

RADICAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

by

Ralph Leighton

Canterbury Christ Church University

Thesis submitted

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2019

Acknowledgements

I wish to record my appreciation of the staff development fund at Canterbury Christ Church University for financial support in defraying some of the costs incurred in registering for this PhD, and to Sheila Wraight at CCCU Graduate Office for her guidance through a labyrinth of regulations and forms. Dr Laila Nielsen of Jönköping University, Sweden, has shown unwavering support for my work, and her belief in its worth has at times outstripped my own; her disciplined approach to academic work is of a standard beyond the capabilities of a mere mortal such as me but to which I aspire nonetheless. Without the encouragement, understanding, and clarity of thought and insight provided by my supervisor, Dr Ruth Rogers, this PhD would not have been completed; my gratitude to her is considerable. Similarly I am indebted to Dr Adrian Holliday for his support, encouragement and knowledge. The advice, insight and encouragement of Dr Richard Bailey (Head of Research at ICSSPE, Berlin, Germany), and Professor Andrew Peterson (University of Birmingham, UK) were consistently generous and always welcome, while the benefits to me of the efforts and wisdom of Professor Trevor Cooling, Dr Lynn Revell and Professor Linden West cannot be overstated. The requirements of confidentiality mean that I cannot name any of the schools, teachers, and others who have participated in the research relating to this submission, apart from those identified in some of the texts, without whose involvement I would have had nothing about which to write; particular appreciation and thanks are due to them.

CONTENTS

Page

- 3 Abstract
- 4 Summarising the publications
- 5 Narrative commentary
- 39 Leighton, R. (2004) 'The Nature of Citizenship Education provision: an initial study.' *The Curriculum Journal* 15[2], pp167-184
- 56 Leighton, R. (2006). 'Revisiting Postman and Weingartner's "New Education" – is Teaching Citizenship a Subversive Activity?' *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 2[1], pp79-88.
- 70 Leighton, R. (2010) 'Chapter 19. Radical Education: the past?' in J. Arthur and I Davies (eds) *The Routledge Education Studies Textbook* London: Routledge
- 81 Leighton, R. (2011). 'Introducing pre-service citizenship teachers to the design and implementation of focus days to enhance their professional learning'. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 7[1], pp.89-102.
- 98 Leighton, R. (2012) *Teaching Citizenship Education: A Radical Approach* London: Continuum
- 268 Leighton, R. (2013a). 'Citizenship teachers – Different types, different needs'. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 9[1], pp.85-98.
- 283 Leighton, R. (2013b) 'Overcoming the Nocebo Effect - A Radical Approach To Citizenship Education' *International Journal of Education for Social Justice* 2[1], pp16-33
https://repositorio.uam.es/bitstream/handle/10486/13533/63654_2.pdf?sequence=1
- 304 Leighton, R. (2013c) 'Goal Driven, Girl Driven – citizenship education in an English independent school' *Citizenship, Social and Economic Education* 12[2], pp71-85
- 331 Leighton, R. (2014) 'England's self-image as portrayed in public examination Citizenship Education textbooks.' In P. Cunningham and N Fretwell (eds) *Innovative Practice and Research Trends in Identity, Citizenship and Education* London: CiCEa pp140-155
- 351 Nielsen, L. and Leighton, R., (2017). 'What are the gender, class and ethnicity of citizenship? A study of upper secondary school students' views on Citizenship Education in England and Sweden'. *Confero: Essays on Education, Philosophy and Politics* 5 [1], pp11-70
<http://www.confero.ep.liu.se/issues/2017/v5/i1/a02/confero17v5i1a02.pdf>

- 396 Leighton, R (2018) 'Formally equal, but not really: the second stage of an ongoing study into English school students' perceptions of 'the citizen'.' *Citizenship teaching and learning* 13[1], pp31-44
- 415 Leighton R and Nielsen L (2018) 'Theorizing Young People's Perceptions of their Citizenship Identity' in J.A. Pineda-Alfonso, N.De Alba-Fernández and ENavarro-Medina (eds) *Handbook of Research on Education for Participative Citizenship and Global Prosperity* Hershey, USA: IGI Global pp537-70

ABSTRACT

The publications discussed herein constitute a programme of research which identifies developments in Citizenship Education in England. In particular they and the accompanying narrative discuss the extent to which Citizenship Education has the potential to radically facilitate social change.

All education is political, and the radical approach to Citizenship Education openly promotes social justice and critical active participation. The pedagogy of Citizenship Education is shown to be a political and moral practice intended to expand criticality, participation, self-determination, and imagination, a practice closer to the stated aims of the Crick Report than have been any of the iterations of the National Curriculum for Citizenship. In promoting a synthesis between a pedagogy of discomfort and the principles of subversive teaching this thesis advances the notion that politicians should be accountable, that people should be able and enabled to take decision makers to task, that those decision makers are the servants of the people.

From the first published article (Leighton, 2004) up to the most recent collaboration (Leighton and Nielsen, 2018), thematic analysis has led to the identification of two contrasting experiences: *formal* citizenship and *real* citizenship. While the state directs teaching and learning towards the *formal*, this clashes with the *realities* experienced daily by teachers and students. My data are far-reaching and derived from teachers, student teachers, school students, policy documents, other published research, web sites and other electronic sources. They offer a unique insight into the development of citizenship education in England.

Despite the continually diluted National Curriculum and the lack of appropriate provision in many schools, radical citizenship education is shown not only to be a theoretical possibility but slowly becoming a reality. It is practicable and realistic to aim for citizenship education to be truly radical, making hope possible now and for the future.

SUMMARISING THE PUBLICATIONS

(Leighton 2004) *4 academically high achieving schools, no specialist staff, different modes of delivery. Face to face interviews with staff, unstructured interviews with 2 sets of students.*

(Leighton 2006) *A 'discussion piece' outlining the potential and relevance of 'Subversive Education' to the teaching of Citizenship Education.*

(Leighton 2010) *A book chapter which defines and reviews radical education and critiques conservative 'progressivism'.*

(Leighton 2011) *A response to Ofsted; action research supported by data from semi-structured interviews with teachers and student teachers.*

(Leighton 2012) *A book offering insights and arguments of radical approaches to education, arguing and demonstrating that citizenship education can become a liberating and empowering force for change. 14 case studies/vignettes, including several from classroom teachers and 1 from a sixth form student.*

(Leighton 2013a). *8 'types' of citizenship teacher identified and their development needs discussed in the light of the challenges of radical citizenship pedagogy. Semi-structured interviews, observation, analysis of personal records, and quantitative data analysis.*

(Leighton 2013b) *Position paper in an international journal, outlining the principles of radical citizenship education*

(Leighton 2013c) *Focus group interviews with students, individual interviews with teachers, at a girls' independent school*

(Leighton 2014) *Thematic analysis of public examination textbooks*

(Leighton 2018) *Discusses spaces between the formal and the real. Individual interviews with teachers, focus group interviews with students.*

(Leighton and Nielsen 2018) *Focus on the formal & the real in the interpretative context of intersectionality and of human capabilities. Individual interviews with teachers, focus group interviews with students, comparisons made.*

(Nielsen and Leighton, 2017). *Discusses spaces between the formal and the real in England and Sweden. Individual interviews with teachers, focus group interviews with students, comparisons made.*

NARRATIVE COMMENTARY

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the regulations laid down by Canterbury Christ Church University for consideration for the award of PhD by publication, this summary commentary explains the unique contribution I have made to the body of knowledge and evidence of the nature and development of citizenship education in England. That contribution emphasises the potential for radical social change which citizenship education in England presents, identifies radical school practices, and considers the extent to which these can be replicated. The Crick Report, which established the parameters for citizenship education and the teaching of democracy in schools, emphasised the need to ‘extend radically to young people the best in existing traditions of community involvement and public service’ (Advisory Group 1998, para 1.5; p6), as well as to develop:

‘ . . . a change in the political culture [so that people are] 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.’ (Advisory Group 1998 para 1.5 pp6/7)

My publications cited here constitute a coherent and far-reaching programme of research constructed from data arising from the methodologies explained in each case. The studies identify developments in Citizenship Education in England, the perceptions of teachers and learners with regard to the impact of those developments, and – collectively and uniquely – discuss the extent to which Citizenship Education has the potential to radically facilitate social change, particularly as ‘radical’ is largely missing from contemporary research and wholly absent from the various iterations of the National Curriculum. They were published during the period 2004–2018 and include some of the earliest published scholarly studies into Citizenship Education after its establishment in the National Curriculum in England, and reflect the development of Citizenship Education during a particularly turbulent period of educational change in that country.

WHAT IS CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION FOR?

Perhaps reflecting the powerful presence of socialist politics in my Glasgow upbringing, I have been strongly influenced by the words of John Maclean when on trial for sedition:

‘I know quite well that in the reconstruction of society, the class interests of those who are on top will resist [that] change, I am out for an absolute reconstruction of society, on a

cooperative basis . . . my appeal is to the working class. I appeal exclusively to them because they and they only can bring about the time when the whole world will be in one brotherhood, on a sound economic foundation. That – and that alone – can be the means of bringing about a re-organisation of society. That can only be obtained when the people of the world get the world, and retain the world.’ (Maclean, 1918)

My conviction of the essential truth of Maclean’s words has influenced me personally and professionally for most of my adult life, and it would be remiss to ignore that influence on my research.

It has been my consistent position that, by adhering to the letter of legislation while certainly going against both the spirit of it and the posturing of politicians who were meant to be championing it, citizenship education in England can enable a co-operative reconstruction of society. As required by Canterbury Christ Church University’s regulations for PhD by publication (para 5.5) this is an original insight in the field of citizenship education, and my testing of a number of critical theoretical positions in that context has led to a deeper understanding of the social control role of education and of the potential for social change which citizenship education offers and, at times, delivers.

I am one of those who have argued (Larkin, 2001; Gillborn 2006; Leighton 2006, 2013b) that, far from being intended as an enabling and liberating subject, the purpose of the introduction of Citizenship Education in England was to reinforce the status quo, to debilitate and control awareness of social inequality and social injustice. As I propose in Leighton (2006) and demonstrate in (2012) and (2013b), that intention need not remain a barrier to imaginative and empowering teaching and learning; my research indicates that reality can be – and often is – different. Far from inevitably being another form of social control (as critiqued by Gillborn, 2006, and to which I offer a detailed response and rebuttal in Leighton, 2013b) or being concerned solely with the development of conformity and ‘character’ (Arthur, 2008), Citizenship Education can and should be placed in the contexts of learning variously identified and/or proposed by Gramsci, Freire, Postman and Weingartner, and others. My first article (2004) attempts to do this, while I am more coherent in Leighton (2006) and, as my writing developed, clearer still in more recent work. The central tenet of my submission is that, despite the initial and subsequent vacuity of iterations of the National Curriculum for Citizenship Education, the subject presents an opportunity to enable and empower current and future generations to be more questioning and less acquiescent. As my research progressed I came to recognise this as a slow and gradual process. The Crick Report clearly lays out a

radical agenda which goes contrary to the traditionally conservative social reproduction of the English education system.

The nature and purpose of citizenship education, both internationally and in the specific context of England, is highly contested. Osler and Starkey offered a comparison between France and England – geographical near neighbours but with wholly different educational emphases. The French programme is based on Republican values, particularly human rights, and emphasises the unacceptability of racism and discrimination. The English programme, established in 2000 and tentatively introduced into the compulsory curriculum in September 2002, claims to emphasise democracy and active engagement with society and thus presented itself as more pragmatic and less concerned with core principles. (Osler and Starkey 2001, p288/9). Core principles came to the fore in England following a series of legislation – commonly known as the Prevent Strategy – ostensibly intended to protect individuals and society from radicalisation. These core principles include the much critically discussed Fundamental British Values [FBVs] of:

- democracy,
- the rule of law,
- individual liberty,
- mutual respect for and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs and for those without faith.

To that list can be added an ill-defined set of precious freedoms which various Conservative politicians (e.g. Gove 2005) have vowed to promote and protect.

One might wonder in what sense the FBVs are ‘British’, let alone ‘fundamentally British’; that is something students can be expected to ask about and which any teacher might struggle to answer. Whether they are values is also open to discussion. They could well be ideals or moral codes to which many Britons aspire and to which the state pays a degree of lip service, but that does not make them distinctive or unique to British culture, history, or identity. They are similar to the Australian society values, for example, which include:

‘ . . . respect for the freedom and dignity of the individual, freedom of religion, commitment to the rule of law, Parliamentary democracy, equality of men and women and a spirit of

egalitarianism that embraces mutual respect, tolerance, fair play and compassion for those in need and pursuit of the public good (Australian Government, 2019, p5).

The explicit notion of FBVs is rejected in Northern Ireland's curriculum (McCully and Clarke, 2016) and is nowhere to be found in Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence (Scottish Government, 2011), so these are clearly not essentially British values being taught in British schools. Particularly pertinent for my continuing analysis has been the insight provided by Sen (1999) and by Nussbaum (2001), that such values/rights/principles have no real meaning if there is differential access to them and their application. My position – and that of radical citizenship education – is that these 'values' are not currently evident in practice in the United Kingdom and that society would be stronger, healthier and more equal if they were and, better still, if the country's true fundamental values were identified by an informed population rather than by a political elite.

De Coster et al (2012) have written in detail about the ever-widening differences in subject philosophy, content and esteem, in teacher attitudes, preparation and expertise, of pupil engagement and outcomes, in 35 educational territories throughout Europe. My smaller and more recent study, conducted in collaboration with Dr Leila Nielsen (Nielsen and Leighton, 2017), indicated significant differences in school students' attitudes to both the subject and the nature of 'the citizen' between Sweden and England. Schulz et al (2018) conducted Europe-wide research which shows that a number of social factors directly correlate to the likelihood of social participation and of confidence in political decision makers amongst young people. These studies raise questions about some of the generalisations of juvenile behaviour identified in the Crick Report. The concerns identified in the Crick Report – of increases in hate crime, in racist assault, in juvenile murder, in political apathy – were illustrated by anecdote or reference to recent headline events. They were not borne out by available statistical data but fitted media and popular perceptions; this presented an archetypical folk demonization and the inevitable subsequent moral panic, a process which young people undergo generationally as outlined by Cohen (1972) and others subsequently. It is clear that many young Europeans are highly sceptical of institutions and of the personnel who run them. The reasons for and extent of such scepticism in those countries varies according to national contexts, but the single unifying factor appears to be that the more young people are informed about how their country is organised and administered, the less persuaded they are that such organisation and administration is for the benefit of the population as a whole.

It has therefore become the case in my research that the beliefs and attitudes of young people have moved to the fore. Their sceptical awareness cannot be claimed to reflect the position of Maclean outlined above, that there should be a radical reconstruction of society in the interests of the working class, but it does indicate a significant level of dissatisfaction with the status quo. This reinforces my perception that the state – any state – cannot expect to educate its citizens about political circumstances without being brought to account over the inconsistencies between what is meant to be and what really is the case. In Leighton and Nielsen (2018), we have come to label these two contrasting positions as *formal* citizenship and *real* citizenship. While the state and its National Curriculum directs teaching and learning towards the *formal*, it is inevitably the case that this clashes with the *realities* experienced daily by students. For example the expectation that we tolerate the beliefs of others contrasts with the requirement for a daily act of broadly Christian worship, or where the rule of law conflicts with data which show that young black males are ten times as likely to be stopped by the police than are their white peers (gov.uk 2019).

The school of thought to which I ally myself is outlined in Leighton (2006) and dealt with in more detail in Leighton (2012 and 2013b), proposing that the subject can and should promote and enable social change through equipping young people with skills of enquiry and investigation, and an understanding of how society works, in order to hold to account those who would claim to lead and/or represent society. That state-provided education can and should be used to assess the efficacy and legitimacy of the state – and to enable change where efficacy and legitimacy are seen to be lacking – is the radical stance proposed in this submission. By this I mean that the state should be held to account for the extent to which it operates openly and honestly, and in the best interests of society as a whole, rather than indulging in or allowing underhand and obscured activities which result in decisions made to the benefit of an elite; democracy should be able to bear the weight of close scrutiny. Evidence that this is not only both possible and necessary but is also taking place is identified from the viewpoint that Citizenship Education is potentially radical and empowering, as well as consideration of the arguments and evidence of others.

THEORETICAL INFLUENCES

Throughout these papers I have taken the stance that those who argue that education must be neutral propose an impossible position. When Lenin wrote that “there can be no impartial social science in a society based on class struggle” (1913, p23) he was referring to data collection and analysis not pedagogy; however, education in any society is part of that society’s ideological apparatus and it therefore promulgates a particular world view. While the content of some

curriculum subjects might be portrayed as 'neutral' if one does not delve too deeply into that content – the selection of some 'facts' over others, the ways in which schools are organised, the choice of textbooks, the extent and ways in which teachers are educated and given any autonomy – all are politically influenced. That all pedagogy is inherently political is, to me, self-evident; it is also clearly evident in the data discussed in Leighton (2004, 2013c, 2014).

In addition to investigating a number of state comprehensive schools in various parts of England, my research has been conducted in the independent sector, in a Scottish primary school, within two selective systems in the South of England, and with further insights from Australia, Nigeria and Sweden – so that the data are far more wide-reaching than those derived from studies which concentrate solely on English state schools. I have given teachers (both specialist and non-specialist), student teachers and school students space to voice their understandings, and to shine personal spotlights on the subject and how it feels to experience it from different places. These insights are contextualised with reference to policy documents, other published research, web sites and other electronic sources and they offer a unique insight into the development of citizenship education, providing a series of images which come together to form a mosaic which provides an understanding of what has taken place.

The circumstances and detail of the development of that mosaic have been viewed through a lens shaped by radical education theories as represented particularly (but not exclusively) by Postman and Weingartner (1976) and by a range of Marxist positions. Postman (1970) identified ways in which schools became “a major force for political conservatism” (p83), which shows no signs of dissipating. The introduction of Citizenship Education into the National Curriculum for England – and the particular forms which the content of that curriculum has taken – has been explicitly and profoundly political. As identified above, to adopt a different approach and focus than those proposed in that curriculum is no more or less political. I have been aware of my own politicised views throughout my research and make no apology for them; any researcher who adopts primarily qualitative methods has to recognise their own imprint on their data.

Contestation of the nature and purpose of Citizenship Education, both internationally and in the specific context of England, is evident in much of the current literature. The circumstances and detail of Citizenship Education have consciously been viewed by me through a lens shaped by radical education theories as discussed in the next section. We have seen that it has been argued that the purpose of Citizenship Education in England was to reinforce the status quo, to debilitate and limit

awareness of social inequality and social injustice, while my research indicates that outcomes can be different. It is my belief that state-provided education can and should assess the efficacy and legitimacy of the state, and enable change where these are found to be lacking; a healthy democracy can bear the weight of close and critical scrutiny.

Developing a theoretical context

The starting point for my theoretical position was that the condition of Citizenship – and, therefore, the role of Citizenship Education – has to be about more than understanding how to conform to prevailing values and to carry out basic democratic functions. This stance is in radical contradiction to the positions adopted by many writers on citizenship education; however, it is consistent with at least some of the early justifications of the subject. Indeed, Bernard Crick, who was responsible for the articulation of the ideas that laid the foundation for the National Curriculum for Citizenship Education, consistently emphasised the need for change and not conformity. I view political empowerment within the prevailing system, dominated as it is by the ideology of ownership and inequality (Marx and Engels 1973, Navarro 2007), as inadequate in itself, and that the objective should be an emancipation in which people are freed from the dominant ideology and the apparatus of the current state and enabled to decide for themselves how their society should be organised, a break from false consciousness and from a happy consciousness – the first based on a misunderstanding of the social relations of production and the second typified by a desire for distraction. Marx outlined that position in his Tenth Thesis on Feuerbach where he wrote that “the standpoint of the old materialism is ‘civil’ society: the standpoint of the new is human society, or socialised humanity” (Marx and Engels 1973, p30). My view throughout has been that pedagogy in general, and the pedagogy of Citizenship Education in particular, is a political and moral practice which should expand criticality, expand participation, enable self-determination, and imagine a liberating future. This is explained in particular detail (Leighton 2006, 2012, and 2013b) when I first outline the influence of Postman and Weingartner and again when I later describe my vision for the pedagogy of citizenship education.

Marxism

Marxists who have influenced my approach include Bowles and Gintis (1976), whose ‘Correspondence Theory’ of education as the primary tool of social placement still bears the closest scrutiny, and their central tenet that education exists to operate in the interests of the dominant class still holds true. Marx stated that in order to understand what happens in any society we need to recognize why it happens, what the motives are and what the outcomes will be; this is one

element of what a radical approach to citizenship education demands, as outlined in Leighton (2004). It is the case that, although the National Curriculum for Citizenship goes beyond requiring pupils to gain some understanding of the electoral process and of alternative systems, and comprehending the roles and responsibilities of local and national government, etc. this “is offered within a framework of established order, to encourage more participation in the system rather than to question it.” (Leighton 2004, p169)

Inevitably, workers become answerable to their hierarchical superiors rather than to their customers/clients, as Michels (1949) demonstrated in his ‘Iron Law of Oligarchy’. Civil servants need the approval of permanent secretaries, head teachers need the approval of local authorities and, increasingly, of the CEOs of money-making academy trusts, classroom teachers need the approval of just about everyone. However, consideration of this process viewed through the lens of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony inevitably leads one to conclude that:

‘...television programmes such as Yes, Prime Minister and West Wing; the populist and popular journalism, film-making and books of Michael Moore; news coverage and popular street mythology; all reinforce the perception that the same could be said for capitalist democracy as was often said about state communism – that it is fine in theory but unworkable in practice – although capitalism is more colourful, generally more comfortable, and offers more television channels.’ (Leighton 2006, pp81/2)

The effects of social class on the possibility of educational success have long been demonstrated by sociologists, particularly in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, showing that working class pupils who held working class social attitudes were doomed to educational failure. To succeed in education, it was argued, pupils had to become middle class (Jackson and Marsden 2012). An alternative interpretation arose, that working class boys’ complicity in their educational failure was, in their terms, not failure at all. Their values were not the values of the school, the characteristics they admired were those which teachers abhorred (Willis 2017, Corrigan 1979). With regard to educational engagement and level of success, social class remains the strongest predictor of educational achievement (Perry and Francis 2015, p2), showing a continued lack of understanding of the needs, aspirations, interests and desires of a significant proportion of the population.

With some minority ethnic community pupils tending towards the lower reaches of success criteria tables, this lack of understanding or inclusion of pupils and the communities to which they have

allegiance continues to compound social problems, while it becomes clear that the intersection of class and ethnicity offers a more nuanced picture than when these factors are considered in isolation (Gillborn 2005). Educational capital continues to reside largely in middle class values (Leighton 2010). Applying Lukes' (1974) concept of the 'Three Dimensional View of Power' enabled me to demonstrate that allegedly radical changes to education in England, Acts of 1870, 1944 and 1988 in particular, were in fact far from radical. These Acts brought about considerable and significant changes to the nature and provision of education, but they "were no[t] attacks on disempowerment, inequality, injustice, discrimination or social inequality." (Leighton 2010, p208)

The Marxist writer Raymond Williams is often credited with the statement that "to be truly radical is to make hope possible rather than despair convincing." This position flies in the face of conservative writers such as Oakeshott, doyen of the oxymoronic 'radical right' in the UK. He proclaimed a preference for "the tried to the untried . . . the convenient to the perfect, present laughter to utopian bliss" (Oakeshott, 1962 p162), but this:

' . . . does not appear to consider whose convenience is best served, whose laughter rings out, when processes and objectives remain the tried and established; it is unquestionably in the interests of the older, the white and the more powerful that things do not change, while it is in the interests of now and the future that they do.' (Leighton 2012 p132)

It has been the case throughout my research that a number of Marxist theories address issues surrounding the role education plays in exploitation with particular insight and relevance. Given that social class remains the strongest predictor of educational achievement and that educational capital continues to reside largely in middle class values, one might have expected that to be the case.

Neo-Marxism

One school of thought within Marxism which has been particularly helpful, and to which I allude briefly above, is that represented by Antonio Gramsci and his advocates – particularly in the proposition of hegemony, which was fundamental to the analysis I offer in Leighton (2004). One of the most significant issues identified has been the demonization of the young as politically apathetic, generally emanating from hearsay, gossip and prejudgement rather than any evidence base, and reflecting a dominant discourse in the media explicitly with regard to Citizenship as a school subject. This process has been substantially outlined and critiqued to identify the manipulation of public consciousness whereby an issue is identified and, with it, blame is heaped upon an alleged

subversive minority. The initial problem is then linked to other problems so that further escalation appears inevitable, often in the UK with explanations and prophecies invoking parallels with the perceived decline of social cohesion in the USA – most typically “towards some ‘renegade’ aspects of social misbehaviour and away from the questionable conduct of those who run and manage society” (Leighton 2012, p130). This is then followed by a call for strong action – increased policing powers, more severe sentences, curfews; seeking punishment rather than social cohesion and social well-being, penalties rather than solutions.

My position challenges the Social Contract Theorists’ unifying tenet of accepting the violence of the state in order to be protected from the greater violence which exists without it. I reject the perception that the state is entitled to mould people to its will and argue so in Leighton (2006 and 2012). The essence of functionalist sociology, and of some contemporary political discourse, is that society functions best through integration and uniformity of purpose. The importance of the family unit is often emphasised, a ‘unit’ designed – according to Engels (2004) – to limit social agitation for change and to control the population by producing wage fodder which fears that economic or coercive retribution will be meted out to them should they step out of line. That such an image of a unit, implying conformity of lifestyle and life choice, ignoring many variations in human conduct, desire and endeavour, is argued at length in Leighton (2004), from which I conclude that, in accordance with Althusser’s perception of the overt curriculum within his critique of the Ideological State Apparatus, that:

‘. . . [t]here is, therefore, a growing body of research regarding the marginalization or exclusion from citizenship rights of a range of groups. National Curriculum guidelines emphasize tolerance and acceptance—in themselves possibly patronizing terms—but also implicitly and explicitly support those between, rather than within, the margins.’ (Leighton 2004, p171)

Capitalist hegemony creates an erroneous view of the status quo, leading people to consider their immediate concerns and how to secure their own material comforts and objectives rather than to think, question and act publicly to challenge the sources of their social and economic oppression. The guidelines for all forms of formal education, including Citizenship Education, apply to all categories of school, and it is not expected that any are intended to open people’s eyes to their structural disadvantage. For Gramsci it would not be enough for those who wish for a more democratic or radical – in Postman and Weingartner’s terms ‘subversive’ – education to develop

forms of education which simply gainsaid what others proposed, in this instance to use Citizenship Education as a crude tool for manipulation and propaganda; “[i]t is too easy to be original by doing the opposite of what everyone else is doing; this is just mechanical.” (Gramsci, 1985; p124)

Radical education argues that to enable people to develop clearer insights and more substantial awareness of their potential to achieve social change, programmes of education must have clear strategies, clear content, and clear outcomes. To adopt a position which opposes the status quo simply because it is the status quo is contrarian rather than radical; opposition to any strategy should be based upon the nature and likely or demonstrable impact of that strategy, not merely on its approval by a particular group. Originality, from a radical educational viewpoint, must also be progressive and have benefits for learners and – ultimately – for democratic society. Otherwise it is simply posturing.

Radical Educators

The greatest influence on my initial thinking comes from radical education theorists identified throughout the texts presented here, showing their continued relevance in, for example, Leighton (2006):

‘While schools in twenty first century England are not the same as the schools of 1960s USA, and many changes to structure, content and delivery have taken place in both countries, it is the belief and experience of the author that, in England at least, pupils are still largely expected to be passive recipients of learning about their place in society.’ (p 79)

The perspectives on education they offer share a commitment to challenging taken-for-granted assumptions about the nature of education and share a belief in questioning the status quo. Those writers address young people’s perceptions of their own experiences, and argue with clarity and certainty that old must give way to new if we expect young people to be prepared for a new society.

I came to accept less and question more as I developed professionally, and Postman and Weingartner (particularly in Leighton 2006) joined Marx and Engels among those whom I consider my most significant influences. In the case of both Illich and the founders of Marxism I have the benefit of hindsight to aid my assessment of what went well in their analyses of society, and how these could be even better if more contemporary data were available. None the less, it is Postman and Weingartner (see also Leighton 2013a and 2013b) who continue to energise me with their

scathing analysis of teaching and schooling which is combined, unlike the works of Marx and Engels or of Illich, with a constructive and radical approach to change for the better. They go beyond economy-based criticism and concomitant calls for either revolution or a state of permanent hand-wringing to provide explanations for what has been happening and ways in which things can be improved. And this is achieved with humour, something which caught my attention as a student and which I have striven to use in my teaching. There is no need for education or educators to be straight laced and po-faced, whether radical or otherwise.

