil explained his rationale for becoming a peer mentor as adding value to his job prospects. This suggests he saw himself as very much a stakeholder in his education and that he was actively seeking out opportunities that he may be able to capitalise on for his focused ends.

Young people who engaged in extra-curricular activities were, however, conscious of certain expectations of them, as one Midlands Community pupil described her teacher as encouraging her to understand: "how we can be involved in like the world and the community around us but how ... we have to do it in the right way". Although she envisioned herself participating in society, she was aware that this must be done in a recognised way – she must not abuse her privileged position by showing disrespect to the proper channels of engagement. In this way, pupils feel

both the freedom of choice and the constraints of duty in their interactions with the world.

Despite apparent differences in whether citizenship might be about getting by or moving on, key themes are common to teachers' and pupils' accounts. Citizenship education is largely agreed to be concerned with outcomes rather than process, with knowledge *about* citizenship taking precedence over any sense of the value of actively *practising* citizenship. Citizenship was thought of as having practical applications by those relating their understanding of *getting by* but this took the form of a readiness to follow *rules* that they felt were being set out for them. Those concerned with *moving on* did not comprehend a practical value and so looked to familiar measurements of *progress*. Both interpretations, however, seek to discern benefits for the individual in line with an economic view of education that will be examined further later in this chapter. The next section will consider the broader context of the National Curriculum in terms of its role in enabling or constraining pupils' agency.

7.3 The Neutralisation of Agency in the National Curriculum

7.3.1 Active Citizenship as part of the National Curriculum ?

When the National Curriculum was introduced in 1988, its stated aim was to prepare young people for 'the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life' (*Education Reform Act 1988*). Its 'permeation' model was purported to enable the cross-curricular themes that its architects encouraged despite the segregation of subjects as distinct disciplines. Bernstein (1973) uses the term 'educational knowledge code' to refer to the principles that should shape curriculum, pedagogy and the means of evaluating teaching and learning. Chapters Three and Four described how the citizenship curriculum grew out of such a code and how it was added to the National Curriculum as a statutory subject, to be taught and examined and inspected alongside established subjects that had long since defined secondary education in England. As such, citizenship became an addition to a *collection* type curriculum (Bernstein 1973) made up of subjects with strongly classified content and a strongly framed pedagogical relationship. This determines what counts as appropriate to a particular lesson and may be why several teachers lamented the lack of comprehension when they drew on the territory of other subjects, such as finance skills "left in the maths room".

Pupils often expressed the feeling that citizenship was not like other lessons and referred to the amount of “work” done in citizenship lessons as separate from any time spent on discussion and debate (“work” was solitary and required writing to produce evidence of reading from textbooks). This reflects findings from Whitty’s (2002) research into forms of talk in secondary school classes, which found the tightly framed discourse of the Curriculum makes explicit to students that the subject does not validate agency in the form of the contribution of their own views and ideas, and inferences should not be drawn from outside the subject. Whitty studied school children’s understandings of valid forms of discourse and found their attitudes exemplified by a boy who did not think mentioning toothbrushing would be deemed relevant to his scientific description of tooth decay:

To him the science lesson was self-contained and self-referential. To have produced work inconsistent with what he perceived as the subject code would have indicated that ... he had failed to achieve the required scientific competence” (Whitty 2002:36)

Citizenship is therefore an exemplar of a subject that ultimately suffers from this absence of links, as its nascence as a statutory subject places it at either end of the chain, in need of justification for its relevance to both formal education and the ‘real world’. Whitty draws on the work of Mannheim (1957) to understand the origins of this disconnect. Mannheim believed that academic pedagogy had generated ‘the suppression of awareness’: extreme specialisation had led to ‘neutralizing the genuine interest in real problems and in the possible answers to them’, with the student ‘rendered entirely uncritical by this method of teaching where everybody takes responsibility for a disconnected piece of [knowledge] only and is, therefore, never encouraged to think of situations as a whole’ (Whitty 2002:9). Such a culture of devaluing critical thought was the root of critical pedagogues’ conviction that the relationship between teaching and learning must be revolutionised. In a system where students are discouraged from critical thought by the notion that it does not equate to ‘work’, citizenship education will not promote the agency necessary for effective, democratic participation. A far-reaching change in attitudes is needed to contest the value of sharply drawn boundaries between academic fields, which is endemic in society, as one South East High teacher complains – about a lack of understanding of “multiple intelligences” – “which is why you might go and see a doctor and they can’t look you in the eye. You might have a merchant banker who’s a brilliant mathematician but morally he’s completely bankrupt”.

Perhaps this absence of examples of rounded characters is why the neat outlines of the model citizen who travels down the 'right path' are so often invoked to illustrate the jurisdiction of citizenship as a subject. This caricature does not, however, empower young people to develop their own character and make their own decisions. The model citizen was not, of course, the only tool teachers used to develop understanding of citizenship. As described in the previous chapter, there was evidence of attempts to engender skills for effective participation in teaching methods, including group work that "gets us together like a community" (year eight pupil, Northern Academy). Also, the young people's use of citizenship vernacular was not limited to superficial references in all cases. Some demonstrated an ability to apply citizenship values, at least within citizenship lessons, as in the response that "everyone has the right of free speech and if I'm saying something like I believe and then they say something they believe, I respect their views and I think to have different views and different points is good" (year eight pupil, Northern Academy).

Understanding on this level could certainly be seen as an empowering precursor to embracing citizenship values more deeply, as some commentators would argue that an individual who does not have a grasp of the language is excluded from the discourse. It is through such discursive practices, however, that pupils are constructed as subjects. As Bourdieu would argue (1992), language is both the medium of communication that binds society and the mode of domination of *subcultures* by the dominant culture. Language, in his analysis, serves to justify existing hierarchies, as a criterion of inclusion that is conditional and stratified; determining the power of groups according to their skill at using the language of the dominant group. Deviation from the language of the dominant culture isolates and excludes groups from the discourse, labelling them *subcultures*. This is something critical pedagogy is concerned to address. Giroux, for example, is conscious of potential for exclusion when he states 'questions of articulation and contexts need to be foregrounded as a matter of both ethics and politics' (Giroux 2011:75).

Therefore, if we are to accept that schools are places where knowledge is transmitted to the end of "creating a person" through a discourse in which young people are both subjects and objects of knowledge, a critical pedagogue's Foucauldian understanding of this power/knowledge relationship between teachers and pupils would dictate that pupils come to construct themselves as self-observing, self-monitoring, self-disciplining and self-improving subjects by their acceptance and internalisation of desirable forms of identity and behaviour.

He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection. (Foucault 1977:202-203).

Certainly, there is more resonance with Foucault's ideas of technologies of power in this use of a hierarchical relationship to *produce reality* through relations with others than technologies of the self which focus on relations with oneself. The division of 'expert knowledge' in schools echoes the power of governmentality experts in disciplines such as medicine and psychology were said to exert (Foucault 1988). The effects of such segregation of knowledge, like those observed by Whitty (2002), were seen by one teacher who had tried to challenge pupils to advance an intellectual argument, which they "ultimately" found "quite confusing", as their segregated knowledge did not allow them to make the connections between subjects necessary for depth of analysis and kept their exploration of the topic of identity on a "superficial" level (teacher, North West School).

It is not enough then, to provide a hollow narrative of one-dimensional model citizens who follow a system of arbitrary practices set out for them by a distant elite. An understanding of the discourse at a deeper level than this purely reductionist model and the bolstering of this framework by meaningful content that includes the interests of marginalised groups and extends to all opportunities to participate should be the blueprint for citizenship education. The outlook for embedding this type of citizenship in English schools does not look promising. Even in a school whose academy specialism was developed on the basis of providing innovative platforms for pupil voice, reservations were expressed as to whether "opportunities are totally equitable amongst all students", it was necessary to "work hard to avoid that syndrome of the keen students always being put forward to represent the views of the majority" (teacher, Northern Academy).

7.3.2 Why Would Young People Want to be Active Citizens?

Indeed, pupils concentrating on *getting by* and those focused on *moving on* may sit side by side in class, but pupils who took the initiative to take part in school councils and other pupil voice fora expressed themselves in terms that revealed a level of informed awareness that was not typical of the young participants in this study. The year eight school council member whose motivation to become a councillor was

that he “thought it would look quite good on the CV” spoke of a conception of citizenship as ‘taking care of yourself’ quite different from his peers’ interpretation of ‘staying out of trouble’. His attitude suggested a Kantian *cleverness*: the skill which enables the individual to use society for their purposes (Kant 1795). More commonly represented in this research was Mill’s (1910a) notion of *developmentalism*: education for an understanding of democracy that seeks to encourage an awareness of the existing system and acceptance of the learner’s role in it, rather than cast her as an active agent of systemic change. In one teacher’s view: “pupils are politically aware, they might not be able to tell you ... who the cabinet minister is for this ministry but they’re very, very astute and they know how to organise and how to plan things” but policy makers have “chosen not to acknowledge” this as “they’ve decided that they don’t want [to change] the system” (teacher, North West School).

Whether young people’s opportunities to experience deliberation are sidelined by the aim of moving on or getting by, a central aim of civic republicanism has been displaced. Although pupils may feel compelled to demonstrate civic empathy, a short circuit has been created that bypasses their own experiences of civic speaking and civic listening, so that that the only views presented for their empathic understanding are those manufactured in the classroom. Barber’s (1984:117) vision of strong democracy with citizens united by ‘civic education’ over ‘homogeneous interests’ is then made impossible. Revisiting earlier liberal thought on citizenship and the transformative powers of education is perhaps insightful at a time when the coalition government is scaling back the state and using the language of the social contract to describe expectations of citizens in the *Big Society* (Helm 2010), while the Labour opposition is pushing for an *educational contract* between the individual and the state to guarantee a ‘relevant’ curriculum ‘more geared to the world of work’ that will ensure children leave school packaged to appeal to employers (Helm 2011) and ready to become economic citizens. Such an approach would presumably endorse the attitude of the bright student who has yet to *use* her citizenship education but sees it as cultural capital in “general knowledge” that would allow her to be involved if “a conversation comes up”; which critics would argue is evidence that young people’s citizenship learning lies dormant, waiting to be expressed in reaction to some external event.

Some teachers had strong views on how the education system fundamentally served to keep the application of citizenship values from being prioritised in schools, with the culture of inspections providing no incentive for pupils to be

“rounded”, rather than “android[s]”, “good little consumers and workers”, “a commodity rather than a person” (teacher, North West School). In this analysis, pupils have become nothing more than the result of their *banking*, or the cultural capital they take on, moving from subjects to objects to *products* of the discourse (Kakos 2012). Citizenship as part of the National Curriculum then is not proactive, or even active. The clearest illustration of this is in pupils’ references to debate. The concept of debate is understood, it is known to be the basis of adult decision making processes, but pupils never described their participation in lessons as truly representing such an empowered process. By year ten, a Midlands Community pupil had experienced “almost like mini debates”, refereed by her teacher who attempted to broach topics “without trying to annoy anybody else” dependent on “the topic”. As amenable as this approach may seem, Foucault’s analysis of pedagogical power relationships found that it was just such intimacies of practice that served to neutralise counter-argument. Similarly, In contrasting the characteristics of the archetypal lecture and seminar, Foucault contended that the overtly skewed nature of the power relationship in the lecture is in fact a more honest and open device than that of the seminar with its claims to reciprocity, that may dupe students into forgetting the true dynamics at work and assume its openness has left nothing further to question (Foucault 1971).