To be radical has been presented by politicians – particularly in Prevent legislation – as being simplistic, highly conservative, anti-democratic, reactionary, fundamentalist, orthodox, backward looking, stagnant. This present narrative is not the place to discuss the origins or purpose of such a perception but it is the antithesis of radical education – which is complex, progressive, highly democratic, innovative, exploratory, heterodox, forward looking, fecund. As shown in detail in Leighton (2013a), the two versions of this concept could not be more opposed.

Crap detecting

Postman and Weingartner (1976; pp12-13) considered whether anything could be done to improve/save society, and we can add further problems now to those things which Arthur critiques as “litanies of alarm” (2003, p3). They also argued that society needs “a new education that would set out to cultivate . . . experts in crap detecting” (1976, p16). Teaching is not the art of dissemination of information, and the teaching of Citizenship in particular:

‘. . . involves the cultivation of skills of communication and informed participation, the development of both knowledge and understanding of structures and relationships in society, and how such skills and knowledge can be deployed. In order for young people to understand “what can be” and possibly “what should be”, they need to look at and understand “what is”.’ (Leighton 2006, p82)

Many young people reject party politics while developing interests and opinions on a wide range of political issues. The accusation that the young are largely politically apathetic can depend upon one’s perception of what constitutes political engagement and what criteria are employed to identify and measure it, but it is an assumption unsupported by evidence. This is not only the case in the UK. From the USA we learn that “it is incorrect to say that young people take no interest in the broader world” (Bernstein 2010, p16) while, on a more global scale, Ross and Dooly (2010) report that

“children and young people do implicate themselves in political behaviour . . . in contrast to frequent narratives suggesting that indifference to political issues is commonplace among youth” (p43). They go on to observe that “voting participation has gradually declined over the past thirty years, and informal political activism has risen sharply” (p44), offering data which indicate that “if young people manage to fulfil their own expectations, they will be considerably more active than their parents’ generation on all levels.” (Leighton 2012, p95)

A radical approach to citizenship education demands much more than altering the content or shifting the emphasis in a particular approach to teaching and learning, it is essential that “radical educators should see the resistant actions of youth . . . and engage with them” (Peters and Bulut 2010, p27). Teaching Citizenship Education is an activity in itself, one – from the radical approach – which requires learners’ involvement and movement. As Berg points out, this can be anathema to many teachers as “authoritarians always flinch and stiffen when children even move out of their desks, and when children move faster they see them as potential rioters” (Berg 1972, p 13). One aim of Citizenship Education is to unlock doors and potential. If successful, it is possible that pupils will come to expect the same opportunities and involvement of other subjects and other teachers. There is therefore the possibility that “effective citizenship education teaching and learning upsets the dependency on old teaching notes and lesson plans, it subverts other subjects and other classrooms and learning spaces.” (Leighton 2012 p21)

Schooling

Arthur notes that “few in Britain would consider the school the most important location for character education” (2010, p23) yet schools play a significant part in shaping individuals and the collective. Indeed, modern social thinkers since Durkheim have argued that education is one of the major agents of socialisation and Althusser referred to it as one of the components of the Ideological State Apparatus, while numerous studies have demonstrated the depth of influence which schools can exert.

In predicting some of Postman and Weingartner’s litany, Goodman observed that the future ‘will certainly be more leisurely. If that leisure is not to be completely inane and piggishly affluent, there must be a community and civic culture’ (1975, p 44). In this he is clearly advocating some form of critical awareness and the development of commonly held and demonstrated values. It is in relation to that position that Goodman asks whether “since schooling undertakes to be compulsory, must it

not continually review its claim to be useful?" (1975, p19). The radical theorist must also consider "useful" to whom, and for what purposes, as I highlight in Leighton (2004, 2006, 2012, 2013c).

Johnson points out that the 18th Century radical educators tended to be "secular and rationalist" (1988, p17), concerned to emphasise the relationship between knowledge and power, and proposing that "knowledge was a natural right, an unconditional good" (p18). Essentially, Johnson identifies 'really useful knowledge' as those ideas which relate to our conditions in life, which describes the wrongs done to us, and which tells us how to change our present circumstances. While far from the purpose of England's National Curriculum, such a perception of 'useful' would certainly satisfy Goodman's requirements and those of many other radical education theorists and practitioners.

Crick emphasised the need for change, not conformity. This built on the premise that education has to achieve more than simple social reproduction, and the position I developed can be summarised as advocating the pursuit of human emancipation free from false or happy consciousness. In considering in this narrative the ideas, evidence and insights offered by almost 60 researchers, and by significantly more within the texts which the narrative supports, it has become clear that Citizenship Education is a political and moral practice which should enable criticality, participation, self-determination, and both personal and societal liberation.

Recent influences

Whatever position is adopted regarding the nature and purpose of Citizenship Education, there can be no doubt that to hold the notion of citizen there must simultaneously be a notion of community or collective – somewhere for someone to be a citizen of. This connection was made by Marshall (1949) and developed by Yuval-Davis (1997, 2011) where she recognises – and which brought me to recognise, articulate, and apply – that people are members of many communities simultaneously. In Nielsen and Leighton (2017) we explain the significance of the interrelatedness of communities, the connectivity, to a person's self-identification as a citizen – concepts of class, gender, ethnicity, nationality, sexuality, for example, are all contested and all are categories we fit/experience simultaneously. The interrelationship is highly complex and too often we hear about what one particular group does or does not do as if it was homogenous rather than a highly complex and diffuse collectivity.

At the same time I was also introduced to the work of both Nussbaum and Sen, and their separate but connected and highly perceptive accounts of human capabilities. When there is discussion about character or rights and responsibilities or playing one's part in society, there is an implicit assumption that everyone has equal access to rights and opportunities within a legal framework in a democratic society. Nielsen and Leighton (2017) demonstrate, building on Sen and Nussbaum, that this is often far from true.

By bringing these concepts together, the terms 'formal' and 'real' were developed in Nielsen and Leighton (2017), further discussed in Leighton and Nielsen (2018), and elaborated on in our book to be published in 2020. We propose, and our thematic analysis of data from interviews with 80 young adults confirms, that not only is there a gap between what is legally provided for and what people daily experience, but that many young people are aware of this gap and conduct their lives accordingly – in response to what is really true for them rather than what is officially true. To offer one simple example – statute requires that every pupil in Key Stage 3 and 4 in England should experience teaching and learning which follows the National Curriculum for Citizenship Education. According to Ofsted (2014) provision of Citizenship is piecemeal in English schools, and it is often not provided at all. To draw any conclusions about the effect Citizenship Education has had on learners since its introduction in 2002 is to assume the *formal* to be the case, that the law is upheld and applied, rather than to be aware of the *real* situation identified by Ofsted and a recurring feature in my research since Leighton (2004). Such a misunderstanding can have a significant effect on research questions, research analysis and conclusions, education policy, and myriad other circumstances.

METHODOLOGY

As my research progressed I became increasingly aware of how the paradigm of social justice can give voice to those rendered powerless by the growth of neoliberal societal individualism. As the concepts of intersectionality and human capabilities became significant to me I strove to capture the insights and experiences of individuals and groups at different life stages and different positions within education hierarchies. This was not a substantial change as, from Leighton (2004) onwards, I have interviewed students and teachers – the latter of whom are not necessarily as powerful as might be assumed. The change has been facilitated by thematic analysis [TA], enabling the voices of those interviewed to be more coherently presented.

My diverse and multi-dimensional sampling frame necessitated the application of several research methods, including structured interviews, focus groups, semi-structured interviews, documentary text analysis, questionnaires, case studies and action research. Where possible and appropriate, secondary data such as official statistics and government agency reports were also applied and interpreted, particularly the large body of data which eventually became available through the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (Keating et al, 2010), to provide an indicative context. This range of methods was brought together through thematic analysis [TA] in order to identify patterns within and across my data. Shared meanings are clarified so that common perceptions of respondents become the focus rather than it being on the preconceptions of the researcher. Braun and Clarke's (2012) recommendation of six phases in thematic analysis, while perhaps necessary for the novice psychology researcher, struck me as fussy and overcomplicating an otherwise useful approach. I considered it most important to ensure that themes were identified, defined and clarified for each publication, and was less concerned with the complexities of codification. A key factor in choosing this analytical approach was the explicit recognition of the position of the researcher, that consistency of rationale and position should be clear and recognised, rather than hiding behind some notion of scientific neutrality. As Braun and Clarke point out:

'Like any form of analysis, TA can be done well, and it can be done poorly. Essential for doing good TA are a clear understanding of where the researcher stands . . . , a rationale for making the choices they do, and the consistent application of those choices throughout the analysis (2012, p59)

The studies were intended to identify the development of Citizenship Education in England and whether Citizenship Education has the potential to facilitate social change, and therefore data were analysed thematically with those intentions in mind in order to gain insights into personal experiences and perceptions. The questions asked and the selection of sources cited were inevitably influenced by my own assumptions, identity, and perceptions of whatever has made me who I am. Freire provided the helpful imagery of thick wrappers of multiple 'whys' which attach to any educational entity that, in the choices we make as educators – which are equally applicable in this case to the choices we make as researchers – 'a deed, a gesture, a poem, a painting, a song, a book are always wrapped in thick wrappers. They have been touched by manifold whys' (Freire 2006, p10). I have sought therefore to balance my own influence and 'whys' with the influences and 'whys' of the biographies of those involved in this research as respondents.

While I aspired to reliable studies inasmuch as replication of method and sample could lead to replication of findings, I have not been concerned to achieve numerical or statistical insights: my themes of people's experiences of Citizenship Education, how they have made sense of those experiences, and the differences between experiences and interpretations are much more matters for discussion and empathetic questioning than for statistical analysis. I sought validity, that what I identify, analyse and discuss gives an insight into the development of Citizenship Education in England, the perceptions of teachers and learners with regard to the impact of that development, and whether Citizenship Education has been shown to have any potential to facilitate social change.

Being an insider

A frequently identified theme in the literature is the benefit of 'insider experience' to educational researchers who can understand the concerns of particular cultures. This can be the reality and culture of the classroom, the staff room, the student teacher experience, the 'profession' model, but there is also a danger that insiders might offer a limited criticality because they are too close, and perhaps do not challenge values, perceptions, understanding – not because they do not wish to but because they cannot see that the values or perceptions exist. Having been a qualified teacher since 1981, actively involved in teacher education since 2002, led the largest Citizenship PGCE in England and serving as external examiner on two similar courses and for the DCFS Citizenship Teaching Certificate, I am unquestionably an insider. Pole and Morrison (2003, p25) caution that, for the insider, "a) there is a need to make the familiar unfamiliar; b) it is essential to recognise this particularly when it is the 'familiar' in another setting" (for example, citizenship teacher education provision in another Higher Education Institution). Understanding and sharing the language and some of the experiences and behaviour involved in teaching and in making teachers could result in taken for granted assumptions not being tested, and consensual misconceptions appearing as conclusions.

My experiences above and as a learner, the types of schools where I have taught, my previous role as a GCSE Chief Examiner, my experience in a range of teaching and school management roles: all of these have further influenced my perceptions of 'right' ways to teach and of 'right' ways to teach Citizenship, and the purpose of so doing. They reflect my skills, attitudes, values, and opportunities, as well as my commitment to the subject and to the ethos which I consider integral to it. It is inevitable that who I am has influenced what I have looked at and how it has been seen in much the same way as those who hear or read what I have to say will be influenced by their values.

Schostak (2002) observes that “dialogic research is like adopting multiple vision, accepting the plurality of possible viewpoints, seeking to engage these viewpoints in dialogue, identifying the resistances each has towards the other” (p 48). It was to this end that interviews were semi-structured rather than rigid, allowing respondents to raise issues of importance to them, and focus groups enabled dialogue between respondents to further elicit those things which mattered to them. He adds that, “[d]ialogue (discovers) difference, the truth of the new, the hyperreal of the postmodern age” (Schostak 2002, p 150). It is also through such dialogic analysis and interpretation that contexts developed within which interview data could be unfolded and interpreted, providing insight and understanding into the actions, motives and experiences which comprise my sample’s experiences of Citizenship Education rather than continuing to attempt to glean slithers of data which are then (mis)interpreted from my personal context.

Sampling

The nature of schools and schooling in England is such that no register exists of citizenship teachers and, although networks are developing, membership of these is neither a prerequisite nor an indication of citizenship teaching. As shown (Leighton 2004, 2013a), qualification as a teacher of citizenship is neither a guarantee of, nor a requirement for, teaching that subject. In justifying the lack of a representative sample it must be noted that we cannot know how such a sample might be composed as we do not know its composite parts or their proportions; we do not know whether such a thing exists and, if it does, whether it has any significance. Therefore, to not offer a sample which purported to be representative is honest as well as pragmatic.

It is also important to note that the areas of England from which much of the data were collected are not typical of the rest of the country in their education systems. Several schools were within Local Education Authorities (LEAs) which operate selection at the end of Key Stage 2 based on a series of tests, similar to the 11+ system phased out in most of the rest of England in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Some students and some experienced teachers were therefore at ‘high school’, similar to the secondary modern school of the tripartite system, while a smaller number were at grammar schools. In some studies, comprehensive and independent schools are also included. The influence of academisation should also be noted, that some schools were under local authority control while others, more recently, were not. The different expectations and pressures schools place on their staff and on their pupils were not taken into account but might have had some bearing on the findings; I didn’t investigate that and so cannot offer any informed insight. It might be

that tensions, pressures, perspectives, etc. are the same whatever the status of the school – without expressly investigating such a possibility, this can only remain an assumption.

All of this means that conclusions offered in the texts are not necessarily definitive. Further research – on different themes, for example – might produce different insights. As previously noted, the eight characteristics identified in Leighton (2013a) were originally six; further research might lead to the identification of more citizenship teacher ‘types’ due to a different thematic emphasis or because of changing curricular circumstances. In seeking depth of data rather than frequencies, personal accounts in preference to uniform or pre-determined inquiries, I have gained significant insights into the themes which permeate my research.

DISCUSSION AND NARRATIVE COHERENCE

Radical citizenship education requires that teachers and students leave their comfort zones. Teachers are not accustomed to inviting challenge and many, particularly non-specialists, find some of the more controversial topics difficult to address. Similarly, students have been conditioned throughout their schooling not to question fundamental issues and therefore take time to understand how to question as much as what can be questioned. Boler and Zembylas (2003) write of the requirements of what they wonderfully describe as a ‘pedagogy of discomfort’, one which:

‘ . . . invites not only members of the dominant culture but also members of marginalized cultures to re-examine the hegemonic values inevitably internalized in the process of being exposed to curriculum and media that serve the interests of the ruling class. No one escapes hegemony.’ (p111).

This should serve as a reminder that radical Citizenship Education goes further than encouraging a critique of the state and of others, and must include self-scrutiny and the development of self-awareness. It is such a notion of discomfort which I have married with Postman and Weingartner’s subversive teaching to develop the notion of radical citizenship education. As yet I have not conducted research into the extent to which such an approach teaching can be identified in England’s citizenship classrooms.

There is a need for the informed discussion presented here, one which identifies, clarifies and reflects the arguments put forward by a range of writers who can be considered to fall into the category of ‘radical education’ and those who might be considered opponents or critics of that

position. Following that clarification I focus more specifically on concepts and competing interpretations within Citizenship Education in England since the subject's introduction to the National Curriculum in 2002. With clarity of insight into the nature of radical education and into Citizenship Education in England since 2002, it becomes possible to take what might appear to some to be wholly distinct approaches to education, thesis and antithesis, and to synthesise these in the recognition of 'Radical Citizenship Education'.

Connecting the texts

This section provides an understanding of the historical development of my thinking, and demonstrates stages of that process. The studies provide a clear pathway through the early stages of development of Citizenship Education as a school subject in England up to the present day, but my insight and understanding did not always develop in such a linear fashion. Therefore what follows outlines my texts chronologically while also reflecting on how later understanding has led to a strengthening of insight.

Early findings in a new context

My first published article (Leighton 2004) was one of the earliest published peer-reviewed articles regarding the reality of Citizenship Education provision rather than the inferred, proposed or imagined state of the subject. That early identification of the space between the required National Curriculum provision of Citizenship Education, established as statutory in 2002, and what was happening in schools was highlighted in citation by Faulks (2006) and by Ofsted in its report into the initial state of Citizenship Education in England's schools (Ofsted 2006, p8). At the time I was not aware of the work of either Sen or Nussbaum regarding human capabilities, nor of Yuval-Davis' development of intersectionality; those approaches have become more integral and more explicitly articulated as my research developed so that I now refer to the difference between the *formal* and the *real* (Leighton 2018, Leighton and Nielsen 2018) discussed earlier in this commentary. In that first article, a small study of four schools showed that teachers and students had different views about what was being taught and what was being learned, and that there was a significant difference between those views and the stated National Curriculum requirements. Despite the sample limitations of size and locality, it was possible to identify four quite distinct responses to the Crick Report and to consider these within a Marxist theoretical framework in seeking to explain how such diverse interpretations could all be considered to follow quite specific guidelines. It was concluded that action and interpretation mattered less than that attempts were being made to generate conformity. It had been my intention to follow up this study at regular intervals but

changes in the organisation and management of the schools, and staff mobility, rendered that unworkable, and so I was not able to map specific changes in specific contexts.

Emerging comprehension of collectivities

It was while collecting data for Leighton (2006) and for some conference papers that I found that differences in teacher background and teacher perceptions of the nature of Citizenship Education were amongst the reasons for diversity of structure, interpretation and content of Citizenship Education in schools. Such differences are evidence of the collectivities and intersectional experiences identified by Yuval-Davis and which have come to inform my later research. This gave rise to Leighton (2013b), a more detailed and in-depth analysis of teacher attitudes and their possible sources which identified eight categories (themselves collectivities, although not a term with which I was familiar at the time) – commitment, conversion, co-existence, colonisation, compliance, conflict, convenience and cynicism – also discussed and developed in Leighton (2012, pp23/25) and in Leighton (2013a, pp90-94).

In initially identifying six different groupings of Citizenship Education teacher attitudes it became clear that writing about an homogenous group of ‘teachers of Citizenship Education’ was both misleading and methodologically flawed. Unlike other National Curriculum subjects, Citizenship Education was – at that time – taught mainly by teachers not qualified to teach it either by degree subject or by PGCE specialism. While there is a surface similarity to the introduction of compulsory Computing/ICT in 1988, that subject is now largely taught by teachers with a relevant degree and/or relevant teaching qualification, whereas there are very few degrees in Citizenship and the number of PGCE places allowed by the government has steadily declined. I have shown (2004, 2012, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c) that the subject, where it is presented to pupils, remains one which is often led and taught by non-specialists.

Radical challenge or an acceptance culture?

Much of the discourse around Citizenship Education has been in relation to conformity, character formation and conservative approaches to change (e.g. Lorimer 2008, 2010; Arthur, 2010; Carr, 2010). With regard to the position I adopted in Leighton (2004), the advocacy of emerging insights into education and social justice, I argued that much of the radical/subversive educational rhetoric of the 1960s and ‘70s could instead be realised within the National Curriculum provisions for Citizenship Education. From this a clearer understanding of radical education emerged, one which

placed it not only in an historical context but also political and educational contexts which, I argued (Leighton 2006, 2010), were identifiable in the present day.

Having scrutinised provision of Citizenship Education in state schools, and teachers' attitudes to it, my focus moved on to a particular aspect of initial teacher education provision (Leighton 2011) in response to an Ofsted report (Ofsted 2010). The issue raised by Ofsted related to schools using collapsed timetable days as substitutes for a coherent Citizenship Education programme. Such days had been identified in Leighton (2004) as one unsatisfactory means of providing Citizenship Education deployed by schools when it was the only strategy used, creating an often shallow and cursory examination of a wide range of skills and topics, but potentially very effective when in combination with other strategies. Preparation and presentation of such days featured in the Citizenship PGCE which I led, and it was of considerable importance that the assumed efficacy of this approach be examined in order to ensure that student teachers were being given the best preparation possible in their pre-service course. Interviews with previous students and with school-based mentors affirmed my perception that such days are potentially highly effective, but only when a planned and organised element within a clear and structured programme of Citizenship Education.

The student teacher participants in that study were all subject specialists, as were all but one of the liaison teachers, and all focus days were delivered within a structured programme in each school. There are no findings to suggest that the utility of focus days when conducted by people with such expertise can be compared with those delivered by non-specialists, or that one-off days have the value of planned programmes. (Leighton 2011, p100) Far from contradicting the Ofsted (2010) findings, this research went beyond that report, again encouraging critical engagement with policy and policy-related documents,

Paucity of school provision I

The variety of provision, and lack of any indication of effectiveness, was discussed within a neo-Marxist framework, questioning whether any ruling group within a nation state could be expected to allow its education system to develop critical young people who would hold them and their system to account. The notion of criticality has been one of the central and consistent leitmotifs throughout these studies, proposing that any political society should face sustained questioning and that active citizenship required an informed citizenry. In the early stages of this research it appeared that teacher attitudes to and background in the subject might be highly influential on pupil learning and participation. The Crick Report evokes the impression of Citizenship Education as more than just

another subject, and many commentators have discussed the particular teaching and learning strategies which appear to be most engaging and effective; it was in recognition of the need to clarify this that Leighton (2012) was written, particularly as ‘citizenship education is in danger of becoming just like all other subjects by being constrained by the straightjacket of previous methods, previous expectations and previous outcomes’ (Leighton 2012, P1)

The main focus of Leighton (2012) is ‘why to teach Citizenship Education’, with a subtheme concerning how to ensure it is an integral element of school in accordance with the principle that:

‘. . . [s]chools need to consider how far their ethos, organisation and daily practices are consistent with the aim and purpose of citizenship education and affirm and extend the development of pupils into active citizens.’ (Advisory Group on Citizenship 1998, p36)

The evidence collected in previous studies indicated very clearly that the subject is at its most effective when integrated into the ethos of the school, so that this book was intended to outline and expand upon strategies which are currently effective in a small number of schools in the UK and beyond. It comprised fourteen case studies, several submitted by teachers and other researchers, and includes preschool and primary school as well as the secondary phase. It offers a radical perspective on understanding and providing citizenship education in schools in England, providing examples of approaches and principles which enable the dynamic and critical involvement of young people rather than compelling their passivity and conformity.

It is here that I offer concrete examples of radical approaches to education to demonstrate that citizenship education can become a liberating and empowering force for change. It was intended to encourage readers to think about the nature of the subject and about the experiences of citizenship. It also comprised a call for action, involvement, and excitement in classrooms and other aspects of school experience. Fundamentally I posed the question ‘what is learning and who is it for?’ which has always mattered more to me than ‘can you see this at the back?’ This is part of the radical approach to citizenship education, an approach which encourages thought and action – and a conscious connection between these – above process and passivity, which will enable both the subject and society to develop.

One of the major challenges to be addressed by a radical approach to Citizenship Education is where the teachers will come from who are willing and able to facilitate the necessary changes for learners. Just as children can be taught to be selfish or competitive, Owen argued over a century ago,

“Children, if properly taught, would imbibe life-long instincts of co-operation and charity towards their fellows; but for this they must be given training at an early age.” (quoted in Kolakowski 2005, p160) What constitutes ‘properly’ is the major bone of contention here. Cooperation and charity are not the essentials for survival in a capitalist or post-capitalist society and, as Marx demanded of Owen, we need to ask “who is to educate the educators?” (Kolakowski 2005 p180) My response has been ‘radical educators’, people with a critical eye whose agenda is driven by empowerment rather than by control and imposition; they need not be citizenship experts, but expert teachers.

The text both summarises previously published work and introduces and contextualises insights into the teaching of Citizenship Education on a wider scale, with data from Scotland and Nigeria as well as from further afield within England than the predominantly South East sample used in my earlier published research. By offering examples of highly effective practice, it places the National Curriculum for Citizenship – in its changing forms – in a radical and ‘subversive’ context. It was described by one reviewer as a text which:

‘. . . challenges educators to reconsider commonly held assumptions about teaching and learning citizenship education . . . a call to action, encouraging educators to provide an empowering conception of democratic citizenship to pupils and to peers. By adopting a progressive postmodern approach to teaching citizenship education, critical reflection and transformative action . . . [Leighton] challenges teachers to push pupils to make a difference to themselves and to society.’ (Ragoonaden 2012, pp158/9)

Placebo V Nocebo

The principles regarding democratisation and an ethos of critical involvement discussed in Leighton (2012) are further expanded upon in Leighton (2013b), an article which also offers a response to concerns raised by Gilborn (2006) and which was written at the invitation of the editors at the Autonomous University of Madrid following a paper presented to the CiCEa conference there in 2012. It is in part a summary of the vision proposed in Leighton (2012) and in part a response to Gilborn’s proposal that Citizenship Education is a placebo. Gilborn’s main concern is that Citizenship Education is a placebo, which he describes as akin to a medical procedure of no therapeutic value. However, a placebo is a substance or treatment intended as a comparative for a treatment considered likely to be of value; placebos have been used in clinical trials to provide a control group so that the efficacy or otherwise of a proposed treatment can be evaluated. There is no such comparative with citizenship education so that a more appropriate term is a ‘nocebo’ (Barsky et al,

2002; Hrobjartsson and Gotzsche, 2003), where an intervention has detrimental effects which outweigh any potential benefits. While this is the term Gillborn intends, it remains the case that he is wrong. In the case of Citizenship Education the danger is that a subject ostensibly intended to increase political literacy and participation might, by dint of poor provision and poor teaching, provoke even greater levels of political apathy than those claimed in the Crick Report.

It might be that citizenship education was not intended to have any benefits but was simply introduced to obscure social inequalities or to appear that the state was doing something about them without making any difference – from Gillborn’s Radical Race Theory position, literally a white wash. However, as I argue in this paper, if citizenship education does not bring about improvements it will be falsely considered to be evidence that such improvements cannot be achieved.

Social class matters

Most studies of citizenship education in England have concentrated on state provided secondary education, with a limited number considering primary phase schooling. This is understandable in that the National Curriculum only applies to such schools. Indeed, with the advent of free schools and academisation, it is applicable to fewer and fewer schools annually. Up to this point, published research into Citizenship Education in England had been concerned with the state sector, with Trafford (2006) one of the few contemporary texts to consider the independent sector as anything other than a class-ridden and/or historical anomaly. Independent schools educate only 7% of the school population and are not governed by the National Curriculum, but those educated in that sector are over-represented in Parliament, the judiciary, and a number of other significant occupation groups. It therefore seemed to me to be appropriate to investigate the nature of citizenship education, if any, such people experienced. Leighton (2013c) is the product of scrutinising documentation followed by a series of interviews with staff and students at a girls’ independent school. This study showed levels of political awareness and social conscience comparable to those identified in Keating et al (2010) and that, at least in this independent school, there was an ethos of civic engagement and political awareness. However, a sample of one cannot be taken as indicative of anything more widely.

Provision II

Leighton (2013a) was developed from a conference paper based initially on observations I had made regarding the relative competences of specialist and non-specialist teachers of citizenship as well as an awareness that many of my former students were either not teaching the subject or had left

teaching completely. I scrutinise the varied backgrounds of teachers of citizenship – academic as well as socio-cultural – and the varieties of provision, which had increased since my 2004 article. A typology of ‘8 Cs’ of citizenship teachers was identified and discussed, similar to but not quite as contrived as Caplow’s (1954) description of women’s ghettoised work, outlining the range of needs and attitudes among specialist and non-specialist teachers of citizenship education, and some recommendations offered regarding how these can be approached.

This study showed both qualitative and quantitative differences in the provision and effectiveness of the teaching of Citizenship Education in England, with most teachers of citizenship not being specialists and working outside their comfort zones in regard to both subject knowledge and teaching strategies. While there is an identified need to continue to develop pre- and in-service programmes for teachers of Citizenship Education, there is no indication that this need will ever be reflected in government policy. Since this paper was published there has continued to be a reduction in pre-and in-service support for both specialist and non-specialist teachers of citizenship.

Reference is made in Leighton (2012) to an expansion of previous research (Leighton 2004) regarding teacher attitudes and backgrounds. The aspect of attitude to the subject was revisited and elaborated upon by Leighton (2013a) following a conference paper presented in 2012 and reflecting upon feedback to that paper. Teacher attitude is crucial to the nature of the development of Citizenship Education in that there are categories of teacher where there is little if any commitment to the subject, with the strong implication that it is not therefore planned, resourced and implemented in any rigorous and potentially successful fashion. Democratisation of classrooms and schools, with the aim of developing critical awareness and the skills of analysis and participation, present considerable challenges to any educator; a lack of commitment to these principles will inevitably mean that the opportunity to further them is lost when reluctant non-specialists are required to teach the subject.

Resources

The CiCEa conference which gave rise to Leighton (2013b) also led to collaboration with colleagues from Greece, Mexico, Spain and Sweden to present a symposium on citizenship textbooks to that organisation’s 2013 conference. I developed my contribution to that symposium with further presentations at a staff conference at CCCU and in discussion with my post-graduate students to produce Leighton (2014), based on an analysis of the images in five textbooks aimed at young people (14-16 year olds) taking public examination courses in Citizenship Education in England. With

reference to Fang (1996) and others showing the role of images in motivating pupils and scaffolding their learning, as well as Freire's (2006) notion of the thick wrappers of multiple 'whys' which attach to any educational entity, I argue that images are at least as important as text. Those involved in the symposium had agreed that our focus would primarily be on images relating to gender, class and ethnicity – what those images indicate regarding the 'official' [*formal*] perception and presentation of these socially constructed and defined categories, and the extent to which that perception can be said to be verified or sustained through other [*real*] data. I also considered a fourth category, the 'English citizenship' perception of the foreign – the European Union and the world beyond Europe. Subsequently, TA has led me to understand that these three categories do not delineate the concerns or identities of young people; our thematic parameters should have been more widely set.

While the images presented in the textbooks are analysed to demonstrate the 'English persona' which they imply, that persona is also shown to be emphasised by what is absent from the images. The presence of specific images represents choices made, so that the absence of others can be considered similarly to represent choices; the most significant absence, for me, was of any images which made reference to social class as significant in England today. Such an absence speaks volumes about the gap between England's state directed self-image and the reality of citizenship in England, the gap between *the formal* and *the real* which has become the focus of my more recent research.

Intersectionality and human capacities

Following that symposium, a colleague from Jönköping University in Sweden, Dr Laila Nielsen, and I agreed to take our research further, to speak with teachers and school students of citizenship to uncover their understanding regarding the conditions of citizenship in England and Sweden. The conference papers which eventually became Nielsen and Leighton (2017) were the product of collaboration regarding theory, methodology and organisation, while we each conducted interviews in our own locations. Our discussion was informed by Marshall's (1949) thesis that citizenship in Western industrialized countries may be divided into three forms: Civil, Political, and Social, and by our earlier observations that experiences of young people in Sweden and England were similar but far from identical. The first draft of our joint article was rejected by a leading Scandinavian journal on the basis that, at 9500 words, it was too short to do the subject justice. Encouraged by the journal editors to extend our discussion, *Confero* published the 19,110 word article online in November 2017. On the basis of that article we secured a book contract with PalgraveMacmillan which investigates the *formal* and the *real* historically as well as currently in both England and

Sweden and which will be published in 2020.

It was in the light of issues identified above that I wrote Leighton (2018) with the focus on the relationship, if there was one, between the textbook presentation of being a British Citizen and the perceptions held by teachers and students of citizenship education in England; effectively the second stage of research into school students' perceptions of 'the Citizen'. There was a consistent rejection of the image presented as being particular and unrepresentative, although some students did appear to absorb some of it into their own perceptions despite contrary personal experiences. The homogeneity of responses, across class, ethnicity, gender and professional role was notable. Responses in interviews showed that neither the students nor their teachers subscribed to the message behind the images, and that they had their own disparate versions of the reality of 'the Citizen'.

While in the process of writing our book for PalgraveMacmillan, Dr Nielsen and I have continued to develop and clarify our interpretation of Capability Theory, synthesising the approaches of Sen and of Nussbaum, and of Intersectionality as described by Yuval Davis. When approached to contribute to a book providing examples of research on citizenship education (Pineda-Alfonso et al, 2018) we agreed to concentrate on how we had developed our theoretical position, and its implications for researching citizenship education. Writing explicitly within the paradigm of social justice, we explained our intention to give a voice to those without the resources to deal with responsibilities imposed by a neo-liberal agenda. To clarify real citizenship (rather than formal) we explained the relationship between the concepts of intersectionality and of human capabilities in place of rights, which means that people adhere to numerous simultaneous collectivities and having the capability to do something requires more than an entitlement to it. While everyone might have the right to an education and to a dignified life, many live in powerlessness and in political, social and economic exclusion. We argued that sufficient human capabilities are required in order to receive the education necessary for citizenship in its real meaning, and the intersectional approach enables interrogation of factors which coalesce, rather than viewing in them in isolation.

CONCLUSION

The principle of extending radical traditions to young people in England through citizenship education is embedded in the Crick Report and throughout my work, yet is noticeably absent from any iteration of the National Curriculum. I have consistently emphasised the potential and necessity for radical social change which citizenship education in England presents and I have drawn attention

to radical school practices as well as theoretical discussion. It is abundantly and increasingly clear, as I have shown, that class interests continue to compete and that education is one mechanism by which those with power manipulate those without. To me it follows that a more equitable society will therefore “only be obtained when the people of the world get the world, and retain the world.” (Maclean, 1918) That is not the intention of the National Curriculum for Citizenship, but in Leighton (2006, 2012 and 2013b), I show that the original intention need not be a barrier to imaginative and empowering teaching and learning.

The stated aim of the Crick Report was to change England’s political culture through the provision of the teaching of citizenship and democracy in schools. That there is no clear evidence of such change might be attributable to a failure of Citizenship Education although the limited extent and haphazard quality of subject provision in English secondary schools in the past 17 years makes such a conclusion unreliable. Recent events such as school student strikes and the growth of the Extinction Rebellion movement, both of which draw attention to climate emergency, might be evidence of such change, but probably not. The prime mover, Greta Thunberg, will have experienced the Swedish curricular provision while the main UK exemplar is Holly Gillibrand, a Scot who might not have had any formal citizenship education at all. The furore over the UK’s relationship with the EU since the referendum in 2016 could also be regarded as an increased awareness of and concern for democratic processes; whether such awareness is due to Citizenship Education is a moot point.

The provision of Citizenship Education in England is far from universally radical yet there are many examples of constructive, effective, ‘subversive’ radical citizenship education which at least address the aims and expectations laid down by Crick – aims not replicated in the National Curriculum. My submitted texts collectively identify developments in Citizenship Education in England, the perceptions of teachers and learners with regard to the impact of those developments, and discuss the extent to which Citizenship Education has the potential to facilitate social change. The counter suggestion, that Citizenship Education in England exists to minimise awareness of inequality and injustice, is refuted. By considering the contexts of learning outlined by radical educators and by reflecting upon the gap between the *formal* and the *real*, it becomes clear that recent and current young citizens are becoming more questioning and less acquiescent. Even if the original intentions behind cross-party support for the introduction of Citizenship Education were to manage and minimise public discontent, that has clearly not been the outcome.

Boler and Zembylas’ pedagogy of discomfort can be married to Postman and Weingartner’s subversive teaching in order to develop radical citizenship education so that we all re-examine

inevitably internalized hegemonic values. Simply having a different curriculum is not enough. That difference has to be considered, and the pedagogy to accompany it must be appropriate. That the pedagogy of Citizenship Education is a political and moral practice intended to expand criticality, expand participation, enable self-determination, and imagine a liberating future complies with the aims and aspirations of the Crick Report. To paraphrase several writers cited in this submission and in the body of work to which it refers, all education is political; the radical approach to Citizenship Education is just, perhaps, more open about this. One either accepts or rejects the notion that politicians should be accountable, that people should be able and enabled to take decision makers to task, that those decision makers are the servants of the people; either citizens should be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the political system and its institutions or they should not. To accept or to reject those propositions is to take a political stance.

As my understanding of intersectionality developed I became even more convinced that the qualitative approach was the correct one for these studies. When the National Foundation for Educational Research conducted such a large-scale longitudinal study (CELS), various collectivities were identified and discussed but their interconnectedness was not. My work has developed through thematic analysis to indicate significant differences in school students' attitudes to both the subject and the nature of 'the citizen', that young people are highly sceptical of institutions and the people who run them rather than apathetic or ignorant. From my first published article (Leighton, 2004) up to my most recent collaboration (Leighton and Nielsen, 2018), two contrasting experiences have manifested themselves: *formal* citizenship and *real* citizenship. While the state and its National Curriculum directs teaching and learning towards the *formal*, it is the case that this clashes with the *realities* experienced daily by teachers and students in the independent sector, in primary school, in selective and comprehensive systems in England and further afield. My data are far-reaching and derived from teachers, student teachers, school students, policy documents, other published research, web sites and other electronic sources. They offer a unique insight into the development of citizenship education in England.

I stated at the outset of this narrative that the central tenet of my submission is that Citizenship Education presents an opportunity to enable and empower current and future generations to be more questioning and less acquiescent. The papers presented and discussed clearly show that, despite the continually diluted National Curriculum and the lack of appropriate provision in many schools, radical citizenship education is not only a theoretical possibility but is – in pockets – slowly becoming a reality. In accordance with the quotation from Williams cited above, it is practicable and

realistic to aim for citizenship education to be truly radical in that it can and often does make hope possible, now and for the future.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Advisory Group [The Crick Report] (1998) *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools: The Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship* London: QCA

Arthur, J. (2003) *Education with Character: The Moral Economy of Schooling* London: RoutledgeFarmer

Arthur, J. (2008) 'Traditional Approaches to Character Education in Britain and America' in LP Nucci, T Krettenauer, and D Narváez, (eds.) *Handbook of moral and character education*. London: Routledge. Pp80-98

Australian Government (2019) *Life in Australia – Australian Values and Principles* https://immi.homeaffairs.gov.au/support-subsite/files/life-in-australia/lia_english_full.pdf accessed 2/5/19

Barsky, A. J., Saintford, R., Rogers, M. P., and Borus, J. F. (2002). 'Nonspecific Medication Side Effects and the Nocebo Phenomenon'. *Journal of The American Medical Association*, 287[5] pp. 622-627.

Berg, L. (1972) *Risinghill: Death of a comprehensive* London: Pelican

Bernstein, J. L. (2010). 'Citizenship-Oriented Approaches to the American Government Course' in M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek & J. L. Bernstein (Eds.), *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp.13-35

Boler, M., and Zembylas, M (2003) 'Discomforting Truths: The Emotional Terrain of Understanding Difference' in P Trifonas [ed] (2003). *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change*. Oxford: Psychology Press. pp107-130

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H., (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., (2012). 'Thematic analysis,' in H. Cooper (ed) *Handbook of research methods in psychology* Washington DC: APA books pp57-71.

Caplow, T. (1954) *The Sociology of Work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS): (2008) *Sixth Annual Report. Young People's Civic Participation In and Beyond School: Attitudes, Intentions and Influences* (DCSF Research Report 052). London: DCSF

Corrigan, P. (1979). *Schooling the smash street kids*. London: Macmillan International Higher Education.

De Coster, I., Borodankova, O, De Almeida Coutinho, A.S.and Paolini, G. (2012) *Citizenship Education in Europe Education* Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, European Commission

- Department for Education (2014) *Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools: Departmental advice for maintained schools* London: HMSO
- Engels, F. (2004) *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* Resistance Books: Chippendale, Australia
- Fang, Z. (1996), 'Illustrations, text, and the child reader: what are pictures in children's storybooks for?' *Reading Horizons*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 130-42.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Bloomsbury
- Gillborn, D. (2005). 'Education policy as an act of white supremacy: Whiteness, critical race theory and education reform'. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20[4], pp.485-505.
- Gillborn, D. (2006). 'Citizenship Education as placebo: "Standards", institutional racism and education policy Education'. *Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1(1) pp83-104.
- Goodman, P. (1975). *Compulsory Miseducation*. Middlesex: Penguin.
- Gove, M. (2005) Speech: Rescuing broken lives
<https://press.conservatives.com/post/130939910550/michael-gove-speech-rescuing-broken-lives>
 accessed 4/11/2019
- Gov.uk (2019) *Stop and search* <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/crime-justice-and-the-law/policing/stop-and-search/latest#by-ethnicity> Accessed 4/11/2019
- Gramsci, A. (1957) 'The formation of intellectuals', in: A.Gramsci (ed.) *The Modern Prince and Other Writings*, London: Lawrence and Wishart. pp. 118–125
- Gramsci, A. (1985) *Selections from Cultural Writings*. London: Lawrence and Wishart
- Illich, I. (1971) *Deschooling Society* Middlesex: Penguin
- Jackson, B. and Marsden, D. (2012). *Education and the Working Class* London: Routledge.
- Johnson, R. (1988) 'Really Useful Knowledge 1790 – 1850', in M. Thorpe, R. Edwards, A. Hanson (eds) (1993) *Culture and Processes of Adult Learning* London: Routledge pp17-29
- Hrobjartsson, A., & Gotzsche, P. (2003). 'Placebo treatment versus no treatment'. *Cochrane Database Systematic Review* 2003(1): <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/> accessed 18/12/ 2012
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Bento, T., Mundy E., & Lope, J. (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)*. Research Report DFE-RR059. London: DfE.
- Kenway, J., Willis, S., Blackmore, J. and Rennie, L (1994) 'Making 'Hope Practical' Rather than 'Despair Convincing': feminist post-structuralism, gender reform and educational change', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15[2] pp187-210
- Kołakowski, L. (2005) *Main currents of Marxism: the founders, the golden age, the breakdown*. New York: WW Norton & Company

Larkin, C. (2001). *Citizenship Education or Crowd Control? The Crick Report and the Role of Peace Education and Conflict Resolution in the New Citizenship Curriculum*. Bradford, Centre for Conflict Resolution, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford. CCR Working Papers: No. 9

Lenin, V. I. (1913) 'The Three Sources and the Three Component Parts of Marxism' in K. Marx and F. Engels, F (1973) *Selected works* London: Laurence & Wishart pp23-27

Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View* London: Macmillan

Maclean, J. (1918) Speech from the dock
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/maclean/works/1918-dock.htm> accessed 21/7/19

Marshall, T.H. (1949) 'Citizenship and Social Class' in C. Pierson and F.G. Castles (2006) *The Welfare State Reader* Cambridge: Polity

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1973) *Selected Works* London: Lawrence & Wishart

McCully, A. and Clarke, L. (2016) 'A place for fundamental (British) values in teacher education in Northern Ireland?' *Journal of Education for Teaching* 42[3] pp354-368

Michels, R. (1949). *Political Parties*. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Navarro, V., (2007). 'Neoliberalism as a class ideology; or, the political causes of the growth of inequalities'. *International Journal of Health Services*, 37[1], pp.47-62.

Nussbaum, M.C., (2001). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach* (Vol. 3). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oakeshott, M., 1962. *Rationalism and other essays*. London: Methuen

Ofsted (2006) *Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools* London: Ofsted

Ofsted (2010) *Citizenship Established? Citizenship in schools 2006/9* Manchester: Ofsted

Ofsted (2014) *Citizenship consolidated? A survey of citizenship in schools* Manchester:

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2001) 'Citizenship Education and National Identities in France and England' *Oxford Review of Education* 27[2] pp287-305

Perry, E. and Francis, B. (2015) *The Social Class Gap for Educational Achievement: a review of the literature* London: RSA

Peters, M. A., & Bulut, E. (2010). 'Education and Culture'. In J. Arthur & I. Davies (Eds.), *The Routledge Educational Studies Textbook*. London: Routledge. pp. 19-29

Pole, C. & Morrison, M. (2003) *Ethnography for Education* Maidenhead: Open University Press

Postman, N., (1970) 'The politics of reading' in N. Keddie (ed) (1978) *Tinker, Tailor . . . the myth of cultural deprivation* London: Penguin

Postman, N. and Weingartner, C. (1976) *Teaching as a Subversive Activity* London: Penguin

Ross, A., & Dooly, M. (2010). 'Young People's intentions about their political activity'. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 6(2), 43-60,

- Schostak, J. F. (2002) *Understanding, Designing and Conducting Qualitative Research in Education: Framing the Project* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G. and Friedman, T, (2018). *Becoming citizens in a changing world: IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 international Report*. New York: Springer.
- Scottish Government (2011) *Curriculum for excellence: building the curriculum 5* <https://www2.gov.scot/Publications/2011/02/16145741/7> accessed 4/11/2019
- Sen, A., (1999). *Development as freedom*, New York: Knopff
- Willis, P. (2017). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. London: Routledge.
- Yuval-Davis, N (1997) 'Women, Citizenship and Difference' in *Feminist Review* No 57, pp. 4-27.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2011) *The politics of belonging, Intersectional contestations*, London: Sage

Leighton, R. (2004) 'The Nature of Citizenship Education provision: an initial study.' *The Curriculum Journal* 15[2], pp167-184

ABSTRACT

While compulsory citizenship education has apparently been accepted and, in some quarters, regarded as overdue, in schools there has been little opportunity to discuss the meaning of 'citizenship'. This article reports an initial study of four schools, with a focus on one of them. From this study it was evident that teachers and students have different views about what they are offering and being offered. Some implications of the spaces between these differences are aired in the conclusion of the article.

KEYWORDS: citizenship; teacher attitudes; curriculum models

INTRODUCTION

This article represents the first steps in what is intended to be a study which will reflect upon and evaluate compulsory citizenship education within compulsory secondary education. The introduction of citizenship as a compulsory subject within the National Curriculum for schools in England since August/September 2002 has had several implications for teaching. The perception consistent throughout all the new examination specifications—GCSE short courses, GCSE full course and AS course—and in the support materials disseminated by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), is that, as The Advisory Group put it,

Citizenship is more than a statutory subject. If taught well and tailored to local needs, its skills and values will enhance democratic life for us all, both rights and responsibilities, beginning in school and radiating out" (QCA, 2001a, p. 3).

The proclaimed principle behind the introduction of compulsory citizenship education is to create greater awareness of, and participation in, democratic institutions and processes in the UK, and to engender an inclusive society.

The comparatively low level (for the UK) of participation in the June 2001 General Election¹ can be seen as evidence of the need for some sort of education in the rights, opportunities and responsibilities of citizenship. The widespread unrest in Europe and elsewhere over the USA/UK 'war

¹ The 2001 General Election turnout was the lowest ever recorded, 59.4%. By 2019 it had reached 67.3% <http://www.ukpolitical.info/Turnout45.htm>

against terrorism', and attitudes and behaviour towards people seeking asylum or displaced for other reasons, also suggests to many that this is an urgent, and not exclusively British, matter. It might be that enabling people to understand how social and political structures operate will lead to their effective participation in such structures. Equally, however, it is possible that people have a perception that these structures are not relevant or appropriate to them and they therefore seek alternative social and political strategies which range from nonparticipation to conflict with the ideological and repressive apparatus of the state.

Of concern to me is the apparent dearth of theoretical discussion at a school level about the meaning and nature of citizenship. According to Cleaver et al (2003) senior management have consulted with staff over the planned introduction of citizenship delivery in only 29 per cent of schools. Many teachers are being expected to deliver a subject in which they have had little or no specialist training, and with no immediate prospect of Continued Professional Development Support (CPD) to redress this. While some training institutions offer support and training in citizenship education, and many other agencies can provide insight and resources, schools' very stretched training budgets appear more likely to concentrate on Key Stage 3 strategy initiatives in core subjects. Although citizenship is much more of a 'shortage subject' than any other, with only 300 trained teachers by the summer of 2003 (Davies, 2003), applicants for places are not offered the addition to the training allowance which other shortage subjects attract. Citizenship education appears to be understood by many outside classrooms and staffrooms as a fact or a skill, rather than as a concept, a process or an ideological artefact. This implicit perception underpins QCA guidelines, the deliberations of GCSE subject guidance groups and is evident in the comments of teachers in the study reported in this article.

Clichés have abounded regarding 'bolt on', 'ideas not set in concrete', 'holistic education', 'needs identification' and so forth, yet all carrying with them the assumption for many, both within and outside compulsory education, that citizenship education constitutes 'a good thing' in the sense in which that phrase was used by Yeatman and Sellar (1970). The 'good thing' philosophy continued with Estelle Morris who, when Secretary of State for Education, suggested that sixth formers should have graduation ceremonies and certificates to celebrate achievement because it would "inspire and motivate all young people" (quoted in Born, 2002). This was at the same time as announcing that modern foreign languages need not be studied beyond the age of 14—a decision rather at odds with the citizenship programme of study recommended at Key Stage 3 (11–14 year olds) which includes references to 'local-to-global', 'human rights' and 'debating a global issue' (QCA, 2001b, p. 6).

Citizenship is implicitly international but, presumably, all other nations will speak/act/think in English.

It is my intention to offer some discussion of theoretical interpretations of ‘citizenship’ — without playing the ‘citizen or subject’ semantics game — and then to examine some of the approaches to citizenship education currently in place in four schools in the south-east of England, with particular emphasis on one of those schools. Finally, by bringing together these two elements of the article, I hope to identify encouraging developments and aspects about which there might be some concerns. As I identify at the outset of this article, it is the first step in what I intend will be a study over several years, aiming to evaluate citizenship education in secondary education.

SOME THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

Theories of the nature of citizenship have featured in philosophy since the time of Aristotle and Plato, but often with very different meanings to those we might apply now.

For Aristotle citizenship was the privileged status of the ruling group in the city-state. In the modern democratic state [it] is the capacity to participate in the exercise of political power through the electoral process (Barbalet, 1988, p. 2).

We do not usually now consider citizenship to be a status to be conferred only on the high ranking and powerful, but to be a democratizing and inclusive condition. The perception now more commonly held than Aristotle’s might be attributed to the tradition of writers such as Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. Turner (1997) states that Hobbes (1688) believed the necessity for an imposed social order came about because,

in order to protect themselves from mutual, endless slaughter, [people] create a state through a social contract, which organizes social space in the collective interests of rational but antagonistic human beings. [Therefore] the state is both a guarantor of social security and an instrument necessarily of violence (Turner, 1997, p. 567).

From this perspective, citizenship is membership of that state, conferred on those who accept the security and violence as protection from insecurity and greater violence —ameliorating those experiences which Hobbes (1688) famously described as making life “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short” (part I, chap. 13, p. 186).

Any useful sociological discussion on the nature of being a citizen, i.e. the experiences of being part of civil society, must of necessity include some reference to the ideas of Marx. In order to

understand what happens, Marxism tells us we need to recognize why it happens, what the motives are and what the outcomes will be. As Barbalet states, Marx

insists that mere political emancipation in citizenship is inadequate and instead advocates a general human emancipation in which persons are freed from the determining power of private property and its associated institutions (Barbalet, 1988, p. 3).

While the guidelines for citizenship do indeed go beyond encouraging an understanding of the electoral process and considering alternative systems, clarifying the role of local and national government, etc., it is offered within a framework of established order, to encourage more participation in the system rather than to question it.

Marx proposed in 1846 that, if you “assume a particular civil society . . . you will get particular political conditions” (Marx and Engels, 1973, p. 660) and wrote in 1852 that the machinery of state maintains the material interests of the bourgeoisie by “find[ing] posts for its surplus population and makes up in the form of state salaries for what it cannot pocket in the form of profit, interest, rents and honorariums” (p. 128). He stated in 1845, within his Tenth Thesis on Feuerbach, that “the standpoint of the old materialism is ‘civil’ society: the standpoint of the new is human society, or socialized humanity” (p. 30) before, more famously in the eleventh and last of these theses, denouncing philosophers for only interpreting the world when the point is to change it.

It may be unlikely that a ‘New Labour’ government would actively encourage the dissemination of Marxism, but some discussion or questioning of the status quo and alternative interpretations of events does not seem an outrageous proposition, particularly when students are required to develop “a growing emphasis on critical awareness and evaluation” (QCA, 1999, p. 15). That students are not expected to consider ideas such as those above, or views from any other radical perspective, ignores their ability to be critically perceptive and prevents them from developing this skill in a structured and informed way. In Marxist terms, citizenship education is about inclusion on the terms of the state, the perpetuation of the civil society which replicates bourgeois relationships rather than a humanized and inclusive social order. The National Curriculum for citizenship (QCA, 1999) appears to propose exactly that.

Barbalet (1988) follows Marshall’s (1973) approach in presenting citizenship as a condition relating to social, political and economic provision and integration. Parsons (1965) saw integration as a significant function of formal education, arguing that a range of norms and values had to be transmitted—particularly to immigrant populations — to facilitate social cohesion and consensus, an

attitude which is perhaps reflected in the comments by David Blunkett² regarding oaths of allegiance, competence in written English and interference with the traditions of marriage for some sections of the population. Parsons was aware that movement towards integration was as likely to be motivated by a need to have an appropriate workforce as for any moral or altruistic ideals; Blunkett's approach appears more about uniformity than integration. His views are particularly significant as he was the Secretary of State for Education who established the desirability of citizenship education, the Key Stage 3 guidelines which identify as particularly important issues such as human rights and the diversity of British society.

Park's (1952) 'immigrant/host' model, within the traditions of the Chicago School, identified immigrants entering as strangers as the major stumbling block to their integration and success without, as Banton (1987) argues, adequately discussing hostility and racism within the established population, and without discussing whether integration was a desirable goal—particularly as integration might mean cultural annihilation. Banton and Harwood point out that the hostility or racism of the established communities does not derive from their insecurity or lack of information regarding newly arriving groups, but from disinformation produced by political forces in society. "Race is based on a delusion as popular ideas . . . are moulded by political pressures rather than by evidence from biology" (Banton and Harwood, quoted in Richardson and Lambert, 1991, p. 8). While the guidelines on citizenship clearly encourage multicultural, tolerant, liberal approaches to ethnic diversity, students are more likely to be exposed daily to the attitudes and pronouncements of such various figures as David Blunkett, Robert Park, Alf Garnett³ and media moguls (a culturally loaded concept, both in meaning and spelling) than they are to the details of the QCA guidelines.

Ethnicity is not the only aspect of social existence where there might be identifiable anomalies and contradictions on the concept and reality of citizenship. In recent years, a number of papers in the journal *Sociology* have raised and discussed a range of other issues explicitly in relation to inclusive/exclusive citizenship; for example, issues of sexuality (Richardson, 1998) and regional identity (Bechhofer et al, 1999; McCrone & Kiely, 2000). 'The importance of the family' is a recurring theme in personal, social and health education (PSHE) and in at least one citizenship GCSE specification, presented in ways which—at best—ignore the possibilities of homosexuality and

² Blunkett was Labour Secretary of State for Education 1997-2001. He commissioned The Crick Report which established Citizenship Education in the National Curriculum for England, with its emphasis on human rights and the diversity of British society. He went on to become Home Secretary, one of the four senior executive positions in the UK parliament.

³ The central character in a very popular series of British television situation comedies, running from 1965 until 1998, Garnett was noted for his xenophobia, racism, sexism, and generally reactionary opinions.

stable relationships being compatible. Even celibacy, which is presumably not objected to by those who claim to be the moral guardians of the young, does not get a mention. Anglocentricity, Britishness and Eurocentricity abound in the language of National Curriculum guidelines, with their emphasis on modern European languages and UK/US history, as well as in the work of commentators such as Barbalet (1988) who uses 'British' and 'English' as synonyms. Class and employment status have also been considered by an extensive range of writers and researchers. There is, therefore, a growing body of research regarding the marginalization or exclusion from citizenship rights of a range of groups. National Curriculum guidelines emphasize tolerance and acceptance — in themselves possibly patronizing terms—but also implicitly and explicitly support those between, rather than within, the margins.

Some of the issues of the hidden curriculum as raised by Bowles and Gintis (1976), among others, need to be reconsidered in the light of citizenship education. The citizenship orders (QCA, 1999, pp. 14–15) require that students are introduced to concepts of democracy and avenues of access to power, social integration and cooperation, collective responsibility and equal opportunities. They should be given opportunities to explore their own and other cultures, across class as well as across national boundaries, as well as looking at gender, sexuality, ethnicity and other aspects of human experiences.

On the face of it, such developments are a far cry from the application of authority and control in order to produce a subservient and acquiescent workforce—but are they? Students will still not have choice in what they study, or be rewarded for nonconformity in this subject, just as choice and reward are denied them elsewhere. Citizenship is designed to encourage participation in the system, not to question or challenge it. One should also remember that Bowles and Gintis conducted their research in the USA over thirty years ago, where subjects comparable to citizenship had already been present on the school curriculum for some time. Since their classic text first appeared, little of real significance has changed. It could therefore be argued that the true motive behind the introduction of citizenship rather closely resembles that of the 1867 and 1870 Education Acts, when access to education was introduced for (some of) the masses so that workers could be trained in the skills and attitudes industrialization demanded, and be led to think and act as society's leaders wished. At a time of industrial expansion and political reform, Lowe famously commented on the 1867 Education Bill by saying "we must educate our masters" (Jarman, 1966, p. 264). (Those who are aware of the stereotypical civil servant in BBC television's 'Yes, Prime Minister!' or of Bertie

Wooster's manservant Jeeves in P. G. Wodehouse's novels, will recognize the irony of 'masters' in this context.)