The controversial issues Crick had hoped would stir your people’s interest are absent in pupils’ testimony, perhaps a result of being undermined by techniques like the light-hearted use of devil’s advocate. Empowerment through active participation has been displaced by a simulation of debate that is not to be taken seriously, as one girl explained, outside the classroom pupils may reveal conflicting views but in a citizenship lesson “people tend to just go along with it, no-one tends to strongly disagree with no-one, they tend to just listen to it” (year eight pupil, East Coast College).

Like abstract premises for mathematical problems, citizenship’s relevance does not extend to life beyond the lesson for young people. They may not appreciate, however, that they have been conditioned to give a neutral response to conflicting arguments by *guided freedom* that encourages them to revere ‘balance’ and to regard themselves as tolerant and respectful of all points of view. This non-judgemental approach treats all positions as of equal value, as long as they do not oppose those frequently occurring ‘right answers’ that reinforce what is culturally acceptable. This second concern of cultural acceptability is by no means secondary; after all, *state* education is not merely an end in itself. Rather,

citizenship education operates not only within the National Curriculum; but the National Curriculum itself is a construction of a broader ideological discourse that produces culture at a societal level. An understanding of the macro level values, like the 'politics without adversary' (Mouffe 1993) around issues of diversity, that permeate from this source is therefore fundamental to an analysis of the micro level statements that filter into the discourse of citizenship.

As discussed in Chapter Three, the historical use of schools as an instrument for instilling *morals* and controlling behaviours is widely acknowledged, but is there any evidence that English schools have, after generations of changes to educational policy, made significant progress from a system of containment and control, towards pupils' democratic participation?

Mead's (2009) research into conceptions of participation in secondary schools is instructive. Mead cites his case study of a student-led protest against the war in Iraq, involving a group of 'mature and respected Year 11 Muslim pupils' at a school with an active school council, with whom the head teacher consulted in order to reach agreement on the school's choice of response. As a result of this genuine pupil involvement, part of the school day was given over to discussion of the war and 'a short vigil'. It was agreed that petitions for and against the war would be produced and sent to the Prime Minister and a local Member of Parliament. Staff responses were mixed, with some supportive of what they saw as an authentic channel for young people's expression, and others wary of weakening the school's authority over pupils; what Mead describes as a 'communitarian perspective' that favours 'leav[ing] such issues at the school gate, because they might fuel tension between different sections of the school community' (Mead 2009: 54).

The pupils' sense of empowerment in the wake of this event is what is really striking about Mead's study. Interviewed ten months after the protest, the young people expressed how their presence in the school had been transformed:

... after the protest ... we didn't just feel like children, we felt like responsible people who have their views heard and are not just silenced. (Mead 2009:55)

Mead described how this feeling of agency extended to pupils' consideration of wider-reaching activism and their indictment of the political system that ultimately failed to respond to national protests. They were aware that their school had taken an unorthodox approach to reacting to their actions and that they were a peculiar

minority in proportion to other pupils around the country (10,000 in London alone), whose activism was met with authoritarian discipline. One sixth-form student from a less progressive school commented:

... suddenly the politicisation of youth looks unattractive to those who have called us apathetic for too long. (Mead 2009:55).

Mead drew on his research to question the desirability of pedagogical models of participation. He highlights the transformative power of 'true' pupil participation as an essential element of his case study school's continuing improvement after being consigned to the category of 'failing' (by Ofsted). Mead is convincing in his analysis of the importance of engaging all members of the school as stakeholders in its core processes. Participation on these terms is fundamentally different from Chandler's (2000) 'technical' participation or, in Mead's (2009:55) words, 'instrumental participation that uncouples the political challenge from moral decision-making, and is 'done' by staff to pupils'. While there may be much to be gained from structured participation in the classroom, if this is not complemented by critical thinking and agency, it will *depoliticise* the political education Crick advocated.

7.4 Discussion and Recommendations

The role of schools in social engineering is well documented and has been the subject of myriad local and national policies that have sought to break the cycle of high-performing schools becoming over-subscribed, necessitating the enforcement of strict catchment areas, which drive up property prices, resulting in a decline of poorer families able to send their children to popular schools and the deepening of the divide between the quality of education in richer and poorer neighbourhoods (Gibbons and Machin 2003; Rossell 1991). It is little wonder then that the privileged pupils who enjoyed what their teacher described as the "golden tickets", which would smooth their path to "succeed in society", were also burdened by "expectations" that they had internalised and subjected themselves to. This demonstrates that the value of knowledge is (as is familiar to pupils from their experience of other National Curriculum subjects) determined with reference – and deference – to a system of learning that renders learners' spontaneous contributions irrelevant. It is what Freire (1970) would call a banking approach to education, in which pupils are not able to draw on their own unique range of experiences because there is only one form of recognised currency. Pupils who are rich in this currency are recognised and given opportunities to invest but, as they

are not able to trade in other assets that are not valued as 'good citizenship', they cannot be said to be co-producers of knowledge. Without this dynamic, the requisite agency of active citizenship cannot be exercised.

What, then, does citizenship represent to these young people? Data from pupils suggests citizenship's relevance is limited to its utility as a handbook for fitting in to society's expectations and requirements of them: whether this involved becoming an 'average worker' or having an impressive CV. Reducing the aims of the curriculum to a displaced goal of preparing young people to take their place in their community and society by choosing from appropriate roles could be described as the refinement of *social abilities*, defined by Mannheim (1957:85) as 'those capacities which are needed to get one's work or personality accepted and acknowledged'. A solid foundation of social abilities and those *objective abilities* of achievement which comprise the rest of the National Curriculum is, according to Mannheim, the basis of all personal success. The teacher's task, therefore, is to facilitate the creation of a full portfolio of both sets of abilities in order to give the pupil the maximum range of life choices that comes from their many combinations.

Pupils' accounts suggest that – either because they lacked reassurances from policy makers that citizenship education should include new types of skills as well as new types of knowledge, or because they are accustomed to delivering teaching based on recognisable *outcomes* – teachers tended to take a banking approach to developing pupils. As well as being explicitly endorsed as a 'good' to be developed for the benefit of society, teachers acknowledged that education was moving more and more towards the production of citizens whose assets have clear economic value. As a Midlands Community teacher put it, "formal assessment", with its product of bankable qualifications, "whether you think that's right or not ... that's the way we're going". In other words, teachers used their judgement of the economic value that aspects of the citizenship curriculum represented for their pupils to prioritise certain areas of learning. This entailed a needs analysis that identified where pupils were placed on a scale of credit to debt and encouragement to use their assets to make the wisest possible investment (or, in the case of pupils deemed too heavily in debt, to not get caught in a downward spiral and to put all their efforts into breaking even).

For pupils taught to *move on*, they must draw *profits* from their use of this economic capital in order to be classified among dominant groups, that is, to 'wield strengths' that allow them to make decisions and take control of their own lives (Bourdieu

1986:87). In this way, a certain conception of the division between public and private realms may be internalised by young people as they are encouraged to take *ownership* of *their* education, the purpose of which is framed as helping them to *move on*: an individualistic pursuit concerned only with personal success. Public life is then separate, belonging to the extra-curricular: optional. Although this may be the result of a certain pragmatism on the part of teachers, who describe lessons as too “curriculum-bound” and “restrictive” to cover all aspects of citizenship, their decision to delegate its *active* elements to school councils and other domains of the “keen” pupils that “come forward” sends a particular message about the value of these elements. Dividing public and private gains in this way is more comparable to a neo-liberal interpretation of active citizens who exercise their responsibility to those less fortunate with occasional acts of charity (Faulks 2006) than the civic republican’s conception of entering into public life out of a sense of duty.

A particularly significant example of how Midlands Community pupils were framed as rich in the “golden tickets” of cultural capital was their subject leader’s reference to diversity. In most other schools, cultural difference was spoken of as representing a challenge, a source of either ignorance or tension, but this teacher cited the “different backgrounds” her pupils were “used to” as facilitating a “more direct” approach that could draw on their “knowledge of the world”. Again, this “social awareness” is a bankable asset that will ease transition into the wider world of work where young people can demonstrate their diversity credentials (Ahmed 2012; Taylor 2012).

Pupils of schools in less privileged areas were also quite assured in the conception of citizenship transmitted to them as being about their responsibilities, expressed as helping one’s community by getting on with people, in particular seeking to understand and respect others’ points of view, working together and demonstrating one is a good and law abiding person; their rights, seen as benefitting from living in a society in which people’s behaviour accords with their responsibilities and values are respected; and generally making the ‘right’ choices in life and exemplifying the behaviour of a *good citizen*. It was seen as more of a resource for getting by, less about having one’s own opinions and demonstrating political knowledge.

A prevalent theme expressed by teachers and pupils across participant schools (although acceptance of the narrative’s accuracy and identification with its protagonists varied) was the need to *lift* people out of the negative influences of attitudes that contributed to young people falling into a repeat pattern of anti-social

behaviour. Schools' role in producing citizens who rose above undesirable influences was considered vital, especially where parental involvement in children's development was thought to be minimal at best and detrimental at worst. In one teacher's view, schools were the best qualified arbiter of "unbiased" views and well placed to "tackle" values that may have been instilled in children by their parents. This is clearly a matter of contention for parents who may have a different vision for their children's education, and it raises the question of where the limits of the school's authority to impose the supremacy of particular attitudes and behaviours lie. For example, parents may even wish to pass on their experiences of responding to social exclusion by 'strategically' withdrawing from public life and living by a code of individualism or group loyalty, whereby they choose to live on the margins of society (Jordan 1996). Given the reticence to introduce any mention of political thought to schools that surrounded early attempts to establish statutory citizenship education (Kerr 1999; Faulks 2006), this is an area around which schools might wish to tread carefully.

As stakeholders in their children's education, parents could reasonably assert that matters of personal values, including politics and religion, are the domain of the family and should not be subject to being undone or diminished in any way by agents of the state. However, if, as with religious education, political education in citizenship lessons is not used to replace but, ideally, to complement and help to express home values, or at least to expand knowledge of alternatives which children recognise they have a right to choose between, it should be accepted inasmuch as exploring different worldviews is supported as the jurisdiction of state education. This study found, however, that opportunities to explore ideas and exercise agency were anathema to pupils' experiences of citizenship education.

Assumptions about model behaviour and deviance abounded in young people's accounts: that school was the primary provider of knowledge about the wider world; that influences outside school were inherently negative; that behavioural skills were best learnt at school; that a 'deviant' environment was best understood by those outside it. There was a sense amongst pupils that they relied on their schooling to train them to respond to "life" as it "happens" to them, with one respondent's use of "lost" to describe how he would feel without teachers' instructions and particularly concerned that a template for appropriate behaviour would be missing from his formative experiences if not provided at school.

To some pupils, however, their learning was not a resource to be drawn upon in times of trouble but could be *of use* to their endeavours to live up to the more positive expectations bestowed upon them. From the student councillor concerned with embellishing his CV to those who had utilised their increased political knowledge to enter competitions, or simply felt compelled to join in extra-curricular activities because of the influence of an 'extra credit' culture that nudged pupils to stretch themselves, citizenship held no particular significance as one of many profitable avenues of knowledge they might choose to explore. For these children, a range of options were on offer and they were aware that they had a duty to make the most of their opportunities and *choose* wisely between investments in order to *get on* in life.