Gane states that "all political action is ultimately sanctioned by the exercise of power" (1997, p. 550) — a position I regard as self-evident. The whole idea of a National Curriculum, and the fact that the independent sector was not bound to it by the 1988 Education Reform Act, was an exercise of power for the achievement of political ends. The continual reshuffling of core and foundation subjects, grant maintained schools and local management of schools, city technology colleges and specialist school status—and other reforms, major and minor—all represent the political consideration of schooling and of schools. Lawton argues that the 1944 Education Act moved schools away from elitist to egalitarian principles, from

two distinct types of curricula . . . which hardly ever overlapped or even came close to each other. [These were] the public school/grammar school tradition of education for leadership, which gave rise to a curriculum for "Christian gentlemen" who would become the leaders of society [as opposed to] elementary schools designed to produce . . . a competent factory labour force (Lawton, 1975, p. 1).

The imposition of a National Curriculum in 1988 could therefore be interpreted as a return to the pre-1944 experience of social division and social engineering,⁴ and the recent introduction of literacy, numeracy and citizenship guidelines throughout all stages of compulsory education could therefore be interpreted as a return to egalitarianism. Or can it?

The state might expect one reaction to legislation, but get another, for example, the introduction of the community charge ('poll tax') in the 1980s. In the same way, students might experience lessons in citizenship but it does not follow that they will necessarily become 'good citizens'. Our own observations tell us that teachers might have their motives for 'delivering' education but their students can have widely different reasons for receiving it, widely different perceptions of what they have received and widely different applications for what they have received. Teaching poetry does not make people into poets even if it might equip them with some understanding. Teaching people to read and write does not mean that they will read and write well; in the context of citizenship it should perhaps be borne in mind that we cannot control what they will read and write or how they will understand what they have read. Those who read and write racist and/or sexist material, the

⁴ 'Social engineering' is a term often associated with the New Right condemnation of movement towards removing barriers and disadvantage, but which might equally be used to describe deliberate attempts by an elite to ensure that their privileged social positions are protected by the imposition of false barriers and creating social disadvantage.

tabloid press, Mills & Boon novels, The Beano, Viz., teen magazines, computer program instruction manuals have probably all been taught by someone with a great love of Shakespeare, Milton, Austen or one or more Brontë. It follows that there is a considerable difference between teaching about citizenship, teaching people to become good citizens, enabling young people to become active citizens, and developing and maintaining a society in which everyone wants to play a part and has the opportunity to do so.

DATA, PERCEPTIONS AND DISCUSSION

The four schools in this study are not representative of the range of schools and school students throughout the country. I did not wish to take account at this stage of the issues of social exclusion, underclass, large-scale alienation and anomie that might be found among some students and in some communities. Instead, I have kept the variables as limited as possible regarding type and organization of school. As a starting point I wanted to identify how some secondary schools are approaching the introduction of citizenship education, in the belief that the programme will inevitably fail if schools do not show commitment. Such commitment is not a guarantee of success, but it is a start. Data have been collected from interviews with senior staff responsible for the monitoring of citizenship in each school, as well as from those with 'head of subject' (or equivalent) status in schools A and B. The eight staff teaching citizenship in school A were also interviewed, as were thirty students at school A and six students at school C. Further information was gathered from schemes of work, lesson plans and supporting material made available by school A.

Each school comprises a student body that is predominantly white and predominantly middle class. They are oversubscribed, relatively successful academically, have had positive OFSTED reports, are local authority schools in the south-east of England and have largely supportive relationships with parents. Each in its own way could be described as 'a good school'.

School A is a girls' grammar school with some boys in the sixth form and over 50 per cent A*/A at GCSE and A/B at A level in 2001, 2002 and 2003; the students' average A level score exceeded 300 in each year. As this is an initial study, I currently have more data on one school — school A — than on the others, an imbalance which will be redressed as the study continues. School B is a voluntary-aided boys' comprehensive school, averaging just under 200 points. School C is a mixed grammar school averaging 235 points while school D, another girls' grammar school, averaged 217.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CITIZENSHIP

There are similarities between three of the four schools in that A, B and C have combined citizenship with PSHE to create a post of specific responsibility. This fits with the DfES (2002) perception where citizenship is included in a list of main topic areas for PSHE. In schools A and B the post-holders are teachers of history, both of whom also have experience in teaching politics, and in school C a teacher of religious studies (RS). None of these staff were recruited as specialists in citizenship or in PSHE, but were appointed internally; the post-holders in schools A and B both perceive their appointments as a form of promotion for retention, although their commitment and interest in citizenship is personally emphasized by both.

School D has not awarded a responsibility point but, instead, the role of citizenship co-ordinator has become one of the responsibilities of a deputy head teacher whose subject specialism is English. Her role in relation to citizenship, and her strategies for introducing and implementing policies, are inevitably different from those available to and employed by the other teachers in this study.

TIMETABLE PROVISION

School A has a two-week timetable of fifty lessons, each lasting one hour, with one lesson each fortnight for citizenship throughout Key Stage 3 and the same planned for Key Stage 4 from September 2002. There is also a 'rolling programme' of PSHE, again fortnightly, in which a different timetabled lesson is replaced by PSHE activities in forms, e.g. Friday period 1 PSHE, two weeks later Friday period 2, two weeks later Friday period 3 and so on. Some citizenship work is integrated into the PSHE programme. It is likely that this school will follow a public examination course at Key Stage 4, probably entering students for a GCSE in social science—QCA validated as a citizenship course and qualification.

The other schools operate on more traditional one-week timetables with periods of varying length but still providing twenty-five hours each week of timetabled lessons. They also have PSHE programmes, although varying in nature and composition. None of these schools currently plans to enter students for public examinations in citizenship.

School B has a similar approach to PSHE as school A, with a greater emphasis on the delivery of citizenship in this way. As a church school there is more concern with the ethical and spiritual elements of both PSHE and citizenship, as well as greater RS provision than in any of the other schools in the sample. There are some outside speakers involved in addressing groups of students —

in years and in subject groups — on related issues. The teacher responsible is also in the process of supporting other staff in identifying where their subjects already provide citizenship content.

In school C citizenship is not provided as a discrete subject but integrated into the currently taught curriculum. A series of day events for which the timetable is suspended have been planned, in which it is intended that a variety of speakers and activities will enable students to address and consider relevant issues. Elements of citizenship are again integrated into a PSHE programme, delivered by form teachers from the full range of subjects offered by the school.

School D approaches citizenship as an integrated subject. The deputy head teacher responsible expressed relief that the original proposal in the Crick Report (QCA, 1999), for citizenship to be a specific and discrete subject, has not become a directive as she felt there was neither the curriculum time nor staff enthusiasm required to be able to do this effectively. This school's approach is to identify where citizenship topics arise within the curriculum already taught, and they will co-ordinate this so that there is little duplication.

PERCEIVED STAFF ATTITUDES TO CITIZENSHIP AS A SUBJECT

Key staff interviewed at schools A, B and C identify varying degrees of enthusiasm for citizenship among their colleagues. It was suggested that some staff perceive a threat to their own subjects while they, and others, lack confidence in their abilities to deliver appropriate subject content; these concerns are reflected in the approaches of schools B and C. Although these concerns are also present in school A, that school has a long tradition of teaching social science subjects (sociology at GCSE, sociology, politics and psychology at AS and A2). It was suggested to me that staff in this school see citizenship as an extension of these subjects and look to colleagues from these areas to provide input and to support other colleagues in delivery. Staff are also concerned about the pressure under which many students work to achieve their high examination success, and the tendency towards becoming an 'examination factory'. These staff see citizenship as supporting the development of a more complete and rounded understanding of society for students, as well as developing skills beneficial to them as students and as citizens.

There is therefore some staff opposition to examination entry for citizenship. At the same time, there is anecdotal evidence that the student body is so imbued with an achievement ethic that, for many (students, parents and staff), no examination equals no importance. For some staff, examinations are necessary to legitimize the subject. There are also several staff who see 'both

sides'. It seems that it is perceived as 'easier' to keep to the examination philosophy than to develop an attitude supporting the importance of learning/understanding 'because it is useful' to the individual and their neighbours and society at large.

Citizenship has not yet been formally introduced in school D, although departments are currently 'auditing' their schemes of work. There has been some staff resistance and/or resignation but little enthusiasm. Some are identified as seeing it as 'yet another "great" idea from on high', another imposition on an already overburdened profession.

STAFF COMPETENCE

I have not yet measured competence and am unsure how this can be done effectively. Citizenship is not only about subject content, for skills of research, presentation, literacy and numeracy are explicitly to be developed. According to the DfES, which incorporates citizenship into PSHE in its abstracts journal *Spectrum*, "good PSHE teaching is about having a range of skills and qualities together with specialist knowledge and understanding" (DfES, 2002, p. 2).

The OFSTED reports for each school in the sample clearly show evidence of quality teaching, so that both technical and indeterminate⁵ classroom skills are not in question here. It is also true that citizenship is being overseen by teachers with subject-related expertise, either in the design and implementation of materials or as members of working groups drawing up whole-school strategies and activities. Each of the teachers responsible for citizenship in my sample is confident of having enough teachers with appropriate knowledge, skill and understanding to provide effective learning opportunities for their students.

I have to express some reservations about the 'skill' aspect. Citizenship education is meant to enable students to develop skills of research and interpretation, among many others. I conducted some research into the teaching of research methods at school A, which produced informative results. The deadline date was clearly indicated, yet initial response was roughly 71 per cent. If teachers have difficulties in keeping to deadlines, they might care to consider the situation in which students often find themselves (one did say 'I thought it was next Wednesday'; another, 'I wasn't here that day'). This produces an example of 'do as I say, not as I do', which runs counter to the citizenship guidelines; it renders citizenship as something to be taught rather than something to develop, a subject rather than a condition.

⁵ I use these terms in relation to teaching generally, as Jamous and Peliolle (1970) used them regarding the teaching and practice of orthodox medicine.

STAFF PERCEPTIONS

I can as yet offer no clear-cut conclusions on teachers' perceptions of citizenship education. However, those teachers with whom I have spoken appear to fit into any one of four categories illustrated by typical quotations:

1. 'It's what we all do anyway';
2. 'Another trendy gesture which adds to our workload without helping anyone';
3. 'Not before time';
4. 'As long as I don't have to teach it . . . '.

School A has a long and impressive history of community service, charitable fundraising (£17,000 in 1999), Duke of Edinburgh activities, links with schools in nineteen countries, sold-out public performances of productions such as 'Ghetto', 'West Side Story', and 'Oh! What a Lovely War', as well as individual and team successes in a wide range of sporting activities. There is therefore some justification in those who respond with category 1 above — at least as far as the moral and community aspects of citizenship are concerned — as there is in claims that the school develops more than the academic talents of its students.

To some extent, categories 1, 2 and 4 are different faces of the same response as none is actually an opposition to the principle of citizenship education. There appears a strong feeling among heads of subject, in particular, that the school already meets many of the citizenship requirements and that a raft of other initiatives are having to be integrated into an already busy school day. Literacy and numeracy programmes affect secondary schools, and there remains considerable concern about the workload and uncertainty generated by recent A level reforms. In addition, the school is developing an application for specialist school status as well as building links with business and other elements in the community, and responding to new funding requirements and the recent Green Paper (DfES, 2003) by extending the range of courses offered at 16 and at 16+. Responses 2 and 4 above — 'it doesn't help' and 'as long as it isn't me' possibly reflect this growing workload rather than opposition in principle.

'Not before time' tends to be a pastoral manager/arts or humanities teacher's response. Professional interests lead such staff to the conclusion that political literacy, developed moral awareness and sensitivity to culture and community diversity might be greater life-enhancing skills than a particular examination pass. It can be the case, as in school A, that many of the current initiatives have not greatly impinged on humanities subjects so that, without the introduction of

citizenship education, such subjects were in danger of possible marginalization—welcoming it as a saviour of the subject as much as for its own worth.

No member of staff to whom I spoke, in any of the schools in this study or in other meetings with citizenship teachers, raised the issue of the philosophy of citizenship guidelines. As stated in my introduction, this appears to be regarded as a self-evident ‘good thing’.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

I have, as yet, limited data on student perceptions and what I have is based largely on a series of informal interviews with an unstructured sample of students from schools A and C.

The first impression I gathered is that students at school A enjoy the opportunity citizenship lessons present for discussion and the exchange of ideas. The lack of set homework is also appreciated. The students with whom I had discussions seem to agree that ‘politics is boring’ while competently offering their critique of a range of politicians and policies. It became apparent that it is the presentation and packaging which turns off these students rather than the issues of politics.

They are also aware that issues arise in different subjects and in extra-curricular areas, and show ease and comfort in integrating and relating these points, ideas, experiences, etc. as and where they consider them appropriate. The students also consciously tend to offer public and private responses on some topics — they know which teachers expect or will accept certain attitudes and either cooperate or oppose, depending on mood/attitude. This is a body of students who fully expect to be able to deliver ‘the right answers’ without necessarily believing or agreeing with one word they say or write. There is an unexpressed sensitivity to the notion that a certain ideology is being promulgated, to which the students’ responses seem more in line with hegemony than with mindless acceptance or consensual convergence; they present an appearance of agreement because it suits them.

PROVISIONAL, TENTATIVE REFLECTIONS

Here I draw together some of the findings from this initial study and the earlier theoretical discussion to consider the philosophy of citizenship, staff and student attitudes and the forms of its presentation in the schools studied.

ANY REAL PHILOSOPHY?

If there is, its nature is certainly not apparent to those who deliver or receive citizenship education. The thrust of guidelines and teaching programmes is reflected in their unquestioning nature—‘democracy is good, how we do things is democratic: therefore we are good’ (see, for example, QCA, 1999, pp. 14–15)—reminiscent of the approach to history described by the English humourists Yeatman and Sellar (1970), in which everything desired or imposed by the state is described as ‘a good thing’, without explanation, justification or any consideration of alternatives.

In Marxist terms, citizenship education is about inclusion on the terms of the state, the perpetuation of the civil society which replicates bourgeois relationships rather than a humanized and inclusive social order. As Lawton (1975, p. 30) points out, while Marxism may reduce class to a wholly economic category, Weber also recognized the importance of status and power and that there was a complex dynamic between these three elements. The most effective and efficient exercise of power can be seen in the legal/rational model where the rules lay down what is or is not acceptable, and in normative authority where members believe that the dominant values are the correct ones. The national guidelines on citizenship education reflect what might be seen as ‘chattering class’/New Labour norms and values in a clear set of rules. Whether we agree with these or not, as Lawton comments on another issue, does not make them absolutely true or value free.

The philosophy behind the introduction of national guidelines — generally opposed by teacher associations since 1988 as a rejection of sensitivity to local issues and of teachers’ professional autonomy — appears so far to be a form of egalitarian Yeatman-and-Sellar-ism. This is the philosophy behind imposing, not the philosophy behind what is being imposed. The guidelines themselves indicate a reluctance to engage in questioning what is meant by the concept of ‘citizen’ and whether reality matches meaning for any/all members of society. There is failure to either explain or to attempt to change society, only the attempt to put forward one particularistic view. This conclusion is neither revolutionary nor uniquely British: it may be that the nature of citizenship courses is to confirm the status quo.

STAFF ATTITUDES?

As identified, these fit somewhere within a range of four options

1. ‘It’s what we all do anyway’;
2. ‘Another trendy gesture which adds to our workload without helping anyone’;
3. ‘Not before time’;
4. ‘As long as I don’t have to teach it . . .’

with a fairly even spread throughout school A. There is very little outright opposition but also very little awareness of detail. Teachers other than the most enthusiastic or involved appear unaware of the citizenship guidelines beyond their possible impact on the teacher's own subject area. Those who are the most interested seem to be those whose subjects are the most directly involved. This is not necessarily unique. Literacy co-ordinators are often English specialists and numeracy co-ordinators are likely to be mathematics teachers. It is possibly not surprising that citizenship attracts social scientists and humanities teachers.

VARIETY OF MODELS OF PRESENTATION

There are at least five curriculum models for citizenship:

1. As a discrete subject;
2. As part of PSHE;
3. Integrated into the existing curricular subjects;
4. Special focus events;
5. Ignoring statutory requirements.

The first four are not necessarily mutually exclusive. School A, for example, follows four of these models, but with its main emphasis on model 1. It is likely that schools which do not develop model 1 will also not inevitably adhere exclusively to one other model. Each school would also claim that it addresses issues which cannot be taught as a body of knowledge through such activities as school councils and community service. Models of presentation of citizenship, even if variants of each/any/all of models 1–4 above, offer considerable opportunity for variety. Those which have adopted the fifth approach, typified by the comment 'We don't believe in it', are likely to find an approach imposed upon them following their next OFSTED report or possible LEA or other agency intervention. If government and educational bureaucracy are to be believed, failing to deliver citizenship is not an option.

STUDENT ATTITUDES

It would appear that school students are rather astute. They are aware of the motivation behind assemblies, subject content, etc.; they know how to say/do what the teacher wants/does not want. Much of this might be communicated in unwritten and informal ways about which teachers either know nothing or have forgotten, as indicated in Bowles and Gintis' (1976) concept of the hidden curriculum. I gained the impression that pupils see parents, teachers and politicians advocating some things while preaching or doing something else; such contradictions do not appear to depress or alienate the young so much as disinterest them.

AND FINALLY, A BRIEF POLEMIC

If citizenship education is about a body of knowledge, about persuasion and the idea that participation is better than exclusion, it may be that this is an argument to be won. At the moment it appears to be a mantra being repeated. Those who promulgate participation have not asked the young why they do not participate. Those who approve of a multicultural citizenship programme are seen to proclaim laws that differentiate on the basis of colour or creed — a National Curriculum which proclaims all faiths to be equal but which requires school assemblies to be broadly Christian could be fairly gently described as not wholly consistent. Moral positions are offered as factual. Discussion is to be encouraged but critical assessment frowned upon. Positions outside the mainstream (as identified by some insider agencies) are ignored, downplayed or rejected.

As schools develop their citizenship programmes they will need to consider national guidelines, staff expertise, and social and communal needs. As this study develops I hope to be able to comment on the extent to which the young themselves are able to make an active contribution to citizenship education. A further issue currently being researched is the specialist/non-specialist relationship in school-based initial training of citizenship teachers and the effect this has on all parties concerned — experienced teachers, trainees and school students.

REFERENCES

- Aaronovitch, D (2002) 'If politics has failed, what do you put in its place?' *The Independent* 15/2/2002
- Banton, M (1987) *Racial Theories* Cambridge: CUP
- Barbalet, JM (1988) *Citizenship* Milton Keynes: OUP
- Bechhofer, F, McCrone, D, Kiely, R and Stewart, R (1999) 'Constructing National Identities: art and landed elites in Scotland' *Sociology* 33[3] pp515-34
- Born, M (2002) 'Graduation plan for secondary school leavers' *Daily Telegraph* 13/2/2002
- Bowles & Gintis (1976) *Schooling in capitalist America* London: R&KP
- Cleaver, E, Ireland, E, & Kerr, D (2003) 'The citizenship longitudinal study' *Teaching Citizenship* 7 Autumn 2003 pp15-19
- Curtice J (2002) 'How to get voters back into the polling booths' *The Independent* 14/2/2002
- Davies, I (2003) 'Initial teacher education and the citizenship agenda' *Teaching Citizenship* 7 Autumn 2003 pp30-35
- DfES (2002) *Spectrum 50* London: DfES
- DfES (2003) *14-19: Opportunity and excellence* London: DfES

- Gane, N (1997) 'Max Weber on the ethical irrationality of political leadership' *Sociology* 31[3] pp549-64
- Hobbes, T (1968) [1651] *Leviathan* London: Penguin
- Jamous, H and Peliolle, B (1970) 'Changes in the French university hospital system' in JA Jackson [ed] (1970) *Professions and professionalization* London: CUP
- Jarman, TL (1966) *Landmarks in the history of education* London: John Murray
- Lawton, D (1975) *Class, culture and the curriculum* London: R&KP
- McCrone D & Kiely, R (2000) 'Nationalism and citizenship' *Sociology* 34[1] pp19-34
- Marshall, TH (1973) *Class, citizenship and social development* Westport: Greenwood
- Marx, K and Engels F (1973) *Selected works* London: Lawrence & Wishart
- Ofsted (2001) *Inspecting post-16 sociology with guidance on evaluation* London: Ofsted
- Park, R (1952) *Race and culture* New York: Free Press
- Parsons, T (1965) *Politics and social structure* New York: Free Press
- QCA (1999) *Citizenship: The national curriculum for England* London: DfES/QCA
- QCA (2001a) *A guide for senior managers and governors – citizenship and Key Stages 3 & 4* London: DfES/QCA
- QCA (2001b) *Citizenship – a scheme of work for KS3. Teacher's guide* London: DfES/QCA
- Richardson, D (1998) 'Sexuality & citizenship' *Sociology* 33[1] pp83-100
- Richardson, J and Lambert, J (1991) 'The sociology of race' in M Haralambos [ed] *Sociology: New directions* Ormskirk: Causeway
- Turner, B (1997) 'A neo-Hobbesian theory of human rights: a reply to Malcolm Waters' *Sociology* 33[3] pp565-71
- Yeatman, WC and Sellars RJ (1970) *1066 and all that* London: Penguin

Leighton, R. (2006). 'Revisiting Postman and Weingartner's "New Education" – is Teaching Citizenship a Subversive Activity?' *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 2[1], pp79-88.

'citizenship (education) . . . hammers one more nail into the concept of the teacher as an authority in a particular subject whose job it is to teach it.'

Chris Woodhead, former Chief Inspector of Schools for England ⁶

'Load up on guns and bring your friends, it's fun to lose and to pretend

She's over bored and self-assured: oh no, I know a dirty word.

With the lights out it's less dangerous. Here we are now, entertain us'.

Nirvana 'Smells Like Teen Spirit' ⁷

Introduction

This article considers both the impact of Citizenship Education in the National Curriculum of England and the principles underlying the development of citizenship as a subject in England. It is not the product of structured and systematic long-term research, but based on data already in the public domain and upon experiences and observations gained by the author in training specialist teachers of citizenship. The title is both statement of intent and homage to Postman and Weingartner (1976) in order to demonstrate the importance of the stance – emphasising a need for belief, commitment and passion in education – taken by them and many of their contemporary sociologists.

Even though Postman and Weingartner (1976) were writing at a different time and in a different place, and about the whole field of education rather than about one specific aspect of it, their work is relevant because so little of substance appears to have changed. While schools in twenty first century England are not the same as the schools of 1960s USA, and many changes to structure, content and delivery have taken place in both countries, it is the belief and experience of the author that, in England at least, pupils are still largely expected to be passive recipients of learning about their place in society – that Bowles and Gintis' (1976) Correspondence Theory remains an appropriate and accurate analysis of the application of education in this context.

⁶ <http://theinternetforum.co.uk/school/woodhead3.html>

⁷ <http://www.danceage.com/media/338-Nirvana-Nirvana.php>

Postman and Weingartner (1976) offer a quotation to the effect that learning causes nothing but trouble, juxtaposed with lyrics implying that schooling is designed to produce unquestioning loyalty and cannon fodder. The quotation and lyrics with which this article opens are intended to indicate that policy shapers still fear that education might lead to questioning, while the reality is that many young people have moved beyond questioning to rejection. American schools now see young people 'load up on guns' (the day before a version of this article was presented as a conference paper, a school student in the USA shot and killed nine people) and there are increasing media reports of classroom violence in English schools; young people are becoming 'over bored' and metaphorically 'lost overboard'; teachers and other adults might not always welcome the self-assurance of modern youth; fascination with guns, with libido, and with entertainment indicate not innocence and passivity but awareness, reaction and rejection. It is more helpful to examine why so many young people appear to have rejected the current state of affairs than it is to say that they should not have done so, and it is more sensible to develop strategies to encourage their involvement and contribution than to demand their acquiescence. Pandora's Box is open, there is no point trying to force the lid shut.

Evidence that there might be an intended subversive edge to the Citizenship Education National Curriculum can be found in the Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship, now commonly referred to as "The Crick Report" after the chair of that group, Professor Sir Bernard Crick. The advisory group was established by the then Secretary of State for Education David Blunkett immediately after the Labour Party election victory of 1997, with terms of reference requiring advice 'on effective education for citizenship in schools' (Crick, 1998:4) and expecting 'a broad framework for what good citizenship in schools might look like, and how it can be successfully delivered . . . [including] the involvement of pupils in the development of school rules and policies' (Crick, 1998:4). In the introduction to their report, the Advisory Group stated that its aim was '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 the public life and with the critical capacities to weigh evidence before speaking and acting;' (Crick, 1998:7). There might be a rationale for concern that enabling people to perceive themselves as active members of their society, able to exert influence and to develop critical awareness could be viewed as a change in political culture in a modern democracy. There can be little doubt that expectations of increasing pupils' influence over their schools and encouraging them to question from their own experiences and perspectives was a radical departure from the National Curriculum of the previous ten years.

These priorities would indeed lead to the concerns raised by Woodhead at the beginning of this article.

‘Subversive’, as used here and by Postman and Weingartner (1976), does not mean to overthrow or undermine social values and institutions, but to face and attempt to resolve problems pervading society, to undermine the attitudes which result in suffering and the processes which result in feelings of hopelessness and social alienation. Postman and Weingartner (1976:12,13) pondered whether anything could be done to save a society characterised by:

mental illness . . . crime . . . [adolescent] suicide . . . the most common form of infant mortality in the United States is parental beating. . . misinformation [which] takes many forms, such as lies, clichés, rumour, and implicates almost everybody, including the President of the United States . . . [And] the air pollution problem, the water pollution problem, the garbage disposal problem, the radio-activity problem, the megalopolis problem, the supersonic-jet-noise problem, the traffic problem, the who-am-I problem and the what does it all mean problem.

The list could be extended to include religious fundamentalism, religious intolerance, and the decline of faith and values; impending environmental disaster, growing consumer debt, and internet pornography; problems of falling standards and of unrealistic expectations; political apathy, political intolerance, political inertia, political disempowerment, and politicians who neither deserve nor earn respect. Lists such as these, vividly described by Arthur (2003:3) as “litany of alarm”, lie at the heart of citizenship education – but only if they inform strategies for action rather than become reasons to be disenchanted. If the current political establishment does not seek to address and resolve these problems but, through deliberate endeavour or casual oversight, allows them to continue and to multiply, then – according to Postman and Weingartner’s *New Education* – that establishment must be scrutinised.

The teaching of citizenship education, at its best, equips young people with the tools, knowledge, skills and information through which such scrutiny can be conducted. The purpose and practice of citizenship education is not to produce mindless electoral fodder but to question a society which accommodates or even expects and accepts problems such as those listed. With such a questioning approach, young people are enabled to subvert values and structures shown to be bankrupt, while retaining those demonstrably effective and appropriate to their lives. It is from this position that it is argued that teaching citizenship is both a subversive and empowering activity.

Postman and Weingartner (1976) revisited

While theories of democracy tell us that everyone is equal in law, in access to power and in social engagement, we know this is not true. Weber explained the need for clear rules and structures to prevent bureaucrats from assuming the authority of their office and manipulating decision making to their own ends; Michels' (1949) 'Iron Law of Oligarchy' demonstrates the inevitability of people becoming more answerable to their hierarchical superiors than to the system they both serve. Such ideas are not simply sociological products; television programmes such as *Yes, Prime Minister* and *West Wing*; the populist and popular journalism, film-making and books of Michael Moore; news coverage and popular street mythology; all reinforce the perception that the same could be said for capitalist democracy as was often said about state communism – that it is fine in theory but unworkable in practice – although capitalism is more colourful, generally more comfortable, and offers more television channels.

Political leaders retain their power irrespective of incoherent speech, internecine rivalry, mud-slinging, corruption, double-dealing, deception and dishonesty. People are told 'there is no alternative' when clearly there are alternatives, that weapons exist when there is no apparent evidence of their existence, that politicians have our interests at heart when they seem consistently to demonstrate the opposite. It may be that the perceptions of alternatives, of lack of clarity and of inconsistency are not true but, as Thomas (1923) demonstrated, if people believe something to be real, it is real in its social consequences; if people believe they are being fed crap, they may well bite the hand that tries to feed it to them.

Postman and Weingartner (1976:16) argued for "a new education that would set out to cultivate . . . experts in crap detecting". The teaching of Citizenship in particular is concerned with the cultivation of skills of communication and informed participation, the development of both knowledge and understanding of structures and relationships in society, and how such skills and knowledge can be deployed. In order for young people to understand 'what can be' and possibly 'what should be', they need to look at and understand 'what is'. Many bring a perception of how life and society operate, rejecting politics in its 'party, economic strategy, acceptance and admiration of one's betters' sense while developing interests and opinions on a range of issues. Such young people comfortably fit Postman and Weingarten's criteria for crap detectors.

Citizenship Education should be about being critical, learning that learning can be fun, that there are as many right answers as there are people searching for them. It is therefore the antithesis of what

Postman and Weingartner (1976:32) disparage as 'The Vaccination Theory of Education' – the perception that the professional knows what is best, and that substance and dosage are both outside of the recipients' control.

Several schools are meeting the requirements of the Citizenship National Curriculum to the letter rather than the spirit, with some failing to go even that far (Leighton, 2004a, 2004b; Bell, 2005b). The current shortage of specialist-trained teachers makes a strategy of subject avoidance or token provision inevitable in the short term, but is it a short-term strategy? By summer 2006 there will be approximately 800 specialist citizenship trained teachers qualified through the Post Graduate Certificate in Education route, enough for only 15% of schools to have one such teacher each. There should therefore be competition between schools to ensure they can recruit a specialist; as some schools have already recruited two and a few have three, such competition should be intense. Yet Bell (2005b) expresses both surprise and concern at the paucity of advertisements for specialist trained teachers in the educational press and the limited number of training places for teachers of citizenship in England. He poses the question "if these specialists have so much to offer to this emerging and exciting subject, why are there not more advertisements from schools wishing to recruit them?" and recounts much of the good practice seen by his inspectors, but does not offer an answer to his question. One possible answer could be that the very nature of the subject and the measures it uses for effectiveness contribute to many schools' reluctance to recruit, particularly the expectation placed on, and supported by, the Advisory Group – that the involvement of pupils in the development of school rules and policies should be encouraged. Yet, as Goodman (1975:15) wrote, "it is impossible to become engaged or usefully to identify when one cannot initiate or have a say in deciding". Perhaps that 'yet' should be because'.

The approach that it doesn't matter who teaches Citizenship denigrates both the subject and the staff involved, and limits the opportunities for school students to understand and to make progress. It reflects the politicians' lip-service to public accountability and is equally unsuccessful. It is tantamount to saying 'it doesn't matter, you don't matter', accepting the moderate and the mundane rather than seeking to excel – 'it is okay to be medium' seems to be the message. To say anything else while failing to implement legal and educational obligations is bound to be uncovered by the crap detectors, and that failure is symptomatic of the social reality citizenship seeks to subvert. As Postman and Weingartner (1976) assert, much of pupils' involvement in the processes of education has been based on guesswork – guess how apparently disparate strands are interconnected, guess what answer the teacher wants, guess what is RIGHT and TRUE – but with the

valued questions, values behind the questions, and arbitration on validity of guesses, being in the sole remit of teachers. Questioning a dependence on guesswork has been rejected as 'trendy', progressive or hammering one more nail into the coffin of teacher as unquestionable authority as "most educators . . . are largely interested to know whether it will accomplish the goals that older learning media have tried to achieve" (Postman and Weingartner 1976:37). Despite legislated and social changes, those goals are still largely led by outcomes perceived to be measurable. In the past this may have been evidence of accomplishment in 'the three Rs' or the proportion of pupils getting particular grades; grades still haunt many schools, along with Standard Attainment Test scores at the end of each key stage and league table positions. Their point was that new methods of learning and development are necessary for new skills and a change in the nature of society, and that new goals and ways of perceiving goals and their achievement need to be identified. It is through questioning not acceptance, working things out instead of learning by rote, cooperating rather than competing, that new attitudes will be forged and the needs of a more rewarding society will be met. It has been seen as perfectly acceptable for those with authority to throw questions at children but not for those children to ask questions of the authority figures. Should anyone really be surprised that consistent exposure to questioning has developed a desire to question?

Dedication to 'older learning media', Kuhn's perception of dominant but unshifting paradigms, might here reflect a fear of inquiry or a fear of uncovering inadequacy amongst decision makers and commentators, a preference for their own feelings of security and superiority rather than looking to develop and enhance the prospects of future generations. Bowles and Gintis' (1976) Correspondence Theory leads us to conclude that such decision makers and commentators are determined that young people are not encouraged to have questioning, enquiring and critical approaches but, instead, should be acquiescent and accommodating. However, citizenship is about being questioning. It is about being informed enough to know which questions to ask and of whom they should be asked, and alert to the consequences as well as the content of any answers. Asking directed and informed questions has been derided by Woodhead as a "utilitarian skill"; he places an emphasis on knowledge which assumes either that teachers can give pupils all the answers or that teachers and the National Curriculum for England must have absolute control over what constitutes appropriate knowledge. He also seems to forget that young people are asking questions and probably always have done.

In England, Citizenship is about involvement – one of the three National Curriculum strands requires that students are enabled to develop skills of active involvement and participation. Where the

teacher is considered “an authority in a particular subject whose job it is to teach it” [1], the words resonate with the description CW Mills (1980) offered of professionals as people of narrow interests and narrower specialisms. There is nothing new in the idea of involving pupils in the curriculum nor in developing independent learning skills, but there is some opposition to this approach.

When Crick (1998), Arthur and Wright (2001), Brett (2004) and others have contended that Citizenship is ‘more than just a subject’, they have argued that the development of social responsibility and moral character require schools and teachers to develop new methods, new content, new activities, and new approaches to learning. Citizenship education must be relevant to the lives of pupils and to the lives of those around them if it is to have any long-lasting effect. It is not a subject to be taught by avowed experts to a receptive and passive audience but one which requires pupils to question themselves and those around them, to learn as much about their own potential as about their rights and responsibilities, to understand and to participate and to contribute. Where the subject, its content and its presentation are not seen as relevant, the subject simply does not work. From observation of the teaching of citizenship, and in discussion with practicing teachers of Citizenship – both subject trained and non-specialists – it is clear that non-specialists regularly adopt and adapt ideas from student teacher specialists in order to make their own delivery of citizenship more relevant to their pupils. These trainees and teachers have indicated some commitment to citizenship and to ensuring its relevance to pupils as well as adhering to the National Curriculum.

However, other research (Leighton, 2004a, 2004c) indicates that not all teachers of citizenship see the subject requirements and their professional obligations in the same light. That school management teams consulted with staff in only 29% of the schools where the subject has been introduced (Clever et al, 2003) does not bode well for any inquiry into the extent and outcomes of pupil consultation. When established teachers expect specialist trainees to work with non-specialist materials or wholly in conventional ways, lessons are rarely as successful, nor placements as successful, as when there is collaboration and innovation. Nonetheless such expectations are commonplace. It is also becoming clear that some schools welcome and develop a critical and questioning approach, welcoming pupil contributions and striving to make sure that citizenship is not only taught in innovative ways but that its content remains relevant.

One concern of the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted, 2003, 2005; Bell, 2005a, 2005b) - the inspectorate for education in England, directly accountable to Parliament – is the way in which

citizenship is delivered, often cross-curricular provision with only a cursory relationship with National Curriculum requirements. Structures of delivery have been addressed elsewhere (Leighton, 2002, 2004b), but a common approach is to see the subject combined with Personal Social and Health Education (PSHE), or with Careers education, perhaps once a fortnight. It therefore becomes a subject perceived as of little academic value and little valued by the school, taught largely by non-specialists, an irrelevance and often a distraction from the 'proper' business of schooling. At least one school has changed from 'Citizenship' to 'Life Skills' as the pupils changed the final letter to a 't', others offer PACE (Personal and Citizenship Education) or some other locally created but not necessarily even locally understood name. Bell (2005b) expresses particular concern over the misunderstandings which lead to and develop from such misplaced provision.

When this is done, it reflects an attitude in keeping with Woodhead's belief that citizenship education is both "absurdly grandiose and dangerously diminishing". The Crick Report (1998) and the National Curriculum (DfES 1999) both allow for schools to tailor the subject to meet and address local circumstances. For many schools this has been used as a loophole to avoid a considered approach to delivery, replacing it with an arbitrary combination of curriculum aspects which move away from traditional approaches to education. In such cases, schools are continuing along the path against which Illich (1973a) argued, that they are organised to meet the priorities and needs of teachers rather than those of pupils.

Many schools advocate school councils, community action projects, general studies and general lectures on aspects of current affairs. They provide careers guidance and information regarding substance abuse and legal responsibilities. These activities are controlled by teachers who either set their own restrictions or follow guidelines laid down by school managers or school governors. It is exceptional for a school to devolve any budget to a school council, although a few do; it is rare for schools to have pupil representation on governing bodies, although there is legislated provision for such representation. It is almost unheard of, in the state sector, for pupils to have any formal say in the structure of their day, their lessons, or their curriculum. What is worth knowing, therefore, in preparation for adulthood and participation in the rights and responsibilities which constitute being a Citizen, is almost always dictated according to Bowles and Gintis' (1976) 'Jug and mug' principle – that those in authority know best. This hidden curricular message, self-evidently not a universal truth to anyone sharing the concerns identified thus far, produces a wide-spread attitude of opposition to citizenship education because of the inherent hypocrisy of an approach which says 'we will tell you what is important to you, how to form opinions and what opinions to form'.

Underpinning values of citizenship education include that it enables the development of skills of enquiry, the ability to form and articulate personal opinions, to understand the views of others, and to prepare young people to play an active and effective part in shaping the type of society in which they wish to live. Foisting a passive acceptance of the status quo is an improbable route to achieving these objectives. A more appropriate approach would be to enable young people to understand society and how to read society. In the words of Postman and Weingartner (1976:85) “in order to survive in a world of rapid change there is nothing more worth knowing . . . than the continual process of how to make viable meanings”.

Whose meanings are considered ‘viable’ or worthwhile? Postman and Weingartner (1976) propose eight different teacher ‘types’, each of which we might recognise from our experiences as teacher trainer, as teacher, as teacher trainee and/or as a pupil. For many pupils, part of the reality of the process of schooling is to identify which ‘type’ best describes a particular teacher then to work out and apply whichever strategies will bring most success in appearing to meet that teacher’s criteria; ‘successful’ pupils being those who can most effectively judge and meet the expectations of a teacher type. Those who are equally successful at judging but either do not have the strategies of apparent or real compliance, or prefer not to employ them, are unlikely to be successful. Those not equipped or unwilling to make effective judgements might find that they hit upon a coping strategy which sees them through the system, or they fail to do so and therefore struggle through the system. If this is what is happening in citizenship lessons, then those lessons become simply another part of the process of negotiating survival rather than part of skills and knowledge development.

If this is the case, pupils have learned to make viable meanings and act according to them – a valuable citizenship skill, if unconsciously promoted by teachers and certainly not one which features in the National Curriculum statutory guidelines. A systematic and coherent approach to developing similar skill and discernment, but without creating a long-lasting antipathy to education and to authority, might be a more effective strategy in the long run.

Postman and Weingartner (1976:131-3) identify a newspaper article in which high school dropouts addressing a conference of teachers decried the way in which teachers refused to listen to or take account of the attitudes and experiences of the young, and to which teachers’ responses mixed ‘that doesn’t happen’ with ‘too much paperwork’ and “It’s not my job to love my pupils – it’s my job to teach them.” The big question had become “Where do we get the new teachers necessary to translate the new education into action?”

The big question now is ‘Where do we get enough established teachers to translate the new education into action?’ Leighton (2004a) discusses some of the issues around redirecting established teachers towards citizenship education; one of the greatest barriers for established teachers is that they have often adopted a ‘professional perspective’ rather than a subversive one. In order for teachers to begin to function as subversives, Postman and Weingartner (1976) suggest sixteen principles of practice, some of which remain highly relevant to the present discussion as I attempt to demonstrate below:

1. A 5 year moratorium on the use of textbooks – the rapidly changing nature of citizenship ‘knowledge’ and the wealth of resources being produced means that, although there are many books available, these are often used sparingly to aid learning, rather than as a substitute for learning.
2. Teachers teaching outside their own specialisms – with most citizenship teachers trained in other subjects and specialist trainees being graduates in other disciplines, all teachers of citizenship teach outside their specialisms.
3. Teachers who claim to ‘know’ their subject well should have to write a book on it –the introduction of citizenship education has seen a plethora of books produced, not always by teachers who could justify a claim to know the subject well. This has made the observation of principle 1 above all the easier to achieve.
4. Prohibit teachers from asking questions they already know the answers to – if only.
5. Requirement of evidence that a teacher has had a loving relationship with at least one other human being – the word ‘other’ being crucial here.
6. All graffiti from school toilets be reproduced on large paper and hung in school halls – whereas the tendency is to use anti-graffiti paint. School desks remain a valuable source of information on student angst, and the growth in popularity of websites of pupils’ views of schools is also instructive.
7. Citizenship pupils are expected to consider issues from a range of viewpoints other than their own, to have and respond to opportunities to communicate their own ideas, to recognise and celebrate diversity. This explicitly includes ethnic, local, regional national and international diversity; it also includes the expectation that ‘diversity’ is a theme, not a topic. Whatever topic or issue is being considered in class or in other environments, pupils should be enabled to understand that there is a range of perspectives, each based on particular experiences and values which may not be their own and, crucially for those who are or who feel marginalized (Labov, 1969; Torrey, 1970), which may indeed be their own but shared with others not in the immediate vicinity.

Bernstein asked how we could “talk about offering compensatory education to children who . . . have as yet not been offered an adequate education environment” (1973:215); a pertinent question today considering that independent schools remain, as do over 150 state-provided grammar school and a number of faith schools, when citizenship requires emphasis on integration, equality and mutual understanding. When David Bell, the Chief Inspector of Schools, said that “This growth in faith schools needs to be carefully but sensitively monitored by government to ensure that pupils at all schools, receive an understanding of not only their own faith but of other faiths and the wider tenets of British society” (Bell 2005a), he was widely criticised for an attack on Islam not evident in the text of his speech. While Bernstein was writing largely about the physical environment of school, about which no specific subject can do a great deal, the ethical and moral environment can and should be fundamentally influenced by citizenship education.

Another concern which Bernstein raised was that “we offer a large number of children . . . unstable teaching staff and . . . expect a small group of dedicated teachers to cope.” (1973:215). This can apply to the provision of citizenship teaching in ways illustrated in earlier sections of this paper. There are a few dedicated citizenship teachers working to deliver a subject whose provision has been materially inadequate over many years. Opposition to provision on any level in some schools led Bell (2005a) to say that “citizenship is the worst taught subject at Key Stages 3 and 4” (p1). Where it is taught well there tends to be a clear ethos throughout the school and explicit support from the school management team, but for those schools where this is not the case – the majority, according to Ofsted inspections – children are being deprived of their entitlement and, by default, so is the drive to moderate and integrate society.

Day (2004) writes of passion for one’s subject, for teaching, and for the future of young people as essential emotional characteristics for teachers. It may be that there are people who have drifted into teaching or while teaching who never had or no longer have such passions. People get jaded. Their attitudes, interests, talents, preferences, passions can change. If a person is no longer committed to upholding the law, one might expect them to cease to be a police officer. If a person no longer cares about the health of others, one might expect them to cease being a doctor. If a person is no longer committed to the principles of learning and personal development, goes this argument, one expects them to recognise their new or previously submerged commitments, and give up teaching. If a person no longer cares, or never did care, about Citizenship Education, it would follow that they should not be involved in it. Previous research discussed elsewhere (Leighton 2004c) suggests that there are at least six identifiable positions regarding teachers’ views on teaching

citizenship: commitment; conversion; co-existence; colonisation; compliance; conflict. It was found that those teachers who fit the first two categories felt best equipped to deliver an active and critical Citizenship Education curriculum, and could demonstrate their effectiveness, but that many teachers were to be found in the other categories. Such teachers were not engaged with their subject, and neither, in the main, were their pupils.

Finally

What Postman and Weingartner (1976:204) wrote about ‘the new education’ over thirty years ago can be applied to citizenship education today. “It consists of having students use the concepts most appropriate to the world in which we all must live. All of these concepts constitute the dynamics of the question-questioning, meaning-making process that can be called ‘learning how to learn’. . . The purpose is to help all students develop built-in, shockproof crap detectors as basic equipment in their survival kits”.

It was with considerable prescience that Goodman observed, in 1964, that “the future . . . will certainly be more leisurely. If that leisure is not to be completely inane and piggishly affluent, there must be a community and civic culture” (1975:44). In this, he is clearly advocating some form of critical awareness and the development of commonly held and demonstrated values. It is in relation to that position that Goodman asks whether “since schooling undertakes to be compulsory, must it not continually review its claim to be useful?” (1975:19). If the approach to compulsory citizenship education in English schools is not subversive, if it does not both encourage and equip young people to ask questions and then to take action, if it isn’t being useful and enabling young people to feel of use and value, it isn’t working.

REFERENCES

- Arthur, J. and Wright, D. (2001) *Teaching citizenship in the Secondary School* London: David Fulton
- Arthur, J. (2003) *Education with Character: The moral economy of schooling*. London: RoutledgeFarmer
- Barbalet, J. M. (1988) *Citizenship*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Becker, H. S. (1971) ‘Whose side are we on?’ in Becker, H. (1971) *Sociological Work* London: Allen Lane
- Bell, D. (2005a) Hansard Society Speech <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/>
- Bell, D. (2005b) *Education for Democratic Citizenship – The Roscoe Lecture* at Liverpool John

Moore's University <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/>

Bernstein, B. (1973) *Class, Codes and Control Vol 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language* London: Paladin

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H., (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Brett, P. (2004) 'More than a subject': Fair Play for Citizenship
http://www.citized.info/index.php?strand=2&r_menu=res

Carr, D. (2004) *Professionalism and Ethics in Teaching*. London: Routledge

Cleaver, E., Ireland, E., and Kerr, D. (2003) 'The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study'
Teaching Citizenship 7, 15-19

Crick, B. (1998) *Education for Citizenship and the teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship* London: QCA

Day, C. (2004) *A Passion for Teaching* London: RoutledgeFalmer

DES (1999) *Citizenship: The National Curriculum for England* London: DfES/QCA

Florio-Ruane, S. (2001) *Teacher Education & The Cultural Imagination*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum

Ford, R. (2005) 'Citizenship ceremony for 18-year-olds' London: *The Times* Jan 20 2005, p34

Goodman, P. (1975) *Compulsory Miseducation* London: Penguin

Hargreaves, D.H. (1967) *Social Relations in a Secondary School* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Hargreaves, D.H. (2004) *Learning for Life: The Foundations Of Lifelong Learning* Bristol: Polity Press

ILLICH, I. (1977) *Disabling Professions*. London: Marion Boyars

Illich, I. (1973a) *Deschooling Society* Middlesex: Penguin

Illich, I. (1973b) *Tools for Conviviality* . Glasgow: Collins

Jarman, T.L. (1966) *Landmarks in the History of Education* London: John Murray

Labov, W. (1969) 'The logic of Non-Standard English', in: Keddie N (ed) (1978) *Tinker, Tailor . . . The Myth of Cultural Deprivation*. London: Penguin

Leighton, R. (2004a) *What you give is what you get: a preliminary examination of the influence of teacher perceptions of the role of Citizenship Education* <http://www.citized.info/>

Leighton, R. (2004b) 'The nature of Citizenship Education provision: an initial study'. *The Curriculum Journal* 15:2 pp167-181

Leighton, R. (2004c) 'Mentoring Citizenship Trainees'. *Teaching Citizenship* 9, Autumn 2004 pp26-31

LINSLEY, B. & RAYMENT, E. (Eds) (2004) *Beyond The Classroom: Exploring Active Citizenship in 11– 16 Education* London: New Politics Network

- Michels, R. (1949) *Political Parties* Glencoe: The Free Press
- Mills, C.W. (1980) *The Sociological imagination* London: Penguin
- OFSTED (2003) *Inspecting Citizenship 11-16* London: HMSO
- OFSTED (2004a) *Update 43* <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/>
- OFSTED (2004b) *HEI Report* <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/>
- Postman, N. and Weingartner, C. (1976) *Teaching As A Subversive Activity* London: Penguin
- POSTMAN, N. (1970) 'The politics of reading' in: Keddie N (ed) (1978) *Tinker, Tailor . . . The Myth of Cultural Deprivation* London: Penguin
- QCA (1999) 'Citizenship: The National Curriculum for England' London: DfES/QCA
- QCA (2001a) 'A guide for senior managers and governors – Citizenship at key stages 3 and 4' London: DfES/QCA
- QCA (2001b) 'Citizenship – a scheme of work for key stage 3 Teacher's Guide' London: DfES/QCA
- Ross, A. (2003) 'Children's political learning: concept-based approaches versus issue –based approaches' in: Roland-Levy, C. & Ross, A. (eds) (2003) *Political learning and citizenship in Europe* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham
- Thomas, W. I. (1923) *The Unadjusted Girl*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour*. Farnborough: Saxon Press

RADICAL EDUCATION

The past?

Ralph Leighton

The rationale for this chapter is:

- the scrutiny of a range of ideas, insights and actions which might constitute ‘radical education’;
- the development of an understanding of differences between ‘change’ and ‘radical change’;
- to consider whether radical education is a thing of the past, and only of the past.

INTRODUCTION

There is an ambivalence to the title of this chapter which raises further questions. Is radical education all in the past? Indeed, is it realistic to characterise the history of education as radical? Principally, what is ‘radical education’?

For the purposes of this chapter I have taken ‘radical education’ to include those educational ideas, actions or legislative Acts which have been significantly different to the historical or political context in which they have occurred, and which have had some identifiable impact. That impact might be on the thinking and practice of some educators rather than demonstrably on the daily experiences of school pupils and their teachers, or it could be something which causes a major shift in either theory or practice. Some radical ideas have flourished temporarily then died away, others have been adapted and adopted so that they remain with us in different forms, while yet other radical developments have become part of the mainstream. It can be a challenge at times to identify what was ever radical about the last of these but, as we shall see as the chapter develops, it is the context which dictates the nature and extent of radicalism.

An illustration of the significance of context can be seen in the proposals to introduce free and secular education for all between the ages of 6 and 13, to be administered by locally elected school boards, in late nineteenth-century England. This is not something which current mores might view as radical but which was far removed from the prevailing provision.

Until this time, the provision of education had largely been the preserve of the Church, independently financed institutions, governesses and tutors, with a few ‘enlightened’ factory owners providing some schooling in those skills they wished to see developed in their workforce. To a background of political and social reforms in the 1850s and 1860s which recognised the growing strength of identity and power of the emerging industrial proletariat, and which attempted to stem any

CONTEXTS: MAKING EDUCATION WORK ■ ■ ■

movement towards revolution by allowing limited involvement by some of the members of that class who were perceived as more responsible, came the 1870 Education Act. During the 1867 debate on an early draft of the Bill, Robert Lowe, Chancellor of the Exchequer, argued in favour of the legislation on the grounds that ‘we must educate our masters’ (Jarman, 1966: 264). In other words, having given some power to the masses, government viewed it as essential that those masses be informed and directed to think in ways which would not unsettle the status quo. Such a strategy, when considered in the light of Lukes’ (1974) ‘Three-Dimensional View of Power’, demonstrates control over the political agenda and over decision making – the Weberian concept of normative power (Weber, 2009) – and is far from radical. Although it brought about significant changes, these were changes *within* the system rather than *to* the system; the curriculum, the organisation and management of schools, the purpose and focus of education, pupil/teacher relationships – none were radically altered. It was more of the same for a lot more people, tailored to ensure that the working classes developed the skills and attitudes desired of them by the ruling class. The purpose of extending education was to ensure that how and what people thought and what they thought about was under state control. Indeed, perhaps the only truly radical aspect of this legislation was that it allowed women to stand and vote for the education boards it established.

If we consider other major educational reforms in England since the 1870 Act – the legislation of 1944 and 1988 are perhaps the most important examples – we can apply the same insights and come to very similar conclusions. 1944 saw the reorganisation of school provision, and formalised concepts of measuring ‘ability’, within a parcel of reforms derived from the recommendations of the Beveridge Report; this was the attack on the ‘evil’ of ignorance, just as other legislation attacked the evils of idleness, need, poverty, and squalor. There were no attacks on disempowerment, inequality, injustice, discrimination or social inequality. The 1988 Act brought about the National Curriculum in order to bring education more explicitly under state control, in a response to Thatcherite concerns about ‘trendy’ teaching methods and perceived moves (by whom is not clear) to use education as a vehicle for social engineering. It had – and continues to have – a major impact on teaching and learning, but was inherently reactionary rather than radical.

This is not to say that there have been no radical ideas, movements or moments in education, but that they are unlikely to be found in state legislation under a capitalist system. To identify whether ideas or actions are radical, we have to view them in their political and historical contexts – which is what this chapter endeavours to do. As such ideas and actions are identified and discussed we will go on to look at their impact, to discover whether the radical past of education has had any lasting effect, and whether there is any likelihood of a radical future.

RADICAL IDEAS LEADING TO RADICAL ACTIONS

One of the first educators to propose that education should be about developing the whole person rather than simply about what Bowles and Gintis (1976) later called ‘role allocation’ was JH Pestalozzi (1746–1827). He placed the emphasis of learning on self-directed inquiry, arguing that an environment should exist where children follow their natural inquisitiveness rather than learning by rote those things which teachers or legislators consider important. With his emphasis on ‘head, heart and hands’ – that children needed to learn how to do things, to feel compassion for the natural world, and to be able to think for themselves – he was one of the first educators to consider holistic or child-centred education as valuable. He was clearly out of step with the ideas of his time which emphasised highly didactic fact processing and the training of young people to fit their preordained places in the social structure, and he saw education as an essential step in improving social conditions at a time when those with power had no interest in doing this.

■ ■ ■ RADICAL EDUCATION: THE PAST?

Several subsequent educators have been heavily influenced by Pestalozzi's principles, most notably Steiner (1861–1925) and Montessori (1870–1952). One aspect at least in common to all three is the continuation of their ideas through international networks of schools, each tradition bearing its founders name. AS Neill (1883–1973) founded Summerhill School on the basis of similar principles. These schools might often now be viewed as middle-class enclaves, but that should not prevent us from considering their 'radical' credentials.

Although more than simply a few variations around a common theme, these approaches to schooling have much in common. Neill (1960), for example, believed that children learn best when they are happy, and are more committed to learning when they have some say in how it is managed and delivered. All shared a commitment to developing emotions and skills in children, as well as intellect. By emphasising that education is about learning and development rather than training and repetition, about personal fulfilment rather than economic expedience, that children's talents should be nurtured rather than being replaced by externally imposed knowledge, and that they should be encouraged to pursue their interests under adult guidance rather than being forced to follow adults' perception of what is important, those who follow these educators' principles clearly challenge an economic needs driven perspective on education.

Many current developments in education clearly owe much to the radicalism of these ideas and actions. The emphasis on 'child-centred learning', Gardner's (1983) work on multiple intelligences and regarding a range of learning styles, individual learning plans, Kolb's (1984) development of awareness of the benefits of active learning – these and other mainstays of contemporary educational discourse and practice are no longer considered radical or off the wall, but derive from the pioneering and sometimes ridiculed work of those outlined above.

SOME OTHER RADICAL INSIGHTS

Often regarded as one of the most significant educational thinkers of the last century, John Dewey (1859–1952) also influenced many of the ideas we might now regard as mainstream. He argued that education had to provide, engage with and develop pupils' experiences, that time to reflect rather than to go from one piece of knowledge to another was an essential component in learning, that the physical and social contexts of learning were part of the experience of learning, and that democracy depended upon involving people in their own learning. He proposed that education could improve society by encouraging individuals to develop their full potential as human beings and was particularly critical of rote learning of facts. (See Dewey, 1966.) Again we can see an influence on current practice of ideas from a time when the English education system was based on teacher authority, pupil conformity, and a move towards selection and the continued emphasis on role allocation. The current entitlement of pupils to be non-voting associate members of school governing bodies¹ might be the beginning of the democratisation of schools, but still falls far short of the practice at Summerhill School and the ideals of Dewey.