As practitioners, teachers pragmatically accepted that they were not all starting from an equal footing in terms of pupils' receptivity to the tenets of citizenship and did their best to get on with their job. Their understandings could be compared with I.M. Young's recognition that some citizens are 'more equal than others' (1989:259) and differentiation is therefore needed to empower the less privileged. As discussed earlier, however, the strongest narrative in dialogue with young people felt to be in need of such encouragement was not that of empowerment but of being "warned" of social rules and the consequences of disobeying them. Even teachers who were passionate in relating their ambitions for active citizenship predicted that their students would not report their education to be about engendering the effective and democratic participants of the programme of study – *informed, critical, active citizens who have the confidence and conviction to work collaboratively, take action and try to make a difference in their communities and the wider world* (QCA 2007) – but about conforming to an ideal form of citizenship. This is not an issue of focusing on messages more 'relevant' to young people, facilitated by labelling them as under-privileged, it is a re-framing of citizenship to a reductive form that serves only to reproduce cultural values in order to mitigate young people's potential to commit harm against society.

As Chapter Three's discussion of citizenship education in a capitalist society highlighted, experiences of education are shaped by the institutional and policy structures that define what counts as valid knowledge. Youdell's (2011:13) work points to the National Curriculum as first among the defining forces of the English context of 'governmentally sanctioned educational knowledges'. Giroux warned that 'democracy has now been reduced to a metaphor for the alleged "free" market' (Giroux 2011:73) and that 'it is crucial to develop educational approaches that reject

a collapse of the distinction between market liberties and civil liberties, a market economy and a market society' (Giroux 2011:69). The National Curriculum is certainly not preoccupied with young people's basic freedoms and it may be that the Blairite influence on the citizenship curriculum manifested in swinging the focus much further towards responsibilities than rights, with the result of confining liberties to the economic sense. Despite its emphasis on personal success then, it is helpful to revisit the ideology behind the policy tool of citizenship education.

7.4.1 Manufacturing Model Citizens

Whether the model for citizenship was characterised by *getting by* or *moving on*, this study found that pupils identified the product of a model citizen as the expected outcome of their citizenship education. As Dewey would have it, education, understood in the broadest possible terms, is an instrument of social renewal; of the 'social continuity of life' (Dewey 1994:2). It is within this broader interpretation that citizenship education has found its function.

Beings who are born not only unaware of, but quite indifferent to, the aims and habits of the social group have to be rendered cognizant of them and actively interested. Education, and education alone, spans the gap. (Dewey 1994:3)

For Dewey this is a 'social need', a 'work of necessity' (Dewey 1994:3). For some teachers, such aims of passive absorption of knowledge were incommensurate with the citizenship syllabus, with practices more concerned with "regurgitating" than a consideration of "what makes someone good at citizenship?" The difficulty of reconciling *active* subject matter based on subjectivity with its place in an education system based on *passive* objective evaluation of attainment was a recurring theme throughout the research and teachers felt compelled to pare back their teaching to achieve learning objectives they considered to be the "purpose" of the citizenship agenda. This meant that recognition of the impact of citizenship education was restricted to evidence that a 'social need' was being met by such outcomes as preventing young people from causing harm to their communities, as measured by a lack of burden on the local police. It is argued here that this represents a displaced aim by which the outcome of adopting habits that allow young people to conform to a model of citizenship takes precedence over active processes though which competing views might develop.

Overcoming prejudice and promoting community cohesion for the benefit of social order was seen as key driver for the development of citizenship education, yet

young people were not encouraged to become active members of their communities as abstract concepts of these government priorities took precedence over lived experiences. In this way, pupils were not stimulated to actively engage with citizenship concepts, rather they were taught to passively accept that their position as citizens is manufactured in relation to government policies. Teachers' accounts of "deathly dull" parts of the citizenship syllabus are evidence of the reality of translating curriculum priorities like '[e]xploring community cohesion and the different forces that bring about change in communities over time' (QCA 2007:29) into a syllabus of demonstrable learning objectives. The approach of ensuring pupils can identify what is meant by 'community cohesion' by listing government strategies chooses the production of measurable outcomes over more open interpretations of what young people might get out of their learning.

There is little lightness of touch, to the chagrin of those teachers who had the confidence to relate citizenship values to their classes in their own terms, once they had "got through" the uninspiring syllabus. Others, however, shied away from engaging with issues such as race, as in the case of the teacher who "stopped" comments, rather than questioning them. Controversial views were not seen as a resource for debate, despite the fourth strand of the curriculum stating that pupils' understanding of diversity is developed foremost by '[a]ppreciating that identities are complex, can change over time and are informed by different understandings of what it means to be a citizen in the UK' (QCA 2007). Instead, a superficial conformity to 'appropriate' discussion denies the existence of 'different understandings'.

This may be an example of the reach of the rhetoric of *social inclusion*, which has been attacked in the years since the Parekh Report and the Ajebo Review, which led to 'multiculturalism' falling out of favour as a concept as more integrationist views came back into vogue. Though mandatory assimilation with a 'national' culture continues to be associated with only the Far Right in the UK, there are calls to open up debates on identity, to end what Mouffe (1993) called 'politics without adversary', that is a tunnel vision around equality that denies the existence of divisive differences, competition for resources or conflicting cultural customs; which are all fundamental to engaging with the contested concept of citizenship. The essentials of race, gender and class then become what Butler (1990:15) termed 'permanently moot points' by dint of what Skeggs (1997:195) would call their 'absent presence', or perhaps the black-boxing (Latour 1987) of their place in the political landscape.

In this way, debate is precluded, issues are sanitised, argument is circular; it is productive – in that it is reproductive – but cannot be transformative. The experiences of citizenship education uncovered in this study certainly suggest that opportunities to appreciate the dynamic relationship between values of social and moral responsibility described in the curriculum (including the acceptance and inclusion of all cultural groups), and content on political literacy (that covers legislation relating to those values) are missed – when surely the effect of ‘extreme’ views relating to either strand can only serve to illuminate the other. Engaged with in such a way, the capacity for values to change the law, as well as the law’s facility for suppressing values, could usefully be communicated to students of citizenship. Due to the tokenistic nature of classroom debates, however, subjects like deviance from the law are understood in only one dimension. In the teacher from Hilltop School’s view, this was because “every government has to come out with something that’s how they’re going to deal with social disorder” although “from an education perspective, the imposition of that type of thing never works as fully as it would’ve done if it had gone through an open discussion”.

The focus on young people’s responsibility to adhere to the law, for example, is a ‘model citizen’ approach to citizenship that attenuates the role of free will and takes a purely negative view of social disorder, “anti-social” behaviour and crime. In order to internalise the model citizen, however, its value must be reinforced by the subject’s relations with society. The young people who participated in this study showed an appreciation of the values the citizenship curriculum was designed to impart. Their use of language associated with citizenship discourse in Britain – reference to community, diversity, rights and duties – reflected the prominent themes of the syllabus: but a greater familiarity with citizenship terminology is not evidence of increased identification with the message or propensity to demonstrate affinity with the actions of the model citizen over their predecessors to whom the subject was not taught in its current statutory form. Indeed, one is reminded of Crick’s opinion on the matter –

... the object of the journey is not to learn to speak proper, but to understand and explain general relationships; and also to understand the probable consequences of following inferences drawn from one set of values rather than another (Crick 1999)

– which is why he so vehemently advocated the *practice* of citizenship and its relation to other influences. Students did report their education to be reinforcing of and reinforced by the media in the promulgation of one dominant view of social

disorder as a symptom of an unhealthy society, as in Foucault's critique of Rousseau's natural man who must be denatured.

...the only cohesion asked of individuals is intended to protect, not a natural existence, but the free exercise of sovereignty over and against nature. The relation established by Rousseau is precisely reversed; sovereignty no longer transposes the natural existence; the latter is only an object for the sovereign, which permits him to measure his total liberty. (Foucault 1989:269).

This research suggests that the observed forms of citizenship education exclude an alternative view of rebellious or insurgent behaviour, which might be seen as a normal part of civilised society (Durkheim 1973). A perhaps preferable alternative would encourage debate around oppressive societies with low crime rates, which would question teachers' deference to the model citizen approach by demonstrating manufactured passivity. Pupils could then develop their understandings of citizenship in reference to the social benefits wrought and protected by agents of social change through learning about, for example, laws that have been changed by individuals expressing their free will in the form of acts seen as 'criminal' or 'immoral' in their context (the campaign for women's suffrage would be one of a host of examples). Such an approach would allow young people to question the construction of what is criminal, moral and anti-social generally. It seems that, even within the confines of the model citizen approach, debate is further narrowed, for a discussion of the character of model citizens in different contexts in history and geography could actually serve as an exploratory tool for engaging 'critically with and explor[ing] diverse ideas, beliefs, cultures and identities and the values we share as citizens in the UK' (QCA 2007) as set out in the key stage three programme of study (but this would, of course, explode the myth of the model citizen as an ideal).

7.4.2 What have we got to lose?

Even if the model citizen narrative of citizenship dominates the classroom, if its one-dimensional curriculum is not supported by other social realities produced in wider society, its power will be weakened. Many teachers lamented the "imposition" of the curriculum as a series of missed opportunities as, if efforts had been made to consult young people and incorporate their views, policy makers "probably would have come up with something better" (teacher, Hilltop School). Even in the testimony of teachers who were confident that their school was committed to pupil

involvement and sought to consult with young people, echoes of the perils of the therapeutic approach could be heard. One teacher expressed the need to avoid resting on the laurels of having provided a platform for pupil voice in the form of an extra-curricular school council. Another teacher suggested the pervasion of a “syndrome” whereby an elite few are repeatedly asked to represent their peers, from whom they necessarily differed because of the ease with which they took to the roles offered. Enticements to serve in these roles often included elevation in a hierarchy constructed to replicate adult institutions and privileges such as badges that marked the wearer out as engaged in non-compulsory activities. For young people who feel excluded from formal participation, ambivalent about authority and keen to identify with their peers, such trappings would not provide motivation to express themselves through these bureaucratic channels.

It is this imposition of an adult agenda that led Crick to warn against a focus on children’s understanding of adult political concepts at the expense of allowing them to use language and concepts that were meaningful to their experiences of interacting with the world. Constructed to reflect existing social structures and institutions, the use of school councils to ‘tick the box’ of pupil voice was perhaps the clearest evidence that young people are positioned outside citizenship culture before being invited to join in with existing practices. This construction does not recognise their present citizenship status, it is concerned only with readying them for their future role as adult citizens. They are informed of the normative behaviours they must conform to in order to achieve this social inclusion but inclusion on these terms cannot be described as democratic and, crucially, pupils do not have any real *power*. It was telling that this dissonance between pupils’ mock involvement through the conceit of pupil voice and the disaffecting realisation that genuine engagement is “not allowed” was described by a teacher: pupils struggled to imagine what real participation would look like. This approach of ‘more participation, less democracy’ (Chandler 2000:7) therefore black-boxes young people’s participation as a ‘technical’ involvement comparable to disingenuous public consultation exercises.