Paolo Freire (1921–1997) was highly critical of what he referred to as the 'banking' concept of education, in which the student was viewed as an empty account to be filled by the teacher – an analysis similar to Bowles and Gintis' (1976) 'Jug and Mug' theory. Freire (1972) argued instead for a model of classroom practice where the teacher also learns and the learners also teach, where education is a process to be shared and experienced rather than a commodity to be consumed. Mutual respect between all involved in processes of learning, lacking from most formal and much informal education in Freire's view, is central to this process, as is action which is informed by and linked to personal and social values. As with Pestalozzi and others mentioned in the previous section, Freire considered education to be a tool for making a difference, for developing social capital and making

a contribution to communities. By situating learning in the experience of all participants, it was argued, learners bring a new interpretation to theory and to each other, thus enhancing their own development and the development of those with whom they are learning. Freire was aware that such an approach was not in the self-serving interests of educators and, although notions of respect and understanding might appear in the new National Curriculum, particularly within Citizenship Education, there is little evidence of a sea-change in teacher attitude or behaviour in this regard.

There are similarities between much of Freire's analysis and that of Ivan Illich (1921-2002), who developed a critique of the power of central social institutions such as health and education which, he asserted, ended up more concerned with self-promotion and self-perpetuation than with meeting and serving their original objectives. Just as Michels (1949) demonstrated how all organisations become oligarchies no matter how well-intentioned or careful its members might be, Illich argued this was inevitable in complex technological societies and was true of all attempts to organise and provide for universal social welfare. He argued that such systems aspire to deliver services that are fair and reliable, which requires codes, protocols and procedures. These in turn become complex and rule-bound, rendering them dehumanised. The dominant professions – in our context, teachers and education administrators – not only provide services for people, they also define what people need and what the nature of provision should be. In this way, the professionals become part of the problem they are in place to solve. Indeed, far from encouraging people to learn, formal school trains people to reject learning. School creates the impression that learning is something we do only in special places, at special times in our lives, with the help of qualified teachers. Education is seen as detached from the day-to-day world. By extension, the world cannot be about learning. Education is not seen as a personal project of self-development, but rather a process of gaining qualifications which show that you have learned what the system expects.

Illich (1973) offered guidance for how a more enabling education system could work. This included access to resources at any time for anyone wishing to learn, not only in schools but also in the workplace, museums and libraries – akin to what is now termed 'life-long learning'. He also advocated the opportunities to exchange skills and knowledge now seen in virtual social networks such as Second Life (although these obviously have myriad other applications) and the University of the Third Age. His desire for professionals to work together to nurture and support all aspects of children's existence could be seen in the multiagency approach of the *Every Child Matters* agenda in England, *Getting it Right for Every Child* in Scotland, and some variants of the *No Child Left Behind* program in the USA, if not for the fact that such initiatives remain government-directed and professional-led. As such there is a likelihood that they will go the way of *Operation Head Start* in

the USA in the 1960s, which attempted to engage children living in poverty with opportunities for success in education without addressing the needs or desires of those children or their communities but instead imposing a structure which addressed professionals' perceptions and goals.

The 1960s and 1970s produced a significant amount of radical insight into education without a great deal of measurable impact on mainstream provision. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) clearly demonstrated a tendency for teachers to label pupils and to teach to those labels, fitting what Merton (1968) described as a self-fulfilling prophecy, while Jackson and Marsden (1970) demonstrated the negative effects of selection on pupil progress, based as it was on culturally determined, poorly operationalised and inaccurately measured notions of IQ. While the introduction of comprehensive schools was claimed to be aimed at ending such practices so that all pupils would have an equal opportunity to fulfil their potential, there is little evidence of success. Over 40 years later selection remains in many parts of England, by test or by post-code, and schools continue to set, stream or band pupils according to test scores and/or teacher assessment.

Jackson and Marsden (1968) also showed the effects of social class on the possibility of educational success, concluding that working class pupils who held working class social attitudes were doomed to educational failure. To succeed in education, they argued, pupils had to become middle class. This was further demonstrated by Willis (1977) in his account of working class boys' complicity in their educational failure which, in their terms, was not failure at all. Their values were not the values of the school, the characteristics they admired were those which teachers abhorred. It remains the case today that social class is the most reliable determinant of educational engagement and level of success, showing a continued lack of understanding of the needs, aspirations, interests and desires of a significant proportion of the population. With minority ethnic community pupils also tending towards the lower reaches of success criteria tables, this lack of understanding or inclusion of pupils and the communities to which they have allegiance continues to compound social problems. Educational capital continues to reside largely in middle class values.

Even the concept of meritocracy as bandied about by advocates of comprehensivisation shows a lack of understanding of this term, coined by Young (1958). Young despaired of the misuse and appropriation of this term when he wrote in the *Guardian* newspaper in June 2001 that '[t]he book was a satire meant to be a warning (which needless to say has not been heeded) against what might happen to Britain'. Far from being a society based on equality of opportunity for all where everyone works for the common good, Young showed that a meritocracy was characterised by a self-serving elite claiming legitimacy through the illusion of equality while ensuring that its own interests were secure and perpetuated. It would perhaps be overly cynical to conclude that

advocates of the term, including former prime ministers Thatcher, Major and Blair, were aware of the true meaning of the term; but, if they were not it shows that they had not read Young's work or not understood it.

Other radical writers of this period made their allegiances clear in the title of their publications as well as the content of their analyses. Postman and Weingartner (1976) pulled no punches in advocating that teaching should be subversive, that it was essential for pupils to question and critique if they were to develop and if society was to progress. Their observation that teachers were routinely asking questions to which they already knew the answers, and criticising those pupils who questioned the questions or sought 'new' knowledge or information, was redolent of the comments made by Pestalozzi roughly two centuries earlier.

Keddie (1978) offered a collection which questioned a prevailing notion of victim-blaming – that working class pupils were culturally deprived and could therefore succeed if their culture changed. It is their fault, the argument goes; opportunities are there to be taken or ignored as the individual chooses. One example of the fatuous nature of this argument can be found in the contribution from Labov (1969), where he clearly demonstrates that it is the limitations of teachers' culture – their inability to understand pupils' language, in this case – which inhibits working class, black pupils' achievement. Pupils understand the teacher's language but the teacher is not familiar with that of the pupils. As the teacher is in a position of power and the pupil relatively powerless, it is the teacher's definition of 'right' and 'wrong', of 'lucid' or 'incoherent' which holds sway. In Labov's analysis, it was the teachers' ethnocentricity and middle class world view, underpinned by their professional status, which created an environment in which black working class pupils in particular were likely to 'fail'. As Labov wrote then, and which continues to be true today, 'the myth of verbal deprivation is particularly dangerous because it diverts attention from real defects of our education system to imaginary defects of the child' (Labov, 1969: 22).

Attention was also drawn, primarily by feminist writers, theorists and educators, to the nature of the formal school curriculum, particularly focusing on the stereotyping – often the seeming invisibility – of women in subjects and textbooks (Dixon, 1979; Kelly, 1981). The language of teaching and learning, and the power relationships within schools and other educational settings, were demonstrated by Spender (1980) and others to perpetuate a masculine hegemony, thereby excluding or belittling women and their experiences. Many of these analyses emphasised the interconnectedness of family, school and work, and argued that women were allocated a specific and subservient role in each context. As the problem was structural so must the long-term solution be structural.

It is clear that much has changed in respect of women's place in education. From early reading schemes to advanced textbooks, there is a wealth of material which address to differing extents the previous omission or denigration of women. Girls are outperforming boys in virtually every public examination subject. Projects such as Women Into Science and Engineering (WISE) have broken – or at least seriously cracked – the glass barriers protecting some traditional male employment and education enclaves from female encroachment. However, improved female academic performance has given rise to concerns about boys being 'left behind' despite both sexes continuing to raise their achievement and aspirations – measuring success in relation to gendered competition rather than individual needs and talents. The 'family, school, work' nexus continues to wield a significant influence.

RADICAL EDUCATION AND 'THE RIGHT'

Most of the ideas and actions discussed so far could be placed within the broad spectrum of 'The Left', or at least identified as emanating from progressive perspectives and movements. To some extent this is inevitable as to be conservative, in the words of Oakeshott, himself a conservative philosopher, is

to prefer the familiar to the unknown, to prefer the tried to the untried, fact to mystery, the actual to the possible, the limited to the unbounded, the near to the distant, the sufficient to the superabundant, the convenient to the perfect, present laughter to utopian bliss.

(Oakeshott, 1962: 169)

Nisbett summarises this position by quoting Falkland – whom he describes as a hero of the English Civil War – 'when it is not necessary to change, it is necessary *not* to change.' (Nisbett 1986: 26)

At the same time, conservatism proclaims opposition to all but the minimum of state intervention, management and control, in the belief that it is not necessary to manage that which it is not necessary to change. Where change does come about it should be evolutionary rather than radical. It might appear from this that there can be no such things as conservative radicalism, but those who might be positioned within 'The New Right' would challenge such a perception. Gray argued that the National Curriculum for England 'embodies an indefensible degree of centralisation' (Gray 1993: 31) – notwithstanding that this National Curriculum was introduced by a Conservative government – and advocated a degree of autonomy for state as well as independent schools, with less reliance on local authority and state provision and intervention. Such relative freedom from interference might now be identified in the development of city technology colleges, specialist schools and colleges and, more recently, the establishment of academies.

Just as those with progressive radical ideas and agendas have perceived themselves to be outside the establishment and seeking to develop social justice in and through education, the New Right tries to place itself in a similar position. The tone of Lawson's (1995) introduction to a series of pamphlets produced by the Centre for Policy Studies – a Conservative 'think-tank' – is one of outsiders valiantly trying to reclaim education from an unwieldy and uncaring establishment. That these 'outsiders' include a member of the House of Lords, a knight of the realm, professors, senior Anglican clergy and a Conservative Party director of research who subsequently became a Conservative MP, appears to be an oxymoron which Lawlor does not address.

This group of self-perceived disadvantaged outsiders advocates a return to the teaching of knowledge, 'the training and cultivation of the mind' (Lawlor 1995: 10) and a move away from experiential or exploratory learning and the development of skills. Teacher training, the reader learns, should return to the halcyon days of subject specialists being trained to teach their subjects. Education vouchers should be introduced so that children are valued. The only language structure which schools should accept is Standard English and received pronunciation. Such moves might be more easily considered radical if it were not for conservatism's own dictum, originating from the mid-seventeenth century and cited above, that change should only arise from necessity – assuming that such moves would necessarily be changes.

The central issues here are those of power and perceptions of civil society. Where Oakeshott writes of the conservative preference for the familiar, the tried and tested, facts, sufficiency, convenience, the present, etc., we must ask to whose benefit did or would such a system operate. Indeed, it is pertinent to ask whose laughter is heard if the vast majority of learners are downtrodden, their cultures ignored or derided, their skills devalued, their needs suppressed. In the middle of the nineteenth century Marx argued that, if you 'assume a particular civil society . . . you will get particular political conditions' (Marx and Engels, 1971: 660) and it is clear that the New Right has a vision of and for society based on a return not only to old values but to old inequalities.

SUMMARY

We have seen that education certainly has had a radical past but it would be highly inaccurate to describe all past education as radical. If we were to compare state educational provision in England 130 years ago with what is in place today, we would certainly see remarkable differences, but these changes have come about slowly rather than radically; they have been evolutionary rather than revolutionary.

This chapter has offered only a flavour of some of the radical arguments and ideas regarding education. They should be placed in a wider theoretical context in order to understand their full significance. Few have argued for changes only in education; the arguments have rather been for changes too in social structure and organisation. In the same way as Beveridge claimed it was necessary to attack the five evils, radical theorists have tended to take the apparently paradoxical view that changes in educational provision alone will not result in changes in education. Better physical learning environments, more engaging and active lessons, experiential learning in place of didacticism, involving pupils in their own learning and its structure – none of these things will matter to people who are hungry, impoverished, unwell, poorly housed, who feel disenfranchised, isolated, frightened and rejected.

There have been many changes in the content and structure of education in England and in the other members of the UK – some radical, some influenced by radical thought, some pragmatic, some reactionary, some significant and some ineffectual.

Analyses based on inequalities of educational access and provision based on class, gender and ethnicity continue to be put forward. As our understanding develops regarding the complexities of these social constructs and lived social experiences, and of their interrelationships, so will the range of potential responses and radical solutions become better informed. More is being understood about the range and diversity of learning needs of young people, particularly those whose skills and attributes might render them less immediately and obviously either academic or employable, but who are beginning to be recognised as entitled to an education which develops and supports them. There are moves to recognise what young people can do instead of what they cannot.

Developments such as the movement to give pupils a voice in their education and the running of their schools could yet produce radical changes in the conduct, structure and content of education, depending on the extent to which those voices are given freedom of expression and the extent to which attention is paid to what they say. The growing awareness of cosmopolitanism rather than multiculturalism might yet have a significant impact, where education demonstrates and promotes recognition and respect for the complexities of ethnicity and encourages young people to place themselves in a series of global contexts rather than being limited to parochial, simplistic national boundaries – physical and intellectual. Until the impact and reality of the range of cultural influences

and allegiances which pupils and teachers bring to the process of education [*are fully addressed*]⁸, the situation will remain where

student non-school lives and associations are “checked in at the door”, as schools focus fervently on academic learning and attainment of . . . political values as if these were independent of ethnic, linguistic or social identity. Thus, pupils and teachers experience . . . a “culturallectomy”.

(Florio-Ruane, 2001: 23)

Student voice, active learning, the overt development of political literacy and an awareness of cosmopolitanism, all have come to the fore with the advent of Citizenship Education as part of the National Curriculum for England. The Report which paved the way for the introduction of Citizenship Education had the avowed intention to bring about ‘no less than a change in the political culture of this country’ (QCA, 1998: 7). The Report concluded with a lengthy quotation from the then Lord Chancellor, Lord Irvine of Laing, advocating a particular form of Citizenship Education which fosters respect for law, justice and democracy, relates rights to obligations, and encourages voluntary work. To some extent this is the advocacy of ‘being good and doing good’ but, when considered in the light of a perception that young people are politically apathetic, and which ignores alternative forms of political engagement and reasons why formal political structures do not excite the young, there is a danger that it is simply a late twentieth-century rendition of Lowe’s comment from the late nineteenth-century quoted earlier in this chapter. As Gillborn (2006) points out, there is a danger that a potentially radical departure from conventional education will prove to be no more than a placebo, that much will be expected and little achieved other than an illusion of the consideration and resolution of social and political ills.

Most radical educationalists would argue that education cannot of itself solve society’s problems, but it can reflect them. While society has divisions, unequal opportunities, abuses of power and people of unfulfilled potential, radical educators will seek to offer remedies within a framework of other remedies for other social ills. This has been the past of radical education, and there is every likelihood that it will be the future.

KEY QUESTIONS

1. What is radical education?
2. Have the radical educators of the past influenced today’s education system?
3. Are there any radical forms of education in existence today? Explain your answer.

⁸ Comment in italics was in the original draft of this chapter but not in the published version. Without it the sentence makes no sense.

FUTHER READING

Friere, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Illich, I. (1973) *Deschooling Society* Harmondsworth: Penguin

Keddie, N. (ed) (1978) *Tinker, Tailor . . . The Myth of Cultural Deprivation* London: Penguin

Postman, N. and Weingartner, C. (1976) *Teaching as a Subversive Activity* London: Penguin

Introducing pre-service citizenship teachers to the design and implementation of focus days to enhance their professional learning'

Leighton, R. (2011). ' . *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 7[1], pp.89-102.

Abstract

Much attention has been given to the comparative efficacy of a range of approaches to the delivery of citizenship education in England. A recent inspection report (Ofsted 2010) expressed concern about a perceived over-reliance on collapsed timetable days (referred to here as focus days) as one such mode of delivery.

The effectiveness of focus day planning and delivery is considered in this article by scrutinising the purpose(s), activities and outcomes on a post graduate pre-service programme for citizenship teachers in which such activities form a central theme. The motivation and aims behind the inclusion of focus day planning is clarified and the extent to which these aims are met is discussed. The discussion is informed by data collected from teachers with whom the pre-service students liaised regarding the impact of the focus days on the schools where they took place, and their immediate and longer term impact on the student teachers who were involved. Most of the aims were found to be met and student and experienced teachers identified several benefits of the activity.

Key words: collapsed timetable Ofsted QTS Standards student teachers

Introduction

Various researchers have identified that a range of modes exist for the delivery of Citizenship Education in schools in England (Leighton 2004a; Breslin 2005; Faulks 2006; Ofsted 2006, 2010; Kerr et al 2007; Keating et al 2009, 2010). While attention has regularly been given to the comparative efficacy of discrete (that is, explicit timetabled lessons) and cross-curricular approaches, and to ways in which such approaches might be strengthened, there appears to have been little information with regard to the effectiveness of collapsed time-table days (focus days) in England until the most recent report by the Office for Standards in Education ('Ofsted' – the inspectorate of schools in England), based on inspections of citizenship education in schools in England 2006-09, which noted that 'schools relying heavily on such days were most unlikely to meet National Curriculum requirement' (Ofsted 2010: 24). This is not a wholesale rejection of focus days as a means of delivering citizenship so much as an expression of concern that some schools deploy them as a sole vehicle rather than as part of a more complete and structured approach, and that those schools which take such a single method approach tend not to meet even the basic requirements of the National Curriculum.

Commenting in relation to an earlier Ofsted report, it was noted on a publisher's website, one which provides a forum for advice and ideas across a range of subjects and which had run and was evaluating a cross-curricular global awareness project, that

[m]any of the pilot schools have organised collapsed timetable days to focus on Global Citizenship issues. In a recent OFSTED Report (Feb 2005) [*sic*] on the teaching of citizenship these activity days are seen as useful when they provide participation and responsible action – but only when they are part of an overall coherent citizenship curriculum. (www.teachingexpertise.com)

This article considers the effectiveness of focus day planning and delivery in relation to the experiences of specialist citizenship education student teachers on a Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) programme, the most common pre-service route for aspiring secondary phase (pupils aged 11-18) teachers in England, where such an activity forms a central strand. Having identified the motivation and aims behind the inclusion of focus day planning in that programme, the article then discusses the extent to which these aims are met. This discussion is illustrated by information about the focus days which have been planned and delivered, their impact on the schools where they took place, and their impact at the time and on the professional development of the PGCE students who were involved.

Background and rationale

The planning and delivery of focus days has been a feature of this Citizenship course within an 11-18 full-time PGCE programme since 2003. Its inclusion arose from collaboration between the course leader and the deputy headteacher of an academically successful partnership school which was investigating ways in which to develop pupils other than in relation to their examination performance. A ten day timetable had been designed for the school within which each second Friday (day ten) was to operate without a structured series of lessons but was instead to be allocated to subjects and pastoral groups so that each would be able to work with pupils for a sustained period on topics and skills which were not necessarily included in the National Curriculum but which staff considered to be essential elements of pupils' learning and development.

PGCE Citizenship students planned and delivered such a day at the school. There was no formal assessment of either the effect of this on pupil learning and engagement or of student teacher development, but there was a general sense of positive outcomes. When feedback on this first student-planned focus day was presented to the school-based curriculum mentors as part of the

continuing development programme within the partnership between schools and the university, several other schools expressed interest in working on similar ventures.

The rationale behind requiring the students to work on planning and delivering focus days is multifaceted. First of all there is an awareness that many schools use such days for at least part of their citizenship provision (Leighton 2004a ; Breslin 2005; Ofsted 2006, 2010; Kerr et al 2007). According to Keating et al (2009) 44% of secondary schools in England use 'special events', a category which includes focus days, as part of their citizenship education provision, specifying that 'cross-curricular delivery and/or collapsed timetable events are often used to complement delivery in specific timeslots.' (Keating et al, 2009; P 15); it is therefore deemed both rational and beneficial to prepare the students to contribute to and possibly lead these post qualification. Following from this, it was pragmatically recognised that such experience could usefully be emphasised in job applications and interviews, either for schools which have tried to develop their delivery in this way or for those which have not in recognition that their staff might not have the skills or experience required.

Another factor was that planning and delivery of focus days necessitates close collaboration with colleagues; accepting and delegating responsibilities; meeting deadlines; electronic communication, as much of the planning took place while students were on placements which can be over one hundred miles apart (but are usually at least a little closer); detailed planning; consultation and collaboration with experienced – but often not subject specialist – teachers. Such skills are developed through a range of strategies on the PGCE, of which focus day planning is a significant one. As well as concern for the effective development of each cohort of citizenship student teachers, tutors also expressed awareness of the need to develop the subject locally and nationally, and for future secure and valuable placements. Focus day planning is therefore seen as a way in which non-specialist experienced teachers can see how to be more imaginative in their approaches to the subject, and they would also have the benefit of being able to use the student teacher plans for the day and/or the materials developed for it. Further, it is seen as a means of demonstrating the difference of citizenship as a subject – that it is 'more than just a subject' – to raise its profile in schools and to create an impact in them. Finally, in recognition of the emphasis placed by various agencies on the Standards for the Award of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), which all student teachers have to provide evidence of having met in order to gain their teaching qualification, focus days are considered a possible vehicle for evidence of having addressed many of those standards.

It is only by asking the students and the teachers with whom they have worked that it can be discerned whether and to what extent any/all of the objectives had been met, which is the purpose of the research which informs the latter part of this article. It was assumed, and responses validate the assumption, that comments of the utility or otherwise of this activity were in the context of effective development of pupil learning and understanding of citizenship education.

Process

The introductory sessions take place early in the course, shortly after students have spent a week in their first placement schools, during a period of serial practice when they are in school for two days then university for three days for each of five consecutive weeks. In the first two years of planning focus days the whole cohort worked together to plan one day but, with the large numbers of student teachers involved (in 2010 the target number for recruitment allocated by the UK government's Training and Development Agency for Schools was 34), it was found to be more effective for them to work in two groups which each developing a focus day for a different school; the basic structure of preparation and delivery has remained unchanged.

The first university session is with the mentor from the school for whom the day is to be planned; in all but one case this has been a former citizenship student from the course. Students and the visiting mentor spend approximately one hour discussing the realities, fears, concerns, perceptions etc of learning to teach citizenship from the student viewpoint; this takes place in the absence of the subject tutor so that questions can be openly asked and honestly answered. Once the tutor returns, the mentor gives a brief presentation about the school and an outline of the theme set for the focus day which is always decided upon by the school in prior consultation with the university tutor. Students then ask further questions as they break down the task into a coherent series of foci and related activities, organising themselves into small groups to investigate and plan outline activities. They then have two hours in which to arrive at a basic structure for the day which is presented to the mentor and tutor, and to each other. One student is agreed upon to act as liaison with the mentor and to co-ordinate planning, requests for resources etc – usually but not always a student who is placed at the school for their first teaching practice – and the rest of the day is spent on further planning in the light of advice or concerns raised following the initial presentation.

During their first block practice students continue to collaborate and plan for the day as well as carrying out all the other requirements of their programme – subject tasks, observations, planning, teaching, researching and writing a 5000 word assignment, developing subject knowledge and skills,

etc – so that they can present the proposed content of the day to the mentor, tutor and each other during university sessions immediately before the winter break. In this way everyone can see how parts work together, what needs to be adjusted or developed, where unnecessary repetition can be removed; they can ensure a range of teaching and learning strategies and that their objectives will be met or reconsidered. This session serves to allow explicit critical feedback from students to each other and from the mentor and tutor, as well as reassuring them that the students are on task to ensure that the school pupils have an appropriate series of learning encounters.

The dates for the focus days are agreed between schools and the university before the introductory session. As far as possible these have been on the same day for both groups, ideally on a university subject day in order to minimise disruption to other schools during student placements and to avoid clashing with the professional studies sessions which are delivered to cross-curricular groups on this programme.

A crucially important element in planning has been the use of the university's virtual learning environment (VLE). This enabled students to share initial plans and to support each others' progress and development, as well as ensuring that apparent duplications can be avoided while also allowing disparate plans to be given a coherent and unifying overarching structure. As the two groups work separately and on different topics, it has also allowed sharing of ideas and content between the groups so that student teachers build up a body of plans, materials and activities irrespective of the activity in which they will be involved.

The purpose here is not to summarise or analyse the content of the focus days. However, it is of interest to note that topics for the days have been wide ranging, including crime (several times and with a different focus in each), Britishness, diversity, economy, a United Nations General Assembly simulation, the environment, and global communities. The timing of the Britishness day was particularly serendipitous as it took place one week after the publication of "Curriculum Review – Diversity and Citizenship" (Ajegbo et al 2007), often referred to as the Ajegbo Report, which has since led to the inclusion of identity and diversity as a fourth strand to the National Curriculum for Citizenship in England; the complexity and significance of national identity has been much researched and commented upon both internationally (Tan and Hashim, 2009; Sears 2010) and with specific regard to England (Crick, 2008; Murray, 2008). The two student teachers who led the planning and co-ordination of the Britishness day subsequently presented a paper outlining the

processes surrounding the planning and delivery to an international conference at Oxford University, and both now teach at schools which have since hosted focus days.

Structure(s) of the day(s)

Some days have started with an introductory assembly and some have ended with everyone coming together to share ideas and outcomes. A few have been built around pupils working with the same PGCE students throughout the day, but the more common format has been carousel delivery where pupils stay together and experience four or five sessions and student teachers present one sessions the appropriate number of times. There have been a lot of ICT/power point stimuli as well as bits of paper and sticky-backed plastic activities, with group work around specific tasks being the preferred learning activity. Student teachers understand that they have to enable the development of a range of skills as well as the accumulation of knowledge. Assessment has tended to be either informal or peer assessment on the day, with school teachers following up with more formal formative assessment in line with their planned programmes of study.

The only universally consistent element to each focus day has been that student teachers always have a member of the school teaching staff with them who acts as either a teaching assistance or a semi-passive observer. This gives pupils a sense of security and settlement, not least because some of issues of classroom management can be dealt with by a person known to the pupils and who knows that school's procedures, which is perceived as beneficial to all concerned. It also means that the aim of supporting the development of citizenship in schools by supporting the development of teachers can be realised. School staff also feed back to the student teachers, either at the end of the day or via the teacher with whom the students liaised throughout the planning, so that the students also have assessment and formative feedback.

No structured follow up procedures have been put in place, nor is there any formal assessment of students' involvement in or contribution to the day. Rather, they are required to reflect upon the strategies and activities employed, to adapt their own and others' ideas into elements of their practice during second block placement and – it is hoped but cannot be required or monitored effectively – into their careers as teachers. There is feedback from the mentors and their colleagues, and a tutor is present at each day. Commentary on participation and reflection is required in students' learning journals and details of the process contribute to their evidence towards the Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) standards which have to be met in order to qualify to teach.

There do not appear to have been many significant difficulties and certainly not any insurmountable problems. Student attrition from this course has been low in most years (nil for the first three years, averaging at less than 5% over its duration) and the few withdrawals or interruptions which have occurred prior to focus day delivery have been dealt with very effectively by the student teachers. Some reorganising of groups and reassignment of tasks has been required and achieved with the minimum of disruption and no obvious detrimental effect on the day itself. On three occasions there has not been a student placed at the school hosting a focus day, which required more e-mail communication and created some tense moments for the liaising teacher; there is clearly a preference from all concerned that liaison is between a mentor and student at the host school. There have also been two occasions when the student at the school was struggling with either the liaison role or with their own progress; in both cases the tutor spoke with the mentor and student concerned and another student took over the liaison role.

Experience indicates that, during teaching practice, student teachers should consistently be able to provide evidence of progress in relation to QTS Standards Q1, 2, 10, 14, 15, 18, 25d), 30, 31 in that their expectations and conduct should be consistently high and appropriate, they demonstrate an understanding of a range of factors which affect learning, they know their subject and related curricular requirements, and they can use a variety of techniques to effectively manage learning and behaviour. Many of the other standards can be less frequently identified securely, and focus days enable students to provide evidence towards a significant number of these as indicated in Table A, thus contributing to evidence in regard of 21 of the 33 QTS Standards.