As discussed in Chapter Two, inclusive democracy should involve marginalised groups and allow them to be represented on their own terms and engage with issues on *their* agenda, not an agenda whose only concerns are to reproduce the values of the dominant culture. With an understanding of young people as a marginalised group undermined by this domination, this chapter has argued that the case of citizenship education

demonstrates how their capacity for agency within the education system is attenuated. Young people are not considered stakeholders in their education and this had serious implications for society. The model citizen approach to citizenship teaching is not merely intellectually reductive, it is driven by an agenda that seeks to protect a notion of British society from those that might effect change, In this way, pupil participation becomes a weapon against unpredictable, spontaneous acts but this form of controlled participation lacks meaning for young people's interests. This approach is more pernicious for the nation's youth than a failure to promote critical thinking in favour of reproducing culture: it actively subverts agency and participation in the next generation.

7.4.3 Recommendations

- 1) If schools are to teach active citizenship, education must engage with the political**
- 2) There should be no 'model' for learning citizenship, it should engage with issues that are meaningful to young people**

- 1) This chapter has described a general view of citizenship education as being concerned with the production of rounded individuals who make the 'right' choices for their own futures. This individualism is symptomatic of Giroux's (2011:4) observations of education as a private right, rather than a public good. This research supports Youdell's (2011) conception of education as a commodity, which asserts that pupils are subordinated to school hierarchies and stratified by inequalities produced by education policies that embrace market values. The young people in this study were constructed as *individualised consumers* (Youdell 2011), with their teachers taking a *banking* approach (Freire 1970): this is not conducive to pupils viewing themselves as active citizens. Their education has undermined both the exploration of controversial issues that might inspire activity and the opportunity to practise citizenship skills. The school context provides simulacra of many aspects of citizenship that might be used as resources for exploring issues of political organisation and activism, rights and responsibilities, deliberative debate and other tenets of democratic process. This would require pupils to be seen – and to see themselves – as more than self-interested individuals. Friere's (1970) vision of a classroom of co-creators of knowledge offers an important change in dynamics, not only between teacher and pupil but also among pupils. Rather than looking for

what they might take from a learning experience for their individual benefit, pupils should be encouraged to contribute to others' learning through the co-creation of knowledge. A concern for the collective and an appreciation of the diversity of views it represents should help to expose what McLaren (1995:34) called the 'partisan nature of learning and struggle', by questioning approved forms of knowledge through pupils' alternative narratives based on their own experiences. Using a critical pedagogue's vision of struggle, it might be possible to move beyond an ideal of coercing young people to recognise their responsibilities through adopting values without question and towards a much more ambitious transformation of consciousness in the next generation of citizens. Key to this political transformation is the agonistic positioning of pupils and teachers and the creation of a 'radical imaginary' (Mouffe 1993). The current practice of citizenship education uncovered by this study demonstrates that the alternative to understanding education as political is the perpetuation of the falsehood that education can be neutral. This research supports Freire's (1970) assertion that attempting neutrality results only in support for the dominant ideology. It is therefore disingenuous to present citizenship as removed from the political.

- 2) A more honest pedagogy would not, therefore, assume the kind of didactic approach that this study has demonstrated manifests in pupils' understandings of citizenship being limited to those *models* with which they are presented. Whether or not there might be noble intentions behind steering pupils towards the imperatives of getting by or moving on, these models should be considered anathema to education for active citizenship. There is no capacity for learning that follows such models to acknowledge young people as more than raw material awaiting a mould. Casting pupils as 'pre-citizens' places their actions outside the realm defined as citizenship, rendering their experiences and ability to effect change irrelevant. Whilst the first recommendation is concerned with bringing the political back into debates about citizenship education then, the second recommendation is a companion idea concerned with the personal. In Chapter Two, the separation of public life from the private sphere was described in Lister's (1997) terms as a false public/private dichotomy. Teachers' and pupils' acceptance of the state's intervention to shape young people's values and behaviours exhibits a perverse logic that decrees that the public sphere may

legitimately inform the private sphere but the private sphere should not inform public life. Similarly, drawing on Giroux (2011:75), teachers' 'cultural and political baggage' might be recast as a 'theoretical resource' that invites pupils to find connections and dissonance between ideals espoused at school and their experiences outside school. Rather than invoking a model for pupils to aspire to then, teachers might emphasise the diversity of alternatives they might wish to explore. If learners were free to be so outward-looking, unconstrained by a curriculum preoccupied with 'Britishness', they would have a chance to discuss those issues most important to their communities, with the understanding that this is the practice of civic discourse: and through ongoing debates about the relationship between pedagogy and the political a radical democratic project that is 'constantly in dialogue with its own assumptions' (Giroux 2011:74) might gather pace both in classrooms and in public life. A Mouffean agonistic approach could free educators from the tyranny of avoiding real debate on the basis that confrontation between 'moral enemies' is too contentious, as debates are not set out to be 'won' but are ends in themselves. Fundamental to this level of participation is the recognition of pupils as individuals with unique experiences. The individualistic approach to teaching citizenship outlined above was not found to extend to acknowledging young people's capacity for spontaneous contributions based on their experiences as UK citizens. Although pupils' backgrounds are understood as representing challenges to the model citizen narrative and teachers express hope that, once educated, the pupil may in turn educate others, young people are not given credit for any existing understandings of controversial (or indeed everyday) issues. There is a pervasive denial that citizens ultimately define what citizenship of their country might mean, and that the most pertinent aspects of this ongoing dialogue might be more familiar to young people than abstract concepts like 'community cohesion' suggest: this must be reversed if young people are to be convinced of their stake in their country's future.

7.5 Conclusion

The analysis presented in this chapter demonstrates that, as was suggested in Chapter Three, determining what is left out of a curriculum may be even more illuminating than what is included. The absence of critical thought in pupils'

experiences of learning gives way to the production of citizens who see citizenship as conformity to an approved model, whose appeal lies in the individualistic benefits of moving on or getting by.

The placing of citizenship education into the well-established structures of both the National Curriculum, and school practices designed to deliver education via its norms, has been observed to result in a focus on continuity with those structures. Pressure for teaching and learning to centre on outcomes rather than processes has led to a paradox whereby citizenship's concern for social issues is devalued as incommensurate with an outcomes-based approach while also being the source of its unique contribution to state education. In order to demonstrate the value of this contribution, teachers have then sought to raise citizenship's status by interpreting the subject through familiar pedagogy that pupils recognise from subjects with a higher status. This approach has sought to challenge pupils' and parents' perceptions of the subject by stipulating that it is taught as a *lesson*, drawing attention to what counts as citizenship *work* and seeking to assess pupils' progress as it would be done in other subjects. Pupils' own vernacular has demonstrated that only when teaching and learning follows a formula similar to established subjects do they recognise it as achieving the status of *work*. Teachers' efforts to convey the importance of citizenship are then confined by this restrictive frame.

Such restrictions in schools' practices can be said to define and reinforce schools' social role. As discussed in Chapter Three, this role has been seen as instrumental in reproducing the values of society. It is argued here that this reproduction is embodied in a passive construction of citizens. This can be seen in: teachers' and pupils' deference to ideas of a 'model' citizen that personifies the values pupils learn *about*; pedagogy that mimics the practice of active citizenship by including pupils' views within a framework of validation that undermines participation that does not complement the lesson plan; and a focus on pupils' future economic role that signifies a reduction of their contribution to that which translates into economic form and a reduction of their education to training for their economic contribution through employment and consumption.

Young people are not recognised as stakeholders in their education or their society and so, as Mead's study of youth-led anti-war demonstrations found, even where critical reflection is possible, it is mis-recognised as transgression. Citizenship's black-boxing as nothing more than a school subject therefore serves to ensure that young people's knowledge and skills are not used to undermine the basis of their

state education, which requires them to take a passive role and defer to the power of their teachers.

It is therefore contended that only a radical departure from the norms of English secondary education could result in education *for* citizenship that empowers young people to become agents of social change. Following Mouffe (1993), radical democratic citizens could be encouraged by the recognition of the subject positions of pupil and teacher as 'constructed within specific discourses and always precariously and temporarily sutured at the intersection of those subject positions' (Mouffe 1993:71). This would necessitate a non-essentialist approach to teaching pupils that is not based on an assumption of their lack of 'character' but rather the recognition of their identity as citizens for whom liberty and equality should be more than abstract concepts. The instrumental construction of social co-operation based on individual needs could then be challenged as young people are empowered to identify with a multitude of subject positions, in which they could feel truly invested, as opposed to conceding to the supremacy of an arbitrary civic empathy obliged to value all positions equally. As Turner argued:

The principal antidote to the decline of politics is an educated public that ... supports education not simply because it is good for the economy, but because it is the necessary foundation for the life of the citizen. By citizenship education and political literacy, Crick did not mean a boring diet of civics education combined with encouragement to undertake volunteering. He believed that political education is necessary to provide young people with the intellectual and moral equipment by which they can function as active citizens rather than as a mob open to manipulation. (Turner 2009:293)

As discussed in Chapter Two, an agonistic understanding of citizenship could provide a basis for participation that eschews essentialist labels and offers hope for the future of democratic ideals in an age increasingly fraught with the challenges of global consumer economies. This study found that pupils were denied opportunities to meaningfully practise critical thinking and debate, instead learning about such concepts in a theoretical sense. Citizenship, taught to conform to the norms of the National Curriculum, then suffers from the same cognitive disconnection that leaves numeracy "in the maths room", which cripples pupils' ability to value knowledge from other sources and apply it to question the representation of a key object of the discourse: young people. Despite not recognising themselves in sensationalist

portrayals of youth criminality, pupils were more comfortable accepting the “warning” their education provided as an object of study than questioning its validity.

It is therefore argued that the political nature of citizenship education should no longer be denied but should be drawn upon as a resource. Furthermore, the significance of the personal – young people’s experiences – rather than a proscribed *model* of citizenship should lead the debates that bring citizenship to life.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

In this thesis I have discussed how citizenship education confers particular ideas about what it is to be a citizen to young people in English state secondary schools. I have shown how, despite the expressed commitment of many teachers to promoting active citizenship in their pupils, young people's experiences of citizenship education did not reflect this ideal of agency. Instead, citizenship, for these young people, was associated with the following of rules in order to demonstrate awareness of, and observe, established social norms. This investigation has illuminated the need to bring together theoretical contributions from theorists of citizenship who consider the fundamental tenets that might guide a vision for citizenship that reflects core democratic principles, with theorists of education who offer insights into practices that support or undermine the realisation of that vision. In bringing these theories together with rich empirical data, this study has revealed a fundamental dissonance between young people's views of their education and policy makers' convictions about its function as a vehicle for social change.

As discussed in chapters Two and Three, considerable sociological interest in the general role of education in instilling certain values in young people has come from theorists of citizenship education. Despite this interest, there has been little empirical research that draws together concepts from theories of citizenship with considerations of the possibilities and challenges of transformative education to explore how citizenship education is experienced by teachers and pupils. This study makes an important contribution to citizenship studies by drawing on insights from both these traditions. The thesis' nuanced analysis of the multiple meanings citizenship takes on, as it travels from theorists' tentative grasp, through the policy mill and into classrooms across England, illuminates the potential and pitfalls faced in the translation of a vision of society to contexts where many different understandings are at play. The analysis therefore uniquely contributes to understandings of citizenship education as a process, through which it is possible to make sense of what happens in schools after decisions are taken at the macro level. Valuable research has been dedicated to understanding how the visions of the Crick group and subsequent policy makers related to classroom practices but the broader research questions addressed by this study enable the exploration of more pervasive themes, which fill gaps in the story of how this potentially

transformative addition to the National Curriculum has come to represent conformity to social norms for young people.