Table A Qualified Teacher Standards Addressed by Focus Days

QTS Standard and descriptor	Relationship to focus days
4. Communicate effectively with children, young people, colleagues, parents and carers.	Students have to be able to communicate effectively with pupils they have not previously met, with teachers they have not met, and with each other.
5. Recognise and respect the contribution that colleagues, parents and carers can make to the development and well-being of children and young people to raising their levels of attainment.	It is essential to be part of and to recognise the collective contributions and their effects.
6. Having a commitment to collaborative and co-operative working.	Focus days cannot work without extensive and sustained collaboration and co-operation

7.a) Reflect on and improve their practice, and take responsibility for identifying and meeting their developing professional needs.	For many students this is a rare opportunity to work with someone at the same stage of learning to become a teacher, and it identifies for them what is possible to develop and how to approach such development.
8. Have a creative and constructively critical approach towards innovation, being prepared to adapt their practice where benefits and improvements are identified.	The format is itself innovative and presents opportunities for creative teaching and learning. The collaborative nature also provides insights into different ways of approaching a topic and therefore the opportunity to reflect and improve.
9. Act upon advice and feedback and be open to coaching and mentoring.	Advice is given by peers and by several experienced teachers.
17. Know how to use skills in literacy, numeracy and ICT to support their teaching and wider professional activities	These skills are necessary in planning, particularly ICT, beyond the predictable lesson activities of using a whiteboard and presenting on Power Point.
19. Know how to . . . take practical account of diversity and promote equality and inclusion in their teaching.	Given the nature of the majority of partnership schools, for many students a focus day can be their only opportunity to actively engage with particular aspects of differentiation and inclusion.
22. Plan for progression . . . designing effective learning sequences within lessons and across series of lessons . . .	Progression is more immediate as pupils spend five hours in one day on a theme, rather than five hours spread across ten weeks in the case of a two week time table.
23. Design opportunities for learners to develop their literacy, numeracy and ICT skills.	The extent of this varies depending upon learning activities, but there are opportunities to support pupils' literacy, numeracy and ICT.
25.a) Use a range of teaching strategies and resources . . . taking practical account of diversity and promoting equality and inclusion.	The days always cover a range of strategies and the development of appropriate resources.
25. b) Build on prior knowledge, develop concepts and processes, enable learners to apply new knowledge, understanding and skills and meet learning objectives.	Each session builds on another, and the days are planned with knowledge of their place in each school's citizenship education programme.

25.c) Adapt their language to suit the learners they teach . . .	Again, the nature of partnership schools means that students experience a wider range of abilities than they might otherwise encounter.
32. Work as a team member and identify opportunities for working with colleagues, sharing the development of good practice with them.	The whole thing depends upon teamwork in both planning and delivery, and groups share between as well as within.
33. Ensure that colleagues working with them are appropriately involved in supporting learning and understand the roles they are expected to fulfil.	The students have to ensure that their peers understand what is happening, roles have to be clear and effectively executed, and the teachers need to understand their role within the day.

QTS Standards abridged from <http://www.tda.gov.uk/>

Methodology

Brief prompt sheets, each comprising seventeen questions, were sent to the teachers who had liaised on the planning of focus day involvement of PGCE students in their schools (8 schools representing 12 focus days, of whom 5 replied, representing 8 focus days). A similar sheet, with thirteen questions, was sent to an unstructured sample of former citizenship PGCE students with whom tutors still had contact (16, of whom 8 responded). Those who were both a liaison teacher and a former PGCE student were asked to complete both sheets and those who had hosted more than one focus day were requested to complete a sheet for each day hosted.

There was an overlap within the sample as some respondents had, at different times, filled both the former student and focus day liaison roles; having been PGCE students on the course and therefore involved in planning and delivering focus days, they had since become teachers of citizenship in schools which provided the opportunity for focus day planning and presentation.

The low response rate was disappointing and serves to render findings less representative than had been anticipated. As this study is intended to be illustrative rather than definitive, it is not rendered invalid by this return. It may be that those who did not respond to the questions could have offered alternative information or contrasting insights. 75% of focus day hosts schools and 50% of pre-service teacher participants did respond, so that there are adequate qualitative data from which to gain some understanding and draw conclusions.

Host schools/research population

Host schools are described here as indicative that focus days can be effective in a range of education systems and differing provision. Focus days had been planned and carried out at two grammar schools, one academy, two high schools now (but not when hosting focus days) in the process of becoming academies, two further high schools, one faith comprehensive. All but the two grammar schools are co-educational; all schools are in the state sector and in areas which operate selection at 11.

School A is a highly academic school with outstanding public examination results, including 75% of pupils achieving the top two grades in the national examination for Citizenship Studies intended for 16 year olds (GCSE) which they sit at the age of 15. Their Year 13 (age 18) average point score, indicative of university potential, was in excess of 1070 (the national average for state schools was 757.4). There has been a commitment to citizenship education since 1990, initially with structured cross-curricular provision then with discrete lessons since 2002, as well as a much longer tradition of active involvement in the community. The school has supported citizenship PGCE students since the course started. AS level Citizenship was introduced in 2010 for pupils in years 11 and 12. There are two citizenship specialist teachers.

School B is academically successful school with an average Year 13 score just short of 840. There is no public examination entry for GCSE Citizenship. The school has no citizenship specialists and has developed its citizenship provision into a stand-alone, non-examination subject in KS 3 (age 11-14) and 4 (age 14-16). It has been led by a very enthusiastic 'convert' (Leighton 2004a) to the subject, who has been a highly committed and effective mentor as well as very conscious of the limitations of expertise and provision at the school. It has taken Citizenship PGCE students on an irregular basis.

At School C the average Year 13 point score was almost 500. A mainstream high school, it has a large dedicated centre for pupils with significant learning and behaviour issues, There is non-examination Citizenship provision as well as a GCSE full course option, with a department led by a trained specialist and experienced mentor, with one other specialist. The school regularly supports Citizenship PGCE students.

School D pupils achieved a Year 13 average just over 615. A full course GCSE is available within its options, and there is a compulsory KS3 programme. The school has a long-standing tradition of supporting PGCE citizenship students led by a specialist Head of Department and one other specialist.

Provision in School E is led by a specialist supported by two further specialists since 2010. KS3 pupils have fortnightly citizenship lessons, and in KS4 they have an optional Public Services course. There is no sixth form. The school has supported PGCE students in the recent past, but both this and subject provision have been hampered by high levels of staff turnover.

School F is a specialist humanities school which has supported the Citizenship PGCE from its inception, currently with four specialists (one of whom leads the school's alternative curriculum provision). The Year 13 average score was just under 430. There is a longstanding KS3 programme and, for several years, GCSE Citizenship was offered only as an after school activity. This remains the case for the short course but the full GCSE is now available as a KS4 option, as are AS and A2.

School G also has humanities specialist status and a long-standing involvement in the Citizenship PGCE. There are currently two specialists and one 'convert' (Leighton 2004b) mentor, delivering KS3 and 4 Citizenship. Over 30% of pupils have particular learning needs or disabilities. The average Year 13 score is slightly above 610. Following a recent Ofsted inspection, the content and structure of the curriculum are under review.

School H is an academy with one Citizenship specialist working within the Values provision of the school – a combination of Citizenship, RE and PSHEE – and has recently supported PGCE Citizenship students. All pupils follow a core KS3 programme and the GCSE short course in KS4. The Year 13 average is just below 530.

Results and analysis – liaison teachers

There was general agreement that pupils benefitted from being able to spend concentrated and dedicated time investigating an issue in depth, something which one liaison teacher identified as being raised by pupils, and who went on to comment that the pupils 'felt the benefit of having an issue presented to them in many different formats' (Liaison teacher, School F). Another stated that it was highly beneficial for the pupils to have some experiential learning without the concern that their learning would be subject to book-based assessment.

Liaison teachers also commented that 'the credibility of the subject area has increased, a whole day event bring the department some credibility' (Liaison Teacher, School E). It was generally reported that established staff in each school viewed the days positively. The PGCE students were seen to conduct themselves as good citizens as well as good teachers, always competent and courteous.

Teacher supervising groups were consistently positive about the workshops which they supported and pupils were reported to confirm this view by enjoying the day. On one workshop-based day, the artefacts created by the pupils were perceived as one way in which teaching staff not otherwise involved could find further confirmation of a successful day. One response stated that 'Other staff loved it! Some excellent practice was shared and some ideas have been incorporated into schemes of work.' (Liaison Teacher, School D)

Some liaison teachers showed awareness of possible benefits to PGCE students, with one noting that PGCE students enjoy the collaborative nature of the day and working in/seeing a new school. It also gives them and their host school a reminder about the practical nature of Citizenship, and how different ways of teaching, can create a different outcome, as opposed to the didactic teaching that we can fall into. (Liaison Teacher, School F)

It is the opportunities for collaboration which mentors emphasise, along with the benefits for student teachers of encountering a third school. In particular, as the schools introduce the students as citizenship experts from the university, they are recognised as 'a professional rather than the student teacher and the stigma which is often attached' (Liaison Teacher, School B), while the pupils were considered often to be more engaged when things are presented in different formats and by different people.

It was generally the case that staff who would have normally been teaching the year group involved accompanied their classes to sessions. This could sometimes be as many as 30 teachers during the day across all classes, while some schools found it more convenient to keep to a small and specific group – usually form teachers. In all cases it was noted that established staff were used to implement school behaviour policy.

Schools found the day beneficial for other, more pragmatic, reasons. One teacher offered the observation that having PGCE students in from the university make a focus day much easier to organise than trying to co-ordinate nine separate organisations and associated individuals. The latter was seen as significantly more work and effort, as well as harbouring potentially problems with regard to both the quality and cost of speakers and other practitioners: the school felt secure in its expectations of PGCE specialists. At the same time, liaising with the students and the university were not seen as problem free, with students not always as quick to communicate with schools as some liaison teachers would have liked.

Many of the schools have integrated the student-planned activities into their schemes of work. None has adopted the focus day approach across the whole curriculum but some have collaborated on such days with other subjects. All teacher responses indicate that the benefits to them and to their pupils far outweigh any disadvantages, with one response to my questions concluding with '[n]o drawbacks, . . . It was a thoroughly successful and enriching day' (Liaison Teacher, School B).

Results and analysis – student teachers

The aspect of focus days most regularly identified as a benefit by student teachers was the opportunity to be involved in collaborative practice, closely followed by the development of subject knowledge. For some students the experience of collaboration in schools had been either to lead or to follow, rarely had it been to work in jointly in preparation and delivery. The academic backgrounds of Citizenship PGCE students is highly diverse (Leighton 2004b) and their opportunities to teach their subject on placement heavily dependent upon mentoring and school curriculum (Leighton 2004b) so that there inevitably gaps in their subject knowledge and opportunities to address these in practice can be limited. For many, but not all, focus days provide one such opportunity.

Those students who led or co-ordinated the planning found this a both a benefit and a drawback. While enjoying the opportunity to organise and to accept responsibility, they felt that the additional demands on their time and efforts were considerable – a situation exacerbated by a lack of authority over those of their peers who were not meeting deadlines or not seeming to be fully committed. One student teacher, whose first post was as subject leader for citizenship, perceived a longer term benefit to having to ensure that everyone did as agreed by the required dates in that skills and strategies were developed which were 'useful when I arrived at my full time employment for dealing with difficult members of staff.'

Another benefit identified by the students was that of experiencing a different type of school. Most of the partnership schools operate within a selective system, and not all students have the opportunity to work with pupils whom that system identifies as academically more able. Those students who then work on a focus day in a grammar school thus gain some experience of such an environment and in supporting those pupils' learning. For some it was also an opportunity to spend time in an environment where their subject was clearly valued. Some students did not get the

experience of working in a different school or a different type of school, so that such benefits were unevenly distributed.

Other benefits were perhaps more personal and specific, such as having prepared and delivered a whole-school assembly and developing a close professional relationship with a particular colleague; boosted confidence. One self-aware student observed that

I find it difficult to work as part of a team, as I like to have things done my way! This was not possible in this instance as there were many other people involved in the running of the day.

The main disadvantages identified revolved around the perennial issue that 'as with everything on the PGCE the only drawback was lack of time'. Communication with the schools and between students varied in quality and punctuality, which had an effect on planning and resourcing, and the perceived 'extra' work was considered by some to be a burden – even if they felt the process and the day to have been worthwhile. Many students were aware of the limitations placed on their planning by not knowing their prospective pupils and not having a clear idea of their prior learning and understanding.

Since qualifying, all the students have used the materials from their focus days in their teaching. Most have been involved in planning and delivering similar activities, often cross-curricular in the way which Ratcliffe (2005) advocates, and all have adapted the plans and materials they and their colleagues produced so that these now form schemes of work and learning activities.

Conclusions and implications

The reasons for requiring student teachers to work on focus days were:

1. to prepare the students to contribute to and possibly lead such days;
2. it is relevant to job applications for schools which either aspire to or do use such days;
3. planning and delivery demands collaboration, delegation, meeting deadlines, electronic communication, detailed planning; working with non-specialist teachers;
4. the need to develop the subject locally and nationally;
5. for future secure and valuable placements;
6. non-specialist experienced teachers could see how to be more imaginative, and would be able to use the plans and materials;
7. they are a means of demonstrating the difference of citizenship as a subject, to raise its profile in schools and to create an impact in them;

8. for student teachers they are a vehicle for evidence of having addressed many of the QTS standards.

Responses indicate the extent to which these were achieved, and whether there were any unintended consequences:

1. once qualified, most of the students continue to contribute to focus days and only one stated no involvement in planning these;
2. nobody mentioned the relevance or otherwise to job applications;
3. the skills predicted were identified;
4. schools have been able to use materials to develop the subject;
5. the quality of support offered by the schools to PGCE students and in developing the subject continues in the main to be excellent. One school is currently in special measures and the subject leader in another has recently retired.
6. feedback suggests that non-specialists teachers have found the subject easier to access and develop following their involvement in focus day delivery;
7. impact, difference and profile were all positively commented upon;
8. no respondent expressly identified any QTS Standards. The comments offered showed an awareness of addressing all of the expected Standards, although Q22 and Q25c) were more challenging.

This suggests that the stated aims of focus day planning as part of the 11-18 PGCE Citizenship course are largely met. Even though evidence of addressing Q22 and Q25c) adequately was hard to locate, these are Standards which should be addressed in classroom practice and the lack of secure evidence towards these is not an indicator of a failed activity. Overall, it is possible to note with some confidence that the Ofsted concern over pupils' '[n]egative attitudes derived from dull teaching, uniformity of approach and insufficient scope for students to work in any depth.' (Ofsted 2010:12) can be combated to some extent and on a number of levels through wider adoption of a focus day strategy.

While these findings would suggest that there is significant value to the use of focus days in both PGCE programmes and in school curricula for Citizenship Education, such a conclusion has to be contextualised. The student teacher participants in this study were all subject specialists, as were all but one of the liaison teachers, and all focus days were delivered within a structured programme in each school. There are no findings to suggest that the utility of focus days when conducted by

people with such expertise can be compared with those delivered by non-specialists, or that one-off days have the value of planned programmes.

There are many models for the delivery of citizenship education. The final report of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (Keating et al, 2010), based on data collected and analysed over nine years from 43,410 pupils, 3,212 teachers and 690 schools, firmly concludes that the most important elements in sustained effectiveness in citizenship education were 'deliver[y] in a discrete slot in the timetable of over 45 minutes per week (and) develop[ment] by the teachers who are delivering the citizenship curriculum rather than the school's coordinator for Personal, Social, and Health Education' (Keating et al 2010, p65) . However, some schools do not have such specialists in post while other opportunities are present through which the experience of citizenship education can be enhanced for pupils. The findings of Keating et al (2010) echo the perception of Breslin (2005) among others, that effective and successful citizenship education is dependent upon 'a clear core Citizenship programme that addresses the key themes of National Curriculum Citizenship, a recognisable, appropriately qualified and resourced citizenship 'team' of subject specialists, a range of activities across the school and in the community.' (Breslin 2005: 310) The focus days considered in this study were in place to augment rather than replace such provision.

References

- Ajegbo, K., Kiwan D, Sharma S (2007) *Curriculum Review – Diversity and Citizenship* Nottingham: DfES
- Breslin, T. (2005) 'Delivering National Curriculum Citizenship: Comparing and Applying Curriculum Models', in T. Breslin & B. Dufour (eds) *Developing Citizens* London: Hodder Murray
- Crick, B. (2008) Citizenship, Diversity and National Identity *London Review of Education* 6(1), pp.31-38.
- Faulks, K., (2006) 'Education for citizenship in England's secondary schools: a critique of current principle and practice *Journal of Education Policy* 21(1), pp. 59-74
- 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.
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E. and Lopes, J. (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) Research Report DFE-RR059* London: DfE

- Kerr, D., Lopes, J., Nelson, J., White, K., Cleaver, E., & Benton, T. (2007) *VISION versus PRAGMATISM: Citizenship in the Secondary School Curriculum in England. Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Fifth Annual Report (Research Report RR845)* London: DfES
- Leighton, R. (2004a) 'The Nature of Citizenship Education provision: an initial study', *The Curriculum Journal* 15:2 pp.167-181
- Leighton, R. (2004b) 'Mentoring Citizenship Trainees' *Teaching Citizenship* Issue 9, Autumn 2004 pp. 26-31
- Murray, H (2008) 'Curriculum Wars; national identity and education' in *London Review of Education* 6:1 pp. 39-48
- Ofsted (2006) *Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools* London: Ofsted
- Ofsted (2010) *Citizenship Established? Citizenship in schools 2006/9* Manchester: Ofsted
- Ratcliffe, M. (2005) 'Citizenship Education and the Social Implications of Science and Scientific Learning' in T. Breslin and B Dufour (eds) (2005) *Developing Citizens* London: Hodder Murray
- Sears, A. (2010) 'Possibilities and Problems: Citizenship Education in a Multi-National State: The Case of Canada' in A. Reid, J, Gill, A. Sears (eds) *Globalization, the Nation State and the Citizen: Dilemmas and Directions for Citizenship Education* New York and London: Routledge pp 191-205
- Tan, C. and Hashim, R. (2009) 'A Hyphenated Identity: Fostering National Unity Through Education in Malaysia and Singapore' in *Citizenship Teaching and Learning* 5:1 pp46-59
- <http://www.tda.gov.uk/training-provider/itt/qts-standards-itt-requirements/guidance/qts-standards.aspx> accessed 28 March 2011
- <http://www.teachingexpertise.com/articles/19-developing-citizenship-sharing-our-experiences-891> accessed 29 April 2010

Teaching Citizenship Education – A Radical Approach

Ralph Leighton

Continuum International Publishing Group

The Tower Building
11 York Road
London
SE1 7NX

80 Maiden Lane Suite 704
New York NY 10038

www.continuumbooks.com

© Ralph Leighton 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

[Ralph Leighton has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Author of this work.](#)

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: 9781441165107 (paperback)
9781441104694 (hardcover)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

To come

Typeset by

Printed and bound in Great Britain by

To my parents,

with love and admiration

CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Teaching Citizenship

2. School Ethos

3. Identity

4. Diversity

5. Pupil Voice(s)

6. Political Engagement

7. Active Citizenship

8. Social Order

9. Political Knowledge

10. What Next?

Glossary

Bibliography

Index

Acknowledgements

Many colleagues at Canterbury Christ Church University have engaged with the ideas and arguments put forward here – not always in agreement, but consistently with critical awareness, intellectual rigour and generosity of spirit. The most significant of these is Andrew Peterson, who is an inspirational and supportive colleague as well as a good friend. I have also been encouraged by Lynn Revell, John Moss, William Stow, Yvonne Stewart, and Trisha Driscoll, and by past and present members of the PGCE 11-18 team, all of whom I thank for their valued support.

The Citizenship Education community in the UK is wonderfully supportive, none more so in early stages of this book than Stephen Fairbrass and Lee Jerome. Richard Bailey, James Arthur, Ian Davis, and Liam Gearon have also encouraged my attempts to grapple with citizenship education, and have been unstinting in their willingness to critically engage with my ideas – always to my benefit.

Any teacher worthy of the title learns from those they teach. Without the mixture of wonder, cynicism, enthusiasm, belligerence, insight, application, cussedness, patience, challenge, humour, questioning, inspiration, and general teen-agedness of those I have taught in schools, this book would not exist. More recently, PGCE Citizenship students at Canterbury Christ Church University have kept me on my toes and sustained my confidence in the coming generations of teachers.

The invaluable contributions of Charlotte McGregor at WEDG, Linsey Cameron of the University of Kent, and of my former students Durotimi Adeboye, Kola Adesina, Helen Loader and Philip Tutin are gratefully acknowledge and appreciated. My thanks also go to headteachers Liz Mahindru at Merrylee Primary School and Sarah Parker at Denbigh School, and to Tony Gilland from Debating Matters and Sophie O'Connor for their cooperation, and to Libby Tudball of Monash University, Australia, for alerting me to the programmes discussed in Case Study #8.

The support, advice and understanding of Ally Baker and everyone at Continuum who saw the glimmer of an idea develop into a book of which I am proud, and I hope they are as well. Ally's commitment to the project from the outset, and her advice during its gestation and development, have been key to its successful completion.

Most of all, appreciation and love beyond words go to Jo Letchford and our daughter Jen Leighton for their unstinting encouragement, patience and support.

INTRODUCTION

In educational terms, the twenty first century began in England with the establishment of citizenship education as a statutory subject for Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 which, it was claimed, would bring about a change in the political culture of the nation (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998). Given how remarkably similar the 1990 National Curriculum had been to the requirements of The School Board Act of 1904, as explained by Bailey (1996), the introduction of a new subject might at least have been expected to bring about a change in the culture of schools. Yet citizenship education is in danger of becoming just like all other subjects by being constrained by the straightjacket of previous methods, previous expectations, and previous outcomes – what Rudduck describes as ‘innovation without change’ (1991, p26).

RADICAL APPROACHES

This book adopts some of the insights and arguments provided by advocates of radical and democratic approaches to education to demonstrate that citizenship education can become a liberating and empowering force for change. It is less about ‘how to’ or ‘what to’ and much more about ‘why to’, a book intended to encourage readers to think about the nature of the subject and about the experiences of those who study it and those who teach it. As Blake et al observe, ‘[e]ducation is not the determination of who the student should be, but of how she might become’ (2000, p195), not a process for inducting pupils into a mould but a series of experiences which will enable them to fulfil their potential – this surely applies equally to teachers and pupils, that the journey and the process and the experience of our development is our education.

This introduction provides an overview of the book and the contexts for which it has been developed, including the increased expectations for Masters’ Level work for student teachers and for practising teachers – and how this can benefit their teaching rather than being one more hurdle or a means to promotion. A key principle throughout is the notion that ‘[e]ducation for Citizenship equips young people with the knowledge, skills and understanding to play an effective role in public life’ (QCA 2007; p27 and again p41). That sentence and those which come immediately after it are a call for action rather than

passivity, for involvement not apathy, for excitement to replace boredom, to speak out instead of remaining silent, to understand how things are and how they might be improved. These are not typical ambitions in most classrooms in England but they are at the forefront of a radical approach to teaching citizenship education.

It is unlikely that any teacher underestimates the importance of their calling, and it should be of great concern to us all if they did, for there is nothing more important than education. As Baldelli (1971) puts it, 'education is the process whereby competent persons come into being' (p88); he stresses the essential component of the role of the teacher as 'integrity' in much the same way as Blake et al (2000) identify 'devotion', Draper (2001) writes of 'joy' and 'excitement', and Day (2004) emphasises 'passion'. Any education, and that must include any teaching, which is not served by integrity, developed with excitement, imbued with passion and pursued with devotion, is guilty of 'mental warping and discredit' (Baldelli, 1971; p88). If it is true that education in general is about developing competent people, then it has to be the case that citizenship education is about developing people's competence in their roles as citizens and that they are supported toward that end with integrity and passion, with joy and excitement. In turn we should be aiming to encourage and enable the desire for learning among our pupils and our students.

Radical approaches to education are not new, even if what constitutes radical must vary with time and place. Godwin (1797) explained that study without the desire to learn and to develop is not a real activity but a mockery. This remains true over two centuries later, and particularly true of radical citizenship education – an approach aimed at developing the desire to learn, to share, to understand, to acknowledge but not to fear difference, to understand and enable change. Indeed, while this is particularly true of citizenship education, it must be the aspiration of all education in all subjects and in all age-phases. As Blake et al (2000) coherently and crucially argue, education without risk might meet the aspirations of bureaucracy and standards agenda adherents, but it isn't really education at all. When discussing the competing roles of technologist and philosopher which teachers might try to balance, they observe that the '[t]ranquillised acceptance of the technological

approach is the real danger zone, the threat of a kind of nihilism' (Blake et al 2000, p13). They are not arguing that technique is an inherently bad thing, nor that teachers should not be technologically competent, but that they must not become technocrats; the machinery and processes of education are simply tools to enable learning, and the question 'what is learning?' must matter more than the question 'can you see this at the back?' This is part of the radical approach to citizenship education, the approach which encourages thought and action – and a conscious connection between these – above process and passivity, which will enable both the subject and society to develop.

Citizenship education is not always taught with confidence or imagination, although that situation is reportedly improving year on year (Ofsted 2006, Ofsted 2010). The introduction of Key Stage levels, public examinations, cross-curricular provision, and the recruitment of non-specialist teachers and non-specialist inspectors strongly implies that citizenship education is far from becoming 'more than just a subject' as proposed by the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998). This book responds to the needs and aspirations of those who are dedicated to the ideals and principles of citizenship education but lack the time or opportunity – or lack awareness that they are not alone in aspiring to enable their pupils to make a difference – to clarify how best these can be achieved. Student teachers of citizenship education currently have a few supporting texts which are largely concerned with meeting school and National Curriculum requirements and expectations rather than offering an alternative and critical approach. Recent literature (Faulks, 2006a, 2006b; Gillborn, 2006; Leighton, 2006; Clemintshaw, 2008; Harber, 2009; Brown and Fairbrass, 2010) has identified a growing (re)awareness of the need for questioning and radical approaches to education in general and, for some, to citizenship education in particular. Within that discussion there is emerging an awareness that to plan lessons which address the National Curriculum concepts, processes, range and content and identified curriculum opportunities one by one or, even worse, to simply recycle lesson plans year on year, is to do a disservice to pupils and to society.

CONTEXT

While often identified as a subject arising from the findings and recommendations of the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998), there has been provision for citizenship education as a cross-curricular theme since the National Curriculum was established in England in 1988. The introduction of the National Curriculum and other contemporaneous reforms of education were seen in many schools and by many teachers as a threat and a challenge, with specific allocations of time for some subjects, an official hierarchy of subjects, directions and directives regarding content and styles of delivery, cross-curricular themes, the establishment of a new system and style of inspections. New tests were introduced throughout primary and secondary education, and public examinations were reformed. It is no great surprise that citizenship education was largely ignored during such an upheaval, and there seems to have been no great sense of urgency on the part of government to enforce its own directives with regard to the provision of this particular cross-curricular theme.

The change in government from Conservative to Labour in 1997 heralded many reforms across political and social arenas, one of which was the eventual introduction of citizenship education as a statutory requirement at Key Stages 3 and 4. While Crick and his colleagues recommended that it should be introduced in 2000, the government delayed this in the expectation that schools would use the time to prepare. It is open to question how many schools took appropriate advantage of this time allowance, but one essential preparation not embarked upon early enough was the development of specialist teachers of citizenship education; this did not start at all until 2001 and not extensively until 2002, the year the subject was to be introduced into school, thus ensuring that this new subject began with a number of disadvantages which have yet to be fully overcome. Even now, a decade later, teacher education numbers have been limited to the extent that there are not enough specialist teachers to ensure that every school in England has at least one member of staff who has studied citizenship education as their specialism.

An inevitable consequence was that teachers were under-prepared to develop and deliver what has been referred to as a 'soft-touch' curriculum. After fourteen years of teaching to

the National Curriculum and therefore being told what to teach, and sometimes how to teach it, those same teachers were suddenly expected to work out how to be creative and innovative, producing learning activities which would emphasise the nature of citizenship 'as more than just a subject' (Brett, 2004) in a field of learning which was neither their specialism nor often of particular interest to them. Textbooks were produced and purchased before anyone had a clear sense of what was to be taught, never mind discussing who was going to teach it. By the time some thought appeared to have been given to the more crucial issue of what should be learned – not always the same as what should be taught – schools had already planned either their delivery of citizenship education or their strategies to avoid delivering it (Leighton 2004).

The situation therefore arose that student teachers of citizenship education were being supported in their development by people with varying degrees of expertise in teaching but virtually no experience of teaching citizenship. Even those teachers who, like me, qualified to teach before the National Curriculum was introduced, and had been involved in developing programmes of study which were aimed at raising awareness of social and political issues for several years prior to the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998), could only claim limited experience of teaching the subject. Many school-based mentors had less experience as well as varying degrees of interest in the subject, so that the first few cohorts of specialist qualified teachers of citizenship education were supported by people still trying to work out how best teaching and learning might be achieved. This book represents the thinking behind some of my own attempts to work that out.

PURPOSES OF THIS BOOK

Where Sellar and Yeatman introduce their unique perspective on education with the observation 'that for every one person who wants to teach there are approximately 30 who don't want to learn – much' (1976, p vii) they did not have citizenship education in mind. If they had, they might have added something to the effect that there is also a staffroom full of people who don't think it should be taught – much – and not by them.

One of the aims of this book is to eradicate that attitude. All teachers have to accept their responsibilities as teachers of citizenship education as well as of whatever other subject(s) they are qualified to teach. Poor awareness of chronology, speech patterns, scientific processes, arithmetic, courtesy, locations, aesthetics etc by teachers of any subject could result in equally poor awareness amongst their pupils. The same is true of citizenship education, with even greater repercussions for society. All teachers are teachers of citizenship education.

Another aim is to encourage a more complete approach to education in general. Emphasis is often placed upon the accumulation of 'facts', of little snippets of information which are mistaken for learning and understanding, those things which can be easily identified, examined and measured, which constitute one part of what Harber (2009, p31) describes as lopsided education. It has been pointed out (Rattray Taylor, 1974; Rudduck 1991) that apparently new terminology or new approaches to learning often transpire to be nothing more than cognitive education in a different format – as if wearing a new hat would make me a different person. Currently, even the National Curriculum emphasis on skills appears to require naming and explaining such skills rather than demonstrating and developing them. It is true that some employment focused knowledge and skills are demanded by the National Curriculum – and, we must recognise, by pupils and by the adults responsible for them – but, '[s]uch skills are, of course, necessary. But in a human sense they are trivial' (Rattray Taylor, 1974; p222). Our pupils will leave school and, in most cases, be in some form of employment for about 30% of the day for about 85% of the year for less than 75% of their lifespan – or roughly 20% of their post-school existence – but they will exist as people all the time, throughout their lives; we have to allow them the opportunity to develop more than skills for work.

Considerable progress is being made in the development of initial teacher training and in continued professional development for teachers of citizenship education. However, the

emphasis largely continues to be on what to teach and how to teach it, rather than on why citizenship education should be taught and how best its objectives might be met. A subject in which questioning is fundamental appears to have been developed without questioning itself. Another of the central aims of this book, therefore, is to encourage teachers and student teachers to challenge that approach, to be more questioning of themselves, their peers, each other, and of the subject; the purpose of that questioning must be to gain a deeper understanding of what we are trying to achieve, and greater insights into achieving it.

This questioning approach must become integral to the work of teachers and student teachers of citizenship education. Not only in questioning why things are the way they are – or, even better, whether they are the way they seem to be – but holding all sources up to scrutiny and examination. On most routes to qualified teacher status (QTS) in England there is an option if not a requirement that student teachers begin to write at Masters level; ideally this will support teachers' development so that they also think and teach at (but not to) Masters level. This cannot be achieved without engaging in close scrutiny and critical examination of data, policies, arguments, practices and texts – including this one. Student assignments which cite one or two official reports (usually Crick and possibly one other) and a few chapters from one of the 'how to' textbooks, while often useful and informative, are not examples of Masters' thinking and writing. The references in each chapter of this book indicate more closely the range of sources with which Masters' students should engage.

To say that you agree with me because I'm right, or you disagree with me because I'm wrong, is not enough; these positions need to be explained, demonstrated, argued and supported with credible evidence. That is what Masters writing is about and what citizenship education should be about. There is a thoroughly understandable professional advancement rationale behind the pursuit of Masters qualifications, but an even important motivation should be the enhancement of one's understanding of the skills and complexity of teaching and therefore be better equipped to teach.

SUBVERSIVE EDUCATION AND RADICAL APPROACHES

The work of Postman and Weingartner (1976) shaped much of my understanding as a student teacher and my subsequent practise, and it shapes the approach taken in this book. I have borrowed from, applied and developed some of their ideas in order to demonstrate the need for belief, commitment and passion in citizenship education and that, even though they were writing at a different time and in a different place, and about the whole field of education rather than one specific aspect of it, their work remains relevant because so little of substance has changed.

The influences of a great many other writers, researchers and thinkers will be evident in this text. By no means all are educationists, nor are they necessarily academics or of a radical disposition; if citizenship education is to have any chance of success, it must be truly inclusive. Most of these writers have argued in favour of a questioning approach to life in general; not simply asking questions, but considering which questions to ask, and of whom – much in the same way, I hope, as teachers of citizenship education encourage their pupils.

Postman and Weingartner (1976) wrote of the potential for teaching to be subversive, a principle which can be applied in particular to the teaching of citizenship education (Leighton 2006). In substituting 'radical' I aim to reclaim a respectable term from media and political abuse and misuse. It is not a call to armed insurrection and a bloodbath of all who disagree, but a challenge to face up to and attempt to resolve some of the problems of society, to undermine the attitudes which result in suffering and the processes which result in feelings of hopelessness and alienation. Postman and Weingartner listed some of the problems of their time and, while both order and magnitude might have changed, the basic concerns have not.

The quality of living in the world's richest societies has not improved; if anything has changed at all, it is that we can add further social ills to their 'litany of alarm' (Arthur 2003). Religious fundamentalism and religious intolerance have become problems which conceal and thrive upon other problems and which allow manipulation on all sides. Debt, once seen as the preserve of the poor, is now a personal issue which goes across social class as well as being a national problem on a global scale. There is the dichotomy of both falling standards and unrealistic expectations in a number of public spheres – and possibly in private as well. In the field of public involvement and representation we find a many faceted and interconnected set of problems: political apathy, political intolerance, political inertia, political disempowerment – and the problem of politicians who neither deserve nor earn respect. As Tenzin Gyatso, the fourteenth Dalai Lama, has observed,

we are in danger of losing touch with those aspects of human knowledge and understanding that aspire towards honesty and altruism . . . No one can deny the unprecedented material benefits of science and technology, but our basic human problems remain: we are still faced with the same, if not more, suffering, fear, and tension. It is only logical to try and strike a balance between material development on the one hand and the development of spiritual human values on the other.
(quoted by Lehman 1999; p166)

As people contemplate these potential, or inevitable, or imagined, disasters, there is much metaphorical gnashing of teeth and rending of garments – but hand-wringing is not one of the skills which citizenship education can or should be concerned to develop. It would seem that many people think they can explain the world and feel free to complain about the world; the point must be to change it.

Over the years, many students have decorated their rooms or t-shirts with the slogan 'we are the people our parents warned us about'; if any of my generation think this remains true, they are deluding themselves. We are now the people our children warn us about. If the current social order does not seek to address and resolve problems such as those above

but instead, whether through deliberate endeavour or casual oversight, allows them to continue and to multiply, then that order must be scrutinised and exposed; to do anything else is at best hypocritical and at worst it is damning our children and their futures. The school pupils of today are, after all, those who will inherit whatever the current generations leave behind. One often hears of parents going to great lengths and making considerable sacrifices to provide for or protect their children; ensuring that they live in an honest and principled society is one way in which everyone's children can be protected.

The teaching of citizenship education should, at its best, equip young people with the tools, knowledge, skills and information through which such scrutiny can be conducted. The purpose and practice of citizenship education is not to produce mindless electoral fodder or obedient social drones overdosing on volunteerism and unconsidered beneficence, but to question a society which accommodates or even expects and accepts problems such as those mentioned above. With such a questioning approach, young people can be enabled to subvert values and structures shown to be bankrupt, while retaining those demonstrably effective and appropriate to their lives; it is crucial that they are supported and encouraged to identify moral bankruptcy and ethical vacuums, and to be equipped to do something about them. It is from this position that I argue that the best teaching of citizenship education is both a subversive and an empowering process.

The notion that we need to get under the skin of an idea and of a society in order to really understand either is found in Lukes (1974), and the approach I advocate in this book stems in part from his analysis of the nature of power. Just as those with power determine what we think about, so the National Curriculum determines what we teach about. Critical citizens need to be able to question everything, take nothing for granted, and to decide for themselves whether to accept or reject particular positions and analyses. To teach the National Curriculum for Citizenship in a critical and radical framework requires that we scrutinise what we are expected to teach about and that we enable our pupils to critically engage with their own learning. Not only do we need to understand particular topics, but

such topics can only really be understood by critically considering the nature of the subject they comprise and by engaging with the bigger themes to which the parts contribute.

To offer one example: the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998) centres on the teaching of democracy in schools. The National Curriculum for Citizenship requires that teachers demonstrate that democracy is the best, fairest, most effective, most just political system. Such a position can be put forward by a civics education approach which details and examines institutions of government but does not question them; this would be neither radical nor subversive. More importantly, it would not be effective. There are many forms of democracy and there are many flaws in democratic processes; to deny these truths to our pupils is to deliberately limit their understanding and to invite their scorn and incredulity. The result of such an approach will be – and has been – to either limit pupils’ access to information or to distort their understanding of it. Much better, surely, to be honest with pupils by enabling them to scrutinise democratic and other political systems so that they can come to their own, well informed conclusions.

To do this is to be radical, in terms of state provided and monitored schooling, in that citizenship education would have to embrace and reflect educational ideas and actions which are significantly different from current practices. More than anything, it requires trust in the classroom. Trust in our abilities as teachers to support pupils’ learning, trust in our pupils’ abilities to learn and to think independently, and trust in their teachers by the pupils. As Peters and Bulut paraphrase Willis, ‘radical educators should see the resistant actions of youth . . . and engage with them’ (2010, p27). Postman and Weingartner identified the efficacy and accuracy of pupils’ crap detectors, and we forget about these at our peril.

There is a possibility that the reader will, by this point, have dismissed my approach as idealistic, that ‘it’s all very well in an ideal world but this is utopian nonsense’. I have no objection to utopianism in education, finding it immeasurably preferable to dull pragmatism

or unthinking ritualism, but the ideas and actions of a radical approach to citizenship education have to be rooted in reality; this is one reason for the case studies which feature in each chapter – to show what is being done beyond the mundane and predictable. These ‘case studies’ might be better described as a series of examples from either theory or practice which illustrate what can be achieved. They are not being held up as paragons of citizenship education, but as encouragement to teachers of citizenship education. They are grounded in reality and give us real examples to which we and our students – and our colleagues in school – can aspire.

The determination to keep things real is also why I have referenced the National Curriculum (QCA, 2007) and Ofsted reports. We have to work with the National Curriculum – it indicates what is expected in the teaching and learning of citizenship education and, while it is certainly not beyond criticism or a need to be overhauled and scrutinised, it provides the basis of the subject. That does not mean it should be regarded as a teaching target or the limits of what can and should be achieved, but that it is a starting point. Similarly, Ofsted inspections do not represent the pinnacle of either endeavour or achievement, but their reports do give some indication of what is happening in schools and it would be folly to ignore them.

The chapters in this book represent what I consider to be some of the central issues and themes of citizenship education, and the content of some is based on previously published articles and contributions to other texts. All are informed by my experience of teaching citizenship education in school and of supporting the development of PGCE Citizenship Education students at Canterbury Christ Church University. I have consciously avoided a narrow focus on specific topics within the National Curriculum because the National Curriculum for Citizenship does not have to be taught topic by topic. The nature, purpose and challenges of the subject are much greater than that, and it is with challenges that we begin.

It is the nature of any textbook on citizenship education that it will become dated by the time it is published. With the intention of minimizing that effect on the content of this book, a website has been established at <http://education.leighton.continuumbooks.com> which will be updated every six months for the next few years. In this site there is advice for tutors and student teachers, a list of websites which can offer further insights – both theoretical and practical, and there will be further case studies. It is not in the nature of a radical approach to tell other people what to do and how to do it, but there must be scope for sharing ideas and experiences. Kolb wrote that ‘Learning is the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience’ (1984; p.38), and it is intended that the website will enable all of us to continue to learn how to teach citizenship education. Just as we know that presenting pupils with opportunities to learn from their experiences will enable them to continue to develop as active and responsible (but hopefully not compliant) citizens, it will hopefully prevent us from becoming predictable, complacent and compliant teachers.

SUMMARY

The teaching of citizenship education as a radical and subversive subject can and will change the world. Something has to.

1. TEACHING CITIZENSHIP

The stated aim of the secondary National Curriculum for England (QCA, 2007) is to enable all young people to become successful learners, confident individuals and responsible citizens – not only through citizenship education but through all subjects. All teachers are enjoined to ensure that links are made between their subject ‘and work in other subjects and areas of the curriculum’. (QCA, 2007; p48). To a significant extent, then, all secondary teachers are teachers of citizenship education just as they are teachers of mathematics (particularly but not only numeracy), English (particularly but not only literacy), ICT, and everything else which pupils experience through both the overt and the hidden curriculum. This is a considerable challenge, particularly as few secondary teachers have the experience or expertise to deliver across the curriculum, and even more particularly when their responsibilities now include a subject – citizenship education – of which many have little knowledge or experience, and some have little awareness or interest. Fortunately the National Curriculum identifies and explains what many of these subject links are, but it offers less on how they might be achieved. As Bernstein (2010) notes, however, our concern should not be about covering the curriculum but about uncovering it – not regarding it as something to be delivered but as something to be understood, engaged with, investigated, interrogated, interpreted and used as a tool to enable pupil learning and pupil development.

Below we examine some of the challenges faced by citizenship education teachers, particularly the diversity of types of citizenship teacher, their backgrounds, their needs, and some strategies to support and develop them.

BACKGROUND

There can be no doubt that, whatever progress has been made since the subject was introduced in 2002, some schools are meeting the National Curriculum requirements for citizenship education to the letter rather than the spirit, and others are failing to go even that far (Ofsted 2003, 2006, 2010; Leighton 2004c; Gillborn 2006; Faulks 2006a; Kerr et al

2007). There are schools where the senior staff are not at all clear about what the National Curriculum for Citizenship entails, never mind whether the school is adhering to them, yet many of those schools offer good citizenship features in pupil experiences of teaching and learning, and in extra-curricular programmes. Equally, of course, there are other schools where senior staff have the same low level of understanding, and it shows.

The big question in the late 1960s was '[w]here do we get the new teachers necessary to translate the new education into action?' (Postman and Weingartner 1976; p130); in England since the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998) was presented, the question has been 'where do we get the teachers necessary to implement the National Curriculum for Citizenship?' While some of these pioneers have been drawn from the ranks of serving teachers qualified in other subjects, most have come from elsewhere and by no means all people teaching citizenship education are trained to do so. For many, it is nothing more than a headache and a timetable filler just as has been the case for Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHEE) in its various incarnations, for Religious Education, and for many other subjects to a lesser extent. It has also long been the case, however, that when a teacher is required to teach outside their subject they rarely do it with as much commitment, confidence and capability as when they teach the subject for which they are trained; this is something which those who chose not to employ specialist teachers either do not know or do not care about, and neither excuse is defensible.

The shortage of specialist teachers of citizenship makes the strategy of filling in with people lacking expertise inevitable in the short term, but we have to wonder whether it really is a short-term strategy. To date there has been little more than half the number of teachers qualified to teach citizenship education which would be required to ensure that all state secondary schools in England had at least one specialist; that initial teacher education programmes in the subject are oversubscribed indicates there is no shortage of potential citizenship education teachers. The DfE-sponsored continued professional development course for serving teachers to train as subject leaders in citizenship education has under-recruited in each year it has run, suggesting that most teachers are not inclined to retrain

outside their areas of interest, that some of those who are so inclined are not interested enough to give up the weekends required to follow the course, or that school managers are not interested enough in the subject or their teachers or their pupils to inform or encourage non-specialists with regard to such courses. This distinct shortage in dedicated, specialist teachers, with an understanding of the content and skills required of this compulsory subject, should result in competition between schools to ensure they can recruit such a specialist; as some schools have already recruited two and a few have three, and some specialist teachers have left the profession either temporarily or permanently, such competition should be intense. Not only is there no sign of intense competition to recruit specialist teachers of citizenship, 'with few schools advertising to recruit a specialist citizenship teacher' (Clemintshaw 2008; p83), but many such specialists find themselves filling other teaching posts (Leighton 2004a) or being required to supplement their timetables with subjects outside their expertise, and the uncertainty of employment remains a real concern amongst post graduate student teachers specialising in citizenship education.

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION TEACHING AND LEARNING

Citizenship education should be about being critical, learning that learning can be fun, that there are as many right answers as there are people searching for them. Many schools are now developing collapsed timetable days for the delivery of citizenship and other curriculum areas (see Case Study #3). At one such school, staff expressed considerable reservations regarding the programme planned by my citizenship education specialist student teachers; they thought the work was too advanced, too challenging, beyond the comprehension and competence of their pupils. By the end of the day, those same teachers expressed astonishment at the quality of work produced and the application demonstrated by pupils often perceived as problematic in class. Citizenship education teaching can therefore simultaneously challenge and support those teachers who settle for medium goals, for containment and control, rather than aiming to enable and encourage their pupils. It is to the credit of those teachers that they were quick to see and accept that their assumptions had been misplaced, and that they have continued to work to further develop

strategies which challenge their pupils, but far from all teachers react like that. If they did, we would never have heard of the self-fulfilling prophecy.

Paradoxically, this liberating and enabling function of effective citizenship education teaching and learning could be one of the things which militate against its wider deployment in schools. While teachers of citizenship education will encourage movement and participation, ‘authoritarians always flinch and stiffen when children even move out of their desks, and when children move faster they see them as potential rioters’. (Berg 1972, p 13) If citizenship education can unlock doors and tap into potential, pupils will expect other subjects to do the same. They won’t settle for mediocrity and passivity, so that effective citizenship education teaching and learning upsets the dependency on old teaching notes and lesson plans, it subverts other subjects and other classrooms and learning spaces.

When the Advisory Group on Citizenship (1998), Arthur and Wright (2001), Brett (2004) and others have contended that Citizenship education is ‘more than just a subject’, they have argued that the development of social responsibility and moral character require schools and teachers to develop new methods, new content, new activities, and new approaches to learning. Citizenship education must be relevant to the lives of pupils and to the lives of those around them if it is to have any long-lasting effect. It is not a subject to be taught by assumed experts to a receptive and passive audience – it is difficult to perceive of good practice in any subject in this way – but one which requires pupils to question themselves and those around them, to learn as much about their own potential as about their rights and responsibilities, to understand and to participate and to contribute. Where the subject, its content and its presentation are not seen as relevant, it simply does not work.

CITIZENSHIP TEACHERS

Non-specialist teachers of any subject regularly either try to fit their own discipline-defined strategies to the new to them subject or, more effectively, they adopt and adapt ideas from

experienced colleagues. Given the significant proportion of practising citizenship education teachers who are not specialists, it is no surprise that many will work closely with student teacher specialists in order to make their own delivery of citizenship education more relevant to their pupils. Those teaching students and practising teachers have indicated some commitment to Citizenship education and to ensuring its relevance to pupils as well as adhering to the National Curriculum. However, previous research (Leighton 2002, 2004a, 2004b) indicates that not all teachers of citizenship education see the subject requirements and their professional obligations in the same light.

The delivery of citizenship education in schools in England can best be described as erratic. This is certainly not due to a lack of information about the subject, given the plethora of internet sites, texts, documents, articles, handbooks, and involved NGOs which proliferate, although the inconsistencies between these and the poor quality of some of these materials might be contributory factors. At least as important as such inconsistencies and erratic quality is the extent of the commitment of school leaders – which is considered in Chapter Two – and the demonstrable disparity of types of teacher of citizenship education.

Most secondary school teachers in England have a degree in their subject as well as a post-graduate qualification in that subject, but the vast majority of teachers of citizenship education have degrees in subjects other than that which they have been trained or timetabled to teach. An earlier study (Leighton 2004a) identified one training cohort of 23 students as including graduates in nine subjects, who had worked with 27 school based mentors whose qualifications to teach covered nine different subjects; only in the case of one mentor was that subject citizenship education. Since then, the institution where that cohort was studying has supported the development of a further 200 student teachers of citizenship education, only three of whom have had a degree in that subject. Currently, just under 30% of the mentors involved in supporting new student teachers are themselves specialist-qualified citizenship education teachers, most of whom gained their qualification at that same institution. It follows that student teachers of citizenship education continue largely to have degrees in other subjects and to be supported by teachers trained and

experienced in other subjects. Neither situation is inherently bad, but they do illustrate that citizenship teacher education is significantly different to that in others subjects – in few other subjects, if any, would it be expected that the great majority of applicants are graduates in almost any other subject except that which they wish to teach, that almost none had experienced the subject as a pupil or as an undergraduate student, and that the majority of those supporting their development were likewise lacking in experience of the subject as a pupil or as a student.

That research was based on interviews with student teachers of citizenship education and their subject mentors, and scrutiny of learning journals which the students completed as part of the process of reflecting on their professional progress and development, data brought together and considered in a framework of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA – see Smith and Osborn, 2003). This led initially to the conclusion that there were six distinct ‘types’ of teacher of citizenship education, but a wider ranging sample, further data and greater depth of analysis have revealed two more. While the classifications below (developed from Leighton 2004a and 2004b) are significant, they might not comprise an exhaustive list; the central issue is that there are many types of teacher of citizenship education.

1. Commitment: The decision to study to teach citizenship education is based on a belief in the underlying principles and content of the citizenship curriculum. Their academic backgrounds cover a wide range of subjects, and many have demonstrated their own active citizenship through political activism, working for one or more NGO, or involvement in voluntary activities with faith groups or support networks. There is a strong identification with a sense of mission, a desire to ‘make a difference’.

2. Conversion: Experienced teachers who recognise the importance of citizenship education to the extent that they are more interested in how to enable their pupils to acquire the requisite knowledge and develop the appropriate skills than in teaching their original

subject. Some of these teachers feel that they do not have the necessary skills and depth of knowledge to develop the subject adequately and actively seek the recruitment of specialist teachers with whom they could work. Many of the teachers who enrol on the DfS-funded CPD courses for the teaching of citizenship will be ‘converts’, but not all.

3. Convenience: Some of those who have trained or who are training as specialist teachers of citizenship see it as a route into teaching their degree subjects, with the added bonus of being able to offer a Key Stage 3 subject which other teachers might not be able (or want) to offer. With few initial teacher education programmes in the social sciences, some graduates in related subjects consider their chances of successful recruitment and subsequent employment to be greater on citizenship education programmes. It is certainly the case that many sociology or psychology graduates who have completed a PGCE in citizenship education still teach, but some teach their degree subject rather than their qualifying one. Although not something for which those teachers can be blamed, it leaves us with fewer practising expert teachers of citizenship education.

4. Co-existence: There are teachers trained in other subjects who believe that there is a need for citizenship education teaching, not at the expense of their main subject but possibly complementary to their schools’ PSHEE programmes; they often also perceive a need to prepare young people for life after school in ways which other subjects were not equipped to address. They tend to express what has been described (Leighton 2004a) as a “Not before time” perspective. These teachers, and student teachers training in other subjects, are keen to deliver discrete lessons in citizenship education and to ensure the explicit inclusion and identification of the citizenship education curriculum in their own subject specialist teaching.

5. Colonisation: Some teachers believe that they can deliver ‘their version’ of citizenship education, in line with Crick’s (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998) notion that programmes of citizenship education could be tailored to the requirements of their school

and the local community. This belief is based on the assumption that such requirements are both identifiable and identified, whereas such identification is often heavily influenced by the desire to protect and develop a particular pet interest or area of responsibility. Programmes of study which emphasise first aid, sex education, job applications and road safety, laudable as they might be, do not reflect the National Curriculum for Citizenship.

6. Compliance: Teachers of citizenship education who lack an adequate number of classes timetabled in their 'own' subject. Often younger and uniformly less experienced than their colleagues, they tend to want to avoid upsetting anyone who might be called upon to write a reference, so they do what they can. That they are compliant rather than dedicated or committed does not necessarily result in poorer teaching but it does produce greater anxiety for them, which is unlikely to benefit their teaching or their pupils' learning. More senior teachers who do not want to teach citizenship education are in a position to ensure they were not called upon to do so or, if so timetabled, they can find that the lessons coincide with 'unavoidable' meetings. In the past this left the lesson to be taught by a free and compliant or coerced junior colleague, something which agreements to limit the amount of cover a teacher can do is slowly changing.

7. Conflict: Some teachers are actively opposed to the teaching of citizenship education – either by themselves or by anyone else. Some of this might derive from insecurity with the subject material and ways of developing it: citizenship education tends not to be a didactically delivered subject. Other reasons for adopting such an oppositional stance include ignorance of the National Curriculum and the personal allocation of a relatively low priority to it. There are some, however, who know and understand the National Curriculum for Citizenship, who recognise its purpose and understand its strategies, and whose opposition is based on exactly those things; they are against the use of education as an enabling device. While such opponents of citizenship education might say it is a form of social engineering, the same could be said of any type or content of education; after all, education shapes society either through change or through maintenance of the status quo.

8. Cynicism Those teachers of citizenship education who demonstrate cynicism are, largely, not cynical about the subject but about its likely success. One trained specialist, formerly a subject leader for citizenship but who has now reverted to teaching her degree subject, expressed concern that there were signs of her 'becoming cynical about whether we can make any difference to anyone'. Teachers such as these perceive (or recognise) that the subject is a timetable filler, sometimes without the homework or examinations which give status to other subjects. There can also appear to be a lack of support from school leaders and from other colleagues, giving rise to a sense of isolation.

All of these 'types' of citizenship education teachers represent individuals who require and deserve support, encouragement and development. Those who feel confident need to have their strengths developed, their skills enhanced, their knowledge base extended. So do all those others who teach the subject, whether they do so as a matter of convenience, colonisation, compliance, conflict or cynicism. This is not only their entitlement, but the entitlement of the children they teach – every one of whom deserves the best of their teachers just as their teachers should expect the best of them.

Those who are committed, converted or operate within a framework marked by co-existence need to be equipped to support the development of the subject and the contribution it makes to the life of a school. They need to be enabled to keep up to date with ideas and initiatives and to contribute their expertise and experiences to the benefit of others. Those school mentors and other teachers who fit the colonisation, compliance and conflict categories also deserve opportunities for support and development, but of a different sort. Insecurities have to be addressed and issues clarified. Whether the issue is of misunderstanding the nature and content of citizenship education or of working under duress and insecurity, the outcome will be limited subject development and low pupil achievement. Compliance and, to some extent, conflict, arise from workplace bullying and are clearly in opposition to the principles of citizenship education. Colonisation and some

aspects of conflict deprive pupils of their entitlement to a full education, for which bullying is a rather mild term. Just as schools have anti-bullying strategies and systems which support victims and re-engage perpetrators, teachers are entitled to the same support.

Griffiths is correct when she writes that the essence of all things educational is

‘learning, criticality, an opening out; and all this in a way which is personal and interpersonal, and which fits learners for life in wider society. This is a process which allows learners – and teachers – to change and develop their self-identities in ways which may be risky, but not to the extent of serious damage. Thus, education is concerned with both individual and collective well-being. It is highly personal and individual, and also highly social, political and public.’

(Griffiths 1998; P66)

If teachers are going to be allowed to change, encouraged to change, to take risks, their educational well-being must be considered, for it is by supporting them that young learners will also be supported.

CASE STUDY #1

I have no intention of intimidating readers with a tale of the stellar development of some super-teacher of citizenship education, a Weberian ‘ideal type’ or a Nietzschean superman (of either or indeterminate sex). Nor will I offer a heart-warming story of a poor lost teacher who found professional and spiritual redemption in citizenship education; ‘To Serve Them All My Days’, ‘Dead Poets’ Society’ – works of fiction. Flights of fancy can serve a purpose, but we need to keep this real.

In order for teachers to begin to function as subversives, Postman and Weingartner (1976) suggest sixteen principles of practice to be addressed. I adapted and developed them

(Leighton 2006) to suggest some strategies for radical practice in the teaching of citizenship education, and have further refined my responses below:

1. A moratorium on the use of textbooks – the changing nature of what constitutes ‘knowledge’ in citizenship education, and the wealth of resources being produced by individuals, associations, NGOs and other agencies means that books are often used sparingly, to aid learning rather than as a substitute for learning. Subject specialists appear more willing (and perhaps also both more able and more confident) to do this, preferring to rely on their subject understanding to develop their own resources which can support their pupils’ learning and development. For many schools, the low priority given to citizenship education means that there is little money for textbooks anyway, which can have benefits for the creative teacher.

2. Teachers should teach outside their own specialism – with so many citizenship education teachers originally specialising in other subjects and specialist student teachers largely being graduates in other disciplines, virtually all teachers of citizenship education are indeed teaching outside their specialism. Whether this is to anyone’s advantage remains to be seen, but it should be beneficial to pupils if teachers can make links between subjects – just as the National Curriculum requires them to do – and this is achieved more effectively when people teach outside their comfort zones, whether with regard to subject title or teaching strategies.

3. Exchanges between primary and secondary teachers – Opportunities for exchanges of information between primary and secondary teachers are not yet particularly frequent, although the increased federating of schools might create opportunities for more such exchanges. If citizenship education ever becomes a requirement within the primary