This study sits alongside research that has focused on technical aspects of citizenship education. Evaluations of pupils' attainment of certain standards of knowledge (for example Davies and Evans (2002) study) and surveys of attitudinal change (such as Cleaver et al.'s (2005) and Trikha et al.'s (2005)) offer an overview of how closely the response of those targeted by the policy follows the predicted outcome. The CELS's (NFER 2010) focus on 'citizenship outcomes' is characteristic of most research on citizenship education, in that young people's relationship to the content of the curriculum is not problematised beyond accounting for barriers to their ability to grasp the subject matter. This study has adjusted the focus on citizenship education to trouble the foundations of the subject by foregrounding the meanings that citizenship takes on in the school context. This study therefore represents a wider exploration of these perspectives that is more illuminative than a simple evaluation of the implementation of citizenship education.

In exploring citizenship education as experienced by teachers' and pupils', the methodology of this study extends the commitment of scholars of active citizenship in schools, like Youdell (2011) and Mead (2009), by engaging with the particular practices connected with the subject and their impact on participants' understandings of their citizenship beyond the school context. The theoretical framework of this study therefore builds on considerations of critical practice to understand the capacity for transformative learning experiences to become the norm in what could have been a radical new landscape for education. The richly perceptive accounts of teachers and pupils provide vital contours in the mapping of Crick's (1998) commitment to active citizenship, and its transformative possibilities, through the introduction to English state schools, to today's debates about the subject's place on the National Curriculum. Nuanced analysis of these accounts enables an appreciation of the importance of the tensions inherent in implementing change at the classroom level.

The key findings of this research are threefold. Firstly, through analysis of original data, it is argued that the viability of using the policy instrument of citizenship education to instil *values* – as part of a National Curriculum that pupils perceive to be based on the *value* they derive from each of their subjects – is fundamentally flawed. Secondly, theories of education are drawn upon to suggest that, unless teachers assume an explicitly transformative role as a liberating educator, their

default mode of teaching pupils to conform to expected outcomes will guide their pedagogy. Thirdly, through an investigation of the models of citizenship imposed upon young people and an exploration of radical democratic alternatives, the limits of a citizenship curriculum that seeks to confine classroom debate – and therefore understandings of active citizenship – in isolation from the political and the personal, are exposed.

8.1 Citizenship as a school subject

Research into the delivery of citizenship education since its implementation has suggested that pupils' critical reflection and opportunities to participate in debate about controversial issues have been neglected areas of the curriculum (Davies 2003; Summers et al. 2003; Oulton et al 2004). The depth of qualitative data from this study extends previous research, providing a more detailed and complex account of the barriers to active citizenship in schools.

The location of citizenship education within the National Curriculum is at the root of understandings of the values – and *value* – of citizenship. Both teachers' and pupils' efforts to engage with principles that underpin democratic citizenship have been hampered by a conception of what formal education is *for*. Assumptions about what makes a valid secondary school subject manifested in ideas about *right answers*, the need for *balanced* discussion and the stunted realisation of efforts to promote pupil voice. It has been argued that policy makers place too much emphasis on young people's ability to grasp adult concepts (Crick 1999) and that the transfer of knowledge to passive pupils as a neutral exercise in what is *right* and *balanced* is not compatible with an *active* conception of citizenship (Crick 2001; Davies and Evans 2002). Yet, as I have demonstrated, these elements, which pupils recognised as congruous with their learning from other subjects, characterise the pedagogy of citizenship education.

Aspects of history and political literacy could reasonably be expected to complement more active elements of the curriculum but this research suggests that the balance has tipped away from a recognition of young people as active citizens through practice and towards a 'grand narrative' (Osler 2010:6) with the outcome of reinforcing the dominance and permanence of society's existing structures. Having moved away from an emphasis on young people's skills for influencing public life, particularly the capacity to use critical thought and the confidence to direct their own forms of participation (Crick 1998), in favour of these elements informed by

concerns for social problems (Brown 2006), reference to policy aims seems unlikely to undo what was found by this study to be a prevailing conception of democratic values and processes as *right* and fixed. This conception leaves no room for pupils to *practice* these values because the *right answer* that they are expected to arrive at has already been decided and divulged to them. This research suggest pupils are then left with little to do but go through the motions of participation.

8.2 Engaging with the politics of schooling

A crucial step in moving away from a preoccupation with *right answers* and towards a conception of pupils as active citizens is changing the classroom dynamic of teachers as holders of knowledge and pupils as passive recipients. This dynamic has seen teachers identify and seek to fill in 'gaps' in pupils' knowledge, informed by their perceptions of pupils' backgrounds. This research supports findings from previous studies that reported that this kind of inconsistent practice is inherent in teaching a 'light touch' curriculum (Ofsted 2003; Kerr and Cleaver 2004; Bell 2005). There has been limited exploration, however, of the implications of educators' 'everyday judgements', which have been recognised as shaping and constraining how young people understand their citizenship and the possibilities they see as being open to them (Youdell 2011:9).

This study demonstrated how teachers' projections of pupils' futures guide the model of citizenship they convey as best serving pupils' individual interests. This form of citizenship teaching therefore represents a general view of education as a private right (Giroux 2011) and a perception of the importance of *outcomes*, which resulted in a reliance on a form of pedagogy Freire (1970) critiques as a *banking* approach. Chapters Two and Three explored various articulations of the idea that pupils consume their education (Habermas 1987; Bauman 1998; Crick 2001; hooks 2003). This study has revealed, however, that the view of education as a commodity is central to ways in which teachers and pupils conceptualise education – and aspects of learning that are not thought of as *bankable* seem problematic in this context.

Citizenship education provides an insightful case with which to problematise secondary education more broadly as inhibiting young people's agency by reducing their role to that of consumers. The pupils in this study demonstrated how they saw this approach to citizenship as conferring *value* for their individual futures: and no critical opposition to these market principles was articulated. Drawing on critical

pedagogy, this study has sought to trouble this individualistic understanding. Fundamentally, a banking approach reduces issues of citizenship to the direct outcomes of benefit or loss they might represent for the individual. This form of education can be recognised as divorced from democratic values and simply a matter of training for the adult world of pupils' imaginaries of conformity

Sociologists have always been interested in schools as sites of cultural reproduction but if policy makers seek cultural *change* (Crick 1998) through education policies that encourage active citizenship, this research suggests that schools would need to be supported through an institutional change that observed the necessary shift away from prioritising *outcomes* towards a greater appreciation of *process* that would enable the *practice* of active citizenship to be genuinely embedded. This would allow a change in classroom dynamics that might realise the potential of the school to represent democratic political processes through its fundamental operations, rather than reproduce a model of consumerism for learners constructed as self-interested individuals.

8.3 Engaging with the personal

Finding out how citizenship is constructed in schools has been a core aim of this research. Since its inception, the content of the curriculum has been reviewed, its delivery has been subject to inspection and its fate has been speculated on (Rowe et al. 2014). The effect of an essentially didactic approach of teachers transmitting knowledge to passive pupils (more or less tempered with defined opportunities for pupil voice), however, has not been fundamentally explored. This research found that this approach resulted in pupils' understandings of citizenship being limited to those models with which they were presented. Young people were not recognised as active citizens by these models but as merely having the potential to be directed to certain outcomes identified by the teacher. Casting pupils as 'pre-citizens' rendered their experiences and ability to effect change irrelevant. Indeed, the personal is explicitly removed from the classroom as a detrimental influence on the direction of discussion. Pupils are then not allowed to initiate debate based on issues familiar and important to them, they must adapt to (or feign interest in) adult discourse.

Based on these findings, it is argued here that an alternative to this inculcation of young people into the acceptance of a pre-defined role as a citizen in exchange for benefits bestowed by the state must take young people's experiences as a starting

point; without assuming their citizenship to be *inactive*. It seems perverse that policy makers judge issues such as community cohesion to be important matters affecting young people and proceed to digest them for pupils to imbibe as if young people have no prior knowledge to contribute. Given the space to talk about real lived experiences of conflicting interests without judgement, however, debate about community cohesion could be a valuable learning tool that covers social and moral responsibility, political literacy and community involvement. It might even encourage pupils' interest in government policies.

Validating the personal as a legitimate catalyst for discussion would require classrooms to be opened up to a spontaneity that would seem somewhat alien to the pupils in this study. As Giroux (2011:75) proposes, such an approach 'demands an openness to the other'; a willingness to critically engage with other sources of knowledge, which are continually shifting. This thesis contests that such openness might produce real civic discourse that would encourage young people in their practice of active citizenship. A Mouffean agonistic approach that constructs debate as being between adversaries rather than 'moral enemies' – and as ongoing rather than concluded by 'right answers' – could allay fears about classroom confrontations that currently leave discussion hamstrung. Rather than disenfranchised, self-interested or wary of the state then, pupils would be active in considering ethical questions. They would practise their democratic freedom to advocate some or none of those values periodically inscribed as 'British' or to argue for a radical alternative.

8.4 Implications for Policy and Directions for Future Research

Policy makers' interest in cultivating active citizenship is most often seen through the lens of addressing deficits in society that invoke contemporary social problems. Narrating these social problems to young people will not encourage their active participation, especially when this narration casts them as the problem rather than providing their own solutions. Coercion to be an active citizen for one's personal gain – either in terms of using participation in public life as a way to advance one's interests or to apply an awareness of the apparatus of the state to keep one's activity within the boundaries of acceptable behaviour – might nudge citizens into going through the motions of active citizenship. It seems unlikely, however, to provide conditions conducive to cultivating agents of social change whose practice of active citizenship reinvigorates democracy as an ongoing process. If

opportunities for this genuine practice are not extended, young people and other marginalised groups will justifiably (continue to) feel alienated from public life, as 'technical' or 'instrumental' participation offers them no chance to challenge the accepted ways of participating that have obscured their view of the political and marginalised their interests in the first place.

It would therefore seem that the only option left for policy makers concerned with addressing matters of 'democratic deficit' and social cohesion via active citizenship is to increase opportunities for genuine democratic participation. Fundamentally, such opportunities would need to be bottom-up processes, in which citizens' autonomy is recognised and their experiences and views privileged as valid forms of knowledge. Different forms of action would then need to be legitimised as political acts. Young people who demonstrate their organising and decision making skills by assembling in protest must be recognised and engaged with as political adversaries, rather than met with an authoritarian response that at best trivialises and misrecognises the democratic display of passions as naïve misunderstanding of present processes and at worst uses the sledgehammer of laws designed to protect national security to criminalise them.

The 2011 riots in England provided an opportunity for politicians to explore the disconnect between what society offered young people and what they wanted. Despite this extreme action uniting young people across very different contexts, their youth and criminality was used to invalidate any legitimate concerns (Jensen 2013). The original, peaceful protest against the actions of the police in London was discredited by association. Although many youth groups and community organisations have engaged with underlying issues to reflect and speak out about injustices raised by young people, the only policy changes were the fast-tracking of prosecutions and the addition of emotive rhetoric to existing neo-liberal agendas. Policy makers therefore expose their dualistic vision of young people as on the one hand a wilful threat to communities and on the other unaware of their responsibilities. There is no recognition of the nuance essential to these conceptions – that, not only is young people's awareness of their responsibilities quite obvious from the extreme occasions when they choose to go against them, but that young people have the knowledge and skills to participate and may be engaged in forms of active citizenship that go unrecognised by a top-down definition.

Working with young people, away from the compulsion of schooling, to understand what matters to them, passions they might want to organise around and how they might want to participate, could shift the way policy approaches young people away from assumptions of lack, or a problem to be solved – and towards a continuing dialogue. Only when young people are truly allowed to invest themselves in democratic processes do those processes earn their democratic mantle and, perhaps, the respect of young people that is necessary for their ongoing engagement.

Although this study explored young people's experiences of citizenship education with reference to their experiences of other subjects and aspects of school life, it was beyond the scope of the project to fully explore how opportunities for active participation might be integrated into other lessons and school practices. Kumashiro's (2004) radical techniques for empowering pupils extended to suggestions for the teaching of English literature, music, foreign languages, the natural sciences and mathematics. It is not contended here that this small scale study represents the extent of innovative practice in English secondary schools. Rather, future research might usefully engage with examples of critical pedagogy from the full range of subjects taught in state schools, and indeed schools with explicitly participatory or experimental philosophies. As this study has shown, 'empowering' practices cannot be claimed by teachers on their own behalf, however strong their commitment to reflective pedagogy, rather they must be recognised as such by learners. This study yielded very few examples of pupils' experiences of empowerment through innovative pedagogy. An investigation of cases where pupils identify such practice could, however, provide an insightful starting point for a rigorous exploration of practices that test the limits of young people's participation in schools. A commitment to research questions that explore practices on the basis of pupils' validation would need to be complemented by a research design using participatory methods that reflect a commitment to being pupil-led.

Whilst this thesis opposes prescriptive assumptions about how future research might serve young people's best interests, it might be intriguing to explore pupils' more general experiences of agency within their schools as a potential precursor to understandings of citizenship. The present study's first research question might be modified and the question of 'how active are teachers' and pupils' understandings of their participation in lessons?' might be posed in order to consider the position of these two actors across subjects. Similarly, a second research question of 'what forms of knowledge are engaged with?' might reveal missed opportunities to

include pupil-generated knowledge in more critical approaches to pedagogy, if not examples of pupils leading learning activities. This study has demonstrated the quality of data that such research questions can yield when explored through the study of experiences at schools in diverse settings. It would therefore be of significant sociological interest to further understandings of as full a range of young people's opportunities to actively participate in their education as possible. Semi-standardised interviews have proved an effective method for the cultivation of personal perceptions, arrived at through individual contemplation and yet representative of wider discourse as they speak to common themes. Future use of this method to illuminate teachers' and pupils' views on practices of teaching and learning in other subjects might provide useful comparisons with the present study.

The findings of the present study offer a note of scepticism, however, as they suggest that, while these limits might be stretched further elsewhere, the fundamental qualities of state schools and the policies that govern them would need to be radically transformed in order to incorporate the kind of approaches to critical thinking and debate that critical pedagogues consider necessary for cultivating agents of social change. In order to engage with other policy options for increasing young people's opportunities to participate in public life then, another direction for future research might be that of exploring young people's lives away from compulsory schooling. Again, this research should be led by young people's insights to discover those active practices that might go unrecognised or misrecognised by policy makers and not recognised as political by young people themselves. Young people's calls for tools to organise around these concerns and participate in public life in a way that is meaningful for them might then be heard. The aim of such research would be to channel young people's voices to reflect their passions as valid points of political engagement; the challenge would be to have them heard by politicians.

Bibliography

- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ahmed, S. (2012). 'Affective Economies'. *Social Text* 22(2): 117–139.
- Ajegbo, K., Kiwan, D. and Sharma, S.(2007). *Diversity & Citizenship: Curriculum Review*. Department for Education and Skills.
- Allen, K. & Mendick, H. (2013) 'Young People's Uses of Celebrity: Class, Gender and 'Improper' Celebrity'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 34(1): 77-93.
- Allred, P. and Burman, E. (2005) Analysing Children's Accounts Using Discourse Analysis, in S. M. Greene and D. M. Hogan (eds) *Researching Children's Experience: Approaches and Methods*. London: Sage.
- Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Schocken.
- Arendt, H. (1998). *The Human Condition: Second Edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Back, L. (2002). *Out of Whiteness: Color, Politics, and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ball, S. (2003) 'The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity'. *Journal of Educational Policy* 18(2): 215-228.
- Barber, B.R. (1984). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. University of California Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1993). *Postmodern Ethics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Beck, U. (1992). 'From Industrial-Society to Risk Society - Questions of Survival, Social-Structure and Ecological Enlightenment Theory.' *Culture and Society* 9(1): 97-123.

- Beckett, A. (2006). *Citizenship and Vulnerability*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bell, D. (2005). 'Full Text of David Bell's Speech'. *The Guardian*.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2005/jan/17/faithschools.schools>.
- Bennett, W. (1998). 'The Place to Harvest Patriots.' *School Administrator* 55 (5).
<http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=EJ563932>.
- Berlin, I. (1958). *Two Concepts of Liberty: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered Before the University of Oxford on 31 October 1958*. Clarendon Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1973). *Class, Codes and Control*. London: Routledge.
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and Thinking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blunkett, D. (2002). 'What Does Citizenship Mean Today?' *The Guardian*, September 15.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/sep/15/race.thinktanks>.
- Blunkett, D. (2003). 'Civil Renewal: a new agenda'. Department for Communities and Local Government.
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/communities/civilrenewal>.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). 'The Forms of Capital'. In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westport: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J-C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: SAGE.
- Bowers, C.A. (1987) *Elements of a Post-liberal Theory of Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Boyce, B. (1993). 'The Democratic Deficit of the European Community'. *Parliamentary Affairs* 46 (4) (January 10): 458-477.
- Breslin, T. and Dufour, B. (2006). *Developing Citizens: A Comprehensive Introduction to Effective Citizenship Education in the Secondary School*. London: Hodder Murray.

- Brown, G. (2006). 'Gordon Brown's Speech to the 2006 Labour Party Conference'. *The Guardian*.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/sep/25/labourconference.labour2>.
- Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BSA. (2002). 'Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association'.
<http://www.britisoc.co.uk/about/equality/statement-of-ethical-practice.aspx>.
- Burbules, N. & Berk, R. (1999) 'Critical Thinking and Critical Pedagogy: Relations, Differences and Limits'. In T. Popkowitz & L. Fender (Eds.) *Critical Theories in Education*. New York: Routledge (45-65)
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge.
- Byrne, B. (2004). 'Qualitative Interviewing'. In *Researching Society and Culture*, ed. Seale, C. London: SAGE.
- Chaney, D. (2002). 'Cosmopolitan Art and Cultural Citizenship'. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1-2) (January 4): 157-174.
- Clarke, P. (1996). *Deep Citizenship*. London, Pluto Press.
- Cleaver et al. (2005). *Listening to Young People: Citizenship Education in England*. NFER.
- Connolly, W.E. (1983). *The Terms of Political Discourse*. Princeton University Press.
- Counts, G. S. (1975). *The Challenge of Soviet Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Crick, B. (1998). *Crick Report*. Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. London: HMSO.
- Crick, B. (1999a). *In Defence of Politics*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Crick, B. (1999b). 'The Presuppositions of Citizenship Education.' *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 33(3): 337-352.

- Crick, B. (2000). 'Bernard Crick: Big Brother Belittled' Guardian.co.uk', August 19.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,3604,356134,00.html>.
- Crick, B. (2001). *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture*. Oxford: The Political Quarterly Publishing Co.
- Crick, B. (2002). *Democracy: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crouch, C. (2004). *Post-Democracy*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dagger, R. (2002). Republican Citizenship. In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, ed. Isin, E.F.F. and Turner, B.S. London: SAGE.
- Dant, T. (1991). *Knowledge, Ideology and Discourse: A Sociological Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Davies, I, and Evans, M. (2002). 'Encouraging Active Citizenship'. *Educational Review* 54 (1) (February 1): 69-78.
- Davies, I. (2003). 'Developing Education for Citizenship'. In *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate: 161-174
- Davies, J. S. (2012) Active Citizenship: navigating the Conservative heartlands of the New Labour project *Policy & Politics* 40(1): 3-19
- Davies, L. (2000). The Control of Educational Democracy: International Perspectives. In *Citizenship and Democracy in Schools: Diversity, Identity, Equality*. Stoke-on-Trent, Trentham.
- Dawe, A. (1970). 'The Two Sociologies'. *The British Journal of Sociology* 21 (2) (June): 207.
- Deacon, R. (2006). 'Michel Foucault on Education: a Preliminary Theoretical Overview'. *South African Journal of Education* 26 (2): 177-187.
- Delanty, G. (2002). Communitarianism and Citizenship. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, ed. Isin, E.F.F. and Turner, B.S. London, SAGE.
- DeLeon, A.P. (2006) 'The Time for Action is Now! Anarchist Theory, Critical

Pedagogy and Radical Possibilities'. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*. 4(2): 72-94.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2000). *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge, Second Edition*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Denscombe, M. (2007). *The Good Research Guide*. McGraw-Hill International.

Deranthe, R. (1970). *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et la Science Politique de son temps*. Paris: Vrin.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. Free Press.

DfE (1988). The Education Reform Act. London, HMSO.

DfEE, and QCA. (1999). *The National Curriculum: Handbook for Secondary Teachers in England, Key Stages 3 and 4*. HMSO.

Doddington, C. (2008). 'Critical Thinking as a Source of Respect for Persons: A Critique'. In *Critical Thinking and Learning*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1973). *The Education of Black People*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Durkheim, E. (1973). *Moral Education*. Free Press.

Dwyer, P. (2003). *Understanding Social Citizenship: Themes and Perspectives for Policy and Practice*. The Policy Press.

Elliott, A. & Lemert, C. (2009). *The New Individualism: The Emotional Costs of Globalization*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). 'Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy'. *Harvard Educational Review*. 59(3): 297-324.

Etzioni, A. (1998). *The Essential Communitarian Reader*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Etzioni, A. (1994). *Spirit Of Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Farmer, C. and Trikha, S. (2005) 2003 Home Office Citizenship Survey (London, Home Office and DfES). In *Education for Democratic Citizenship: a Review of Research, Policy and Practice 1995–2005* 1, 21:433-466.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671520600942438>.
- Faulks, K. (2000). *Citizenship*. London: Routledge.
- Faulks, K. (2006). 'Education for Citizenship in England's Secondary Schools: a Critique of Current Principle and Practice'. *Journal of Education Policy* 21 (1): 59-74.
- Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: SAGE.
- Finney, N. and Simpson, L. (2009). *'Sleepwalking to Segregation'? Challenging Myths About Race and Migration*. Bristol: Policy Press.
<https://www.escholar.manchester.ac.uk/uk-ac-man-scw:4b1587>.
- Foucault, M. (1971). 'A Conversation with Michel Foucault'. Ed. J.K. Simon. *Partisan Review* 38: 192-201.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Foucault, M. (1982) 'The subject and power'. In J. Faubion (Ed.) Michel Foucault: Power. Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 Volume 3. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Technologies of the Self: a Seminar with Michel Foucault*. Trans. Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1989). *Madness and Civilization*. London: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of Justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fraser, N. (2000). 'Rethinking Recognition'. *New Left Review* 3 (May).
<http://newleftreview.org/II/3/nancy-fraser-rethinking-recognition>.

- Frazer, E. (1999). 'The Idea of Political Education.' *Oxford Review of Education* 25(1/2): 5-22.
- Frazer, E. and Lacey, N. (1993). *The Politics of Community: a Feminist Critique of the Liberal-communitarian Debate*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Freeman, S. (2007). *Rawls*. New York: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970). *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Freire, P. & Shor, I. (1987). *A Pedagogy for Liberation*. Houndmills: MacMillan.
- Fromm, E. (1956). *The Sane Society*. London: Routledge.
- Fromm, E. (1964). *The Heart of Man*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Furedi, F. (2003). *Therapy Culture: Cultivating Vulnerability in an Uncertain Age*. London: Routledge.
- Gallie, W.B. (1956). 'Essentially Contested Concepts'. *Meeting of the Aristotelian Society, 12th March 1956, Bedford Square, London*.
- Galston, W.A. (2005). *Public Matters: Essays on Politics, Policy and Religion*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The Culture of Control*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Gibbons, S. and Machin, S. (2003). 'Valuing English Primary Schools'. *Journal of Urban Economics* 53 (2) (March): 197-219.
- Giddens, A. (1999). 'Risk and Responsibility.' *The Modern Law Review* 62(1): 1-10.
- Giroux, H.A. (1983). *Critical Theory and Educational Practice*. Melbourne: Deakin University Press.
- Giroux, H.A. (2011). *On Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Continuum.
- Glaser, B. G. (1965). 'The Constant Comparative Method of qualitative analysis'. *Social Problems*. 12: 436-445.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Gramsci, A. (1916) 'Socialism and Culture'. In P. Piccone & P. Cavalcante (Eds.) *History, Philosophy and Culture in the Young Gramsci*. St. Louis: Telos Press. Cited in Giroux, H.A (2011). *On Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Continuum.
- Grant, D., Hardy, C., Oswick, C. and Putnam, L.L. (2004). *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Discourse*. London: SAGE.
- Gray, M. (2003). 'Urban Surveillance and Panopticism: will we recognise the facial recognition society?' *Surveillance & Society* 1(3): 314-330.
- Great Britain (1999) *The Citizenship Order 1999*. London: HMSO.
- Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hahn, C. L. (1999) Citizenship: an empirical study of policy, practices and outcomes. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25, 1&2, 231-250.
- Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female Masculinity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hall, S. (1996). *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: SAGE.
- Hampton, J. (1986). *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanisch, C. (1969). *The Personal is Political*. Available at:
<http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PIP.html>
- Hansen, D.T. (2006). *John Dewey and Our Educational Prospect*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Harland, J. (2004). 'A Curriculum Model for Citizenship'. In *Education for Citizenship*, ed. Denis Lawton, Jo Cairns, and Roy Gardner. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Harrell, J.S., Bradley, C., Dennis, J., Frauman, A.C. and Criswell, E.S.. (2000). 'School-based Research: Problems of Access and Consent'. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing* 15 (1) (February): 14-21.

Hayek, F. (1944). *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge.

Heater, D. (1999). *What is Citizenship?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heater, D. (2004a). *Citizenship*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Heater, D. (2004b). *A History of Education for Citizenship*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Helm, T. (2010). 'Jobless Told: do Unpaid Work or Lose Your Benefits'. *The Observer*. November 7. London, Guardian News and Media Ltd.

Helm, T. (2011). 'Labour Calls for Schools to Teach "Route into Work"'. *The Guardian*, July 10. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2011/jul/10/labour-schools-work-michael-gove>.

Hillgate Group. (1986). *Whose Schools?: a Radical Manifesto*. Hillgate Group.

Hindess, B. (1993). Citizenship in the Modern West. In *Citizenship and Social Theory*. Turner, B.S. London: SAGE.

Hindess, B. (2002). 'Neo-Liberal Citizenship.' *Citizenship Studies* 6(2): 127-143.

Hirst, P.Q., and Khilnani, S. (1996). *Reinventing Democracy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Hobbes, T. (1973). *Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobbs, G. and Vignoles, A. (2009) 'Is children's free school meal 'eligibility' a good proxy for family income?'. *British Educational Research Journal*. 36(4): 1469-3518

Holden, C. (2004) "Heaven Help the Teachers!" *Educational Review* 56 (3), 247-258. In *Education for Democratic Citizenship: a Review of Research, Policy and Practice 1995–2005* 1, 21:433–466.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02671520600942438>.

- hooks, b (1994). *Teaching to Transgress*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, b (2000). *Where We Stand: Class Matters*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. New York: Routledge.
- Horowitz, A, and Matthews, R.K. (1997). "Narcissism of the Minor Differences": What Is at Issue and What Is at Stake in the Civic Humanism Question'. *Polity* 30 (1): 1.
- Hunter (1996) Assembling the School. In *Foucault and Political Reason* A. Barry, T. Osborne, N. Rose (Eds) London UCL Press Ltd. 143-166
- Isin, E. and Turner, B.S.(2002). *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: SAGE.
- Jennings, J. (1994). Rousseau, Social Contract and the Modern Leviathan. In *The Social Contract from Hobbes to Rawls*. D. Boucher, Kelly, Paul. London, Routledge: 115-131.
- Jensen, T. (2013). 'Riots, Restraint and the New Cultural Politics of Wanting'. *Sociological Research Online*. 18 (4) 7. Available at: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/4/7.html>
- Johnson, L. & Morris, P. (2010). 'Towards a Framework for Critical Citizenship Education.' *The Curriculum Journal*. 21(1): 77-96.
- Jones, O. (2011). *Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class*. London: Verso Books.
- Jordan, B. (1996). *A Theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jorgensen, C.G. (2012). *John Dewey and the Dawn of Social Studies: Unraveling Conflicting Interpretations of the 1916 Report*. Information Age Publishing.
- Kakos, M. (2012) Embedding citizenship education: An ethnographic tale of Trojan horses and conflicting performativities. In: Jeffrey, B. & Troman, B. (Eds): *Performativity in UK Education: Ethnographic cases of its effects, agency and reconstructions*. Painswick: E&E Publishing.

- Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Broadview Press.
- Kant, I. (1795) *Perpetual peace; a philosophical essay*. London, Swan Sonnenschein. <http://archive.org/details/perpetualpeaceap00kantuoft>.
- Kant, I. (1960). *Education*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kant, I. (1974). *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Lopes, J., Featherstone, G. and Benton, T. (2009). Embedding Citizenship Education in Secondary Schools in England (2002-08): Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study Seventh Annual Report (DCSF Research Report 172). London: DCSF.
- Kendall, G. and Wickham, G. (1999). *Using Foucault's Methods*. London: SAGE.
- Kerr, D. (1999). 'Changing the Political Culture: The Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools.' *Oxford Review of Education* 25(1/2): 275-285.
- Kerr, D. (2003). 'Citizenship Education in England: The Making of a New Subject.' *Journal of Social Science Education* 2(2).
- Kerr, D. and Cleaver, E. (2004). *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Literature Review - Citizenship Education One Year On - What Does It Mean? Emerging Definitions and Approaches in the First Year of National Curriculum Citizenship in England*. London: DfES.
- Klein, N. (2000). *No Logo*. London, Flamingo.
- Knippenberg, J. M. (1989). 'Moving Beyond Fear: Rousseau and Kant on Cosmopolitan Education.' *Journal of Politics* 51(4): 809-827.
- Kumashiro, K. (2004). *Against Common Sense: Teaching and Learning Toward Social Justice*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Laclau, E. (1994). *Making of Political Identities*. London: Verso.

- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. and Woolgar, S. (1986). *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton University Press.
- Lee, M.J. (1993). *Consumer Culture Reborn: The Cultural Politics of Consumption*. London: Routledge.
- Lefstein, A. (2006). 'Dialogue in Schools: towards a pragmatic approach. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*. 33. London: Kings College Press.
- Lianos, M. (2003). 'Social Control after Foucault.' *Surveillance & Society* 1(3): 412-430.
- Lister, I. (1994). 'Conscientization and Political Literacy: a British Encounter with Paulo Freire'. In *Politics of Liberation: Paths from Freire*, ed. Peter McLaren. London: Routledge.
- Lister, R. (2002). 'A Politics of Recognition and Respect: Involving People with Experience of Poverty in Decision Making that Affects their Lives.' *Social Policy and Society* 1(1): 37-46.
- Lister, R., Smith, N., Middleton, S., and Cox, L. (2003). 'Young People Talk About Citizenship: Empirical Perspectives on Theoretical and Political Debates'. *Citizenship Studies* 7 (2): 235-253.
- Lister, R. (1997). *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives, Second Edition*. New York: NYU Press.
- Locke, J. (1946). *The Second Treatise of Civil Government*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lyon, D. (2007). *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- MacIntyre, A. (2001). *Dependent Rational Animals: Why Human Beings Need the Virtues*. Open Court Publishing.
- Mannheim, K. (1957). *Systematic Sociology: Karl Mannheim: Collected English Writings*. London: Routledge.
- Marenbon, J. (1987). *English Our English: The New Orthodoxy Examined*. Centre for Policy Studies.
- Marshall, T. H. & Bottomore, T. (1992). *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Pluto.
- Martin, R. (1994). Economic Justice: Contractarianism and Rawls' Difference Principle. In *The Social Contract from Hobbes to Rawls*. D. K. Boucher, Paul. London, Routledge.
- May, T. (2011). *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Research*. McGraw-Hill International.
- McLaren (1995). *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren (2003). 'Critical Pedagogy: A Look at the Major Concepts'. In *The Critical Pedagogy Reader*. (69-97). London: Routledge.
- McLaughlin, T. H. (1992). 'Citizenship, Diversity and Education: a Philosophical Perspective.' *Journal of Moral Education* 21(3): 235-250.
- McLaughlin, T.H. (2000). 'Citizenship Education in England: The Crick Report and Beyond'. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 34 (4): 541–570.
- Mead, N. (2009). "Conflicting Concepts of Participation in Secondary School Citizenship." *Pastoral Care in Education* 28(1): 45-57.
- Mehan, H. (1985). 'The Structure of Classroom Discourse'. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Discourse Analysis in Society*. van Dijk, T.A. Academic Press.
- Mill, J. S. (1910a). *On Liberty*. London: Dent.
- Mill, J. S. (1910b). *Considerations on Representative Government*. London: Dent.

- Mill, J.S. (1984) *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill, Volume XXI - Essays on Equality, Law, and Education*, ed. John M. Robson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. Accessed from <http://oll.libertyfund.org/title/255>.
- Miller, D. (1989). *Market State and Community: Theoretical foundations of market socialism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Modood, T. (1992) 'On Not Being White in Britain: Discrimination, Diversity and Commonality'. In M. Leicester & M. Taylor (eds) *Ethics, Ethnicity and Education*, Kogan Page.
- Mouffe, C. (1992). 'Citizenship and Political Identity.' *October* 1(61): 28-32.
- Mouffe, C. (1993). *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso.
- Mouffe, C. (2002). *Politics and Passions: the stakes of democracy*. London: CSD Perspectives.
- Mouffe, C. (2005) *On the Political*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Murdock, G. (2010). 'Consumers, Citizens, and Communards'. In *A Companion to Television*, ed. Janet Wasko. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- NCVO. (2005). *Civil Renewal and Active Citizenship: a Guide to the Debate*. NCVO.
- NFER (2010). *Citizenship Education in England 2001-2010 : Young People's Practices and Prospects for the Future : the Eighth and Final Report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*.
<http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/11579/>.
- NFER (2002). *Citizenship Education Across Europe*. Eurydice Network.
<http://www.nfer.ac.uk/nfer/index.cfm?9B23184A-C29E-AD4D-0833-2B14ABD84380>.
- Nolas, S-M. (2011). 'From Hoodies to Heroes and Back Again? A Discourse Analysis of Youth Development Policy in England (1997-to Date)'. *Social Policy Association Conference 5th July 2011, University of Lincoln*.
- Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Oakeshott, M. (1975). *On Human Conduct*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ofsted (2002) 'National Curriculum citizenship: planning and implementation 2002/03'. <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/national-curriculum-citizenship-planning-and-implementation-200203>.

Oldfield, A. (1990). *Citizenship and Community : Civic Republicanism and the Modern World*. New York: Routledge.

Orwell, G. (1941). Wells, Hitler and the World State. *Critical Essays*. London: Secker and Warburg.

Osler, A. (2000). 'The Crick Report: Difference, Equality and Racial Justice.' *The Curriculum Journal* 11(1): 25-38.

Osler, A. (2008) Citizenship education and the Ajebo Report: re-imagining a cosmopolitan nation. *London Review of Education*, 6(1):9-23.

Osler, A. (2009) Patriotism, multiculturalism and belonging: political discourse and the teaching of history. *Educational Review*, 61(1):85-100.

Osler, A. (2011). Education policy, social cohesion and citizenship *Promoting Social Cohesion: implications for policy and frameworks for evaluation*. P. Ratcliffe and I Newman (eds) Bristol, Polity Press.

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2006). 'Education for Democratic Citizenship: a Review of Research, Policy and Practice 1995–2005 1'. *Research Papers in Education* 21 (4): 433-466.

Osler, A. (2000). *Citizenship and Democracy in Schools: Diversity, Identity, Equality*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Oulton, C., Day, V. Dillon, J. and Grace, M. (2004). 'Controversial Issues - Teachers' Attitudes and Practices in the Context of Citizenship Education'. *Oxford Review of Education* 30 (4): 489-507.

Outhwaite, W. (1996). *The Habermas Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Paechter, C. (2001). *Learning, Space and Identity*. London: Sage.

Parekh, Bhikhu C. (2000). *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: Report of the*

Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain. Profile Books.

Parker, W. (1996). *Educating the Democratic Mind*. New York: New York State University Press.

Parry, G. (2003). Developing Education for Citizenship. *Education for Democratic Citizenship: issues of theory and practice*. A. C. Lockyer, Bernard; Annette, John. Aldershot: Ashgate: 30-46.

Peim, N. (2001) 'The History of the Present: towards a contemporary phenomenology of the school'. *History of Education*. 30(2): 177-190.

Peterson, A. (2011). *Civic Republicanism and Civic Education: The Education of Citizens*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Potter (1997) in Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Pykett, J. (2007). 'Making Citizens Governable? The Crick Report as Governmental Technology'. *Journal of Education Policy* 22 (3): 301-319.

QCA. (2007). 'National Curriculum for England 2008'. London: HMSO.
<http://collectionsr.europarchive.org/tna/20110503184536/curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/key-stages-3-and-4/index.aspx>.

Rasmussen, C. and Brown, M. (2002). 'Radical Democratic Citizenship'. In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, ed. Isin, E.F.F. and Turner, B.S. London: SAGE.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rawls, J. (1993). *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia.

Rawls, J. (1998). Justice as Fairness in the Liberal Polity. *The Citizenship Debates: A Reader*. G. Shafir. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota.

Reay, D. (2004). 'Gendering Bourdieu's Concepts of Capitals? Emotional Capital, Women and Social Class'. *The Sociological Review* 52: 57-74.

- Robinson, A. (1994). 'It Takes One to Know One: Passing and Communities of Common Interest'. *Critical Inquiry*. 20(4): 715-736.
- Roker, D., Player, K. and Coleman, J. (1999). 'Young People's Voluntary and Campaigning Activities as Sources of Political Education'. *Oxford Review of Education* 25 (1-2): 185-198.
- Rorty, R. (1992). 'What Can You Expect from Anti-Foundationalist Philosophers?: A Reply to Lynn Baker'. *Virginia Law Review* 78 (3) (April 1): 719-727.
- Rose, N. (1998). *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power, and Personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rossell, C. (1991). *The Carrot or the Stick for School Desegregation Policy: Magnet Schools or Forced Busing*. Temple University Press.
- Rousseau, J-J. (1968). *The Social Contract*. Trans. G. D. H. Cole. New York: Penguin.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1979). *On Education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rousseau, J-J. (2004). *A Discourse On Political Economy*. New York: Kessinger Publishing.
- Rowe, D., Horsley, N., Breslin, T. and Thorpe, T. (2012). 'Benefit or Burden? How English Schools Responded to the Duty to Promote Community Cohesion'. *Journal of Social Science Education* 11 (3). <http://www.jsse.org/2012/2012-3/rowe-et-al-benefit-or-burden>.
- Rowe, D. (1997). 'Value Pluralism, Democracy and Education for Citizenship'. In *Values, Culture and Education: Political and Citizenship Education*, ed. Leicester, M. and Modgil, F. London: Cassell.
- Sandel, M.J. (2007). *Justice: A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sassatelli, R. (2007). *Consumer Culture: History, Theory and Politics*. London: SAGE.
- Schuck, P. (2002). 'Liberal Citizenship'. In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, ed. Isin, E.F.F. and Turner, B.S. London: SAGE.

- Sedgwick, E. (1990). *Epistemology of the Closet*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Siisiäinen, M. (2000). 'Two Concepts of Social Capital: Bourdieu Vs. Putnam.' Trinity College, Dublin.
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE.
- Skeggs, B. (2003). *Class, Self, Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Smart, B. (1998). 'Foucault, Levinas and the Subject of Responsibility'. In *The Later Foucault: Politics and Philosophy*, ed. Jeremy Moss. London: SAGE.
- Star, S. L. (1991). 'Power, Technology and the Phenomenology of Conventions: On Being Allergic to Onions'. In *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology, and Domination*, ed. John Law. Routledge.
- Stevenson, N. (2003). *Cultural Citizenship, Cosmopolitan Questions*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Sturman, L., Rowe, N., Sainsbury, M., Wheeler, R. and Kerr, D. (2012). *Citizens in Transition in England, Wales and Scotland: Young citizens at 18-25*. Slough: NFER
- Summers, M.G.C., and Childs, A. 2003. 'Teaching Sustainable Development in Primary Schools: An Empirical Study of Issues for Teachers'. *Environmental Education Research* 9 (3): 327-346.
- Swann, M. and Runnymede Trust. (1985). *'Education for All': a Summary of the Swann Report on the Education of Ethnic Minority Children*. Runnymede Trust.
- Szasz, T.S. (1998). *Cruel Compassion: Psychiatric Control of Society's Unwanted*. Syracuse University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1992). *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, C. (1994). *The Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, Y. (2012). *Fitting Into Place?: Class and Gender Geographies and*

Temporalities. Farnham: Ashgate.

Thaler, R.H. and Sunstein, C.R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Yale University Press.

Thomas, D.R. (2003). 'A General Inductive Approach for Qualitative Data Analysis'. School of Population Health, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
<http://libra.msra.cn/Publication/2572995/a-general-inductive-approach-for-qualitative-data-analysis>.

Thompson, M.P. (1994). Locke's Contract in Context. In *The Social Contract from Hobbes to Rawls*. D. K. Boucher, Paul. London: Routledge.

Turner, B.S. (1986). *Citizenship and Capitalism*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Turner, B.S. (1993). *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: SAGE Publications.

Turner, B.S. (2009), 'Bernard Crick: citizenship and democracy in the United Kingdom', *Citizenship Studies* 13(3): 289-296.

van Dijk, Teun Adrianus. (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Discourse Analysis in Society*. Academic Press.

Waldron, J. (1999). 'Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative'. In *The Rights of Minority Cultures*, ed. Will Kymlicka. 1st ed. Oxford University Press, USA.

Walkerdine, V. (1989). *Counting Girls Out*. London: Virago.

Walsham, G. (1993) *Interpreting Information Systems in Organisations*, Chichester: Wiley.

Walsham, G. (1995), Interpretive case studies in IS research: nature and method, *European Journal of Information Systems* (4): 74-81.

Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004). 'What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy.' *American Educational Research Journal* 41(2): 237-269.

White, M. & Hunt, A. (2000). Citizenship: Care of the Self, Character and Personality. *Citizenship Studies*. 4(2): 93-116.

Whitty, G. (2002). *Making Sense of Education Policy*. London, SAGE.

Willis, P. (1998). *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. Morningside: Columbia University Press.

Wollstonecraft, M. (1996). *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* London, Constable.

Youdell, D. 'Subjectivation and Performative Politics - Butler thinking Althusser and Foucault: intelligibility, agency and the raced-nationed-religioned subjects of education'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 27(4): 511-528.

Youdell, D. (2011) *School Trouble: identity, power and politics in education*. Abingdon, Routledge.

Young, I. M. (1989). 'Polity and Group Difference: a Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship'. *Ethics*. 88(2): 250-274.

Appendix A

Interview Schedule (Teachers)

- What were your ideas of citizenship when you were (your pupils' age)?
Probe: where did that come from – school/family/community/the values of society at the time?
- Has this changed? Probe: why?
- What do you think the government is seeking to achieve through CE? Specifically, why are political literacy, community involvement and social and moral responsibility emphasised? Probe: Is it a solution to a problem/does it aim to create a certain type of citizen?
- Does Britain need what you've just described? Why? Probe: relevance of each of the three strands.
- Is this a need you've identified with reference to the children you teach? Probe: relevance of each of the three strands.
- How does your teaching of CE address this? Probe: would you adopt a different approach with a different group of pupils?
- CE was introduced with 'light touch' guidelines. How does this affect teaching practice in relation to other, more prescriptive, curriculum subjects? Do you draw on your own values more as a result? How do you avoid bias?
- How do you empower different types of pupils to promote pupil voice? Probe: whether different approaches are taken with children from different backgrounds.
- Do you think the children apply what they learn in citizenship lessons to their lives outside the classroom? Do you see this in school? Probe: does that make for a happier school etc.?

Appendix B

Interview Schedule (Pupils)

- What does citizenship mean to you? Probe: where did that come from – school/family/community/the values of society?
- How has your CE affected this?
- What do you understand by the terms political literacy, community involvement and social and moral responsibility? Probe: thinking about those areas, what do you think your teacher is trying to achieve through CE that isn't covered by other subjects you learn about in school; is it a solution to a problem or does it aim to create a certain type of citizen?
- Do you think that's something we need in Britain today – taking one at a time? Why? Probe: relevance of each of the three strands.
- Do you think your class needs what you've just described? Probe: relevance of each of the three strands; do classmates with different backgrounds need this more than others?
- How does the way CE is taught compare with teaching in other lessons?
- Does CE give you opportunities to get out and "be a citizen"/ put into practice what you've learnt?
- Are there any issues covered in CE that you have discussed with friends or family in the last month?
- Do you feel that if an issue was important to you and you felt it was relevant to citizenship, you could bring it up in class?
- What happens when you are having a discussion and people have different views? (Is it deliberative discussion?)
- Can you think of a time that you have used something you've learnt in a citizenship lesson in a real-life situation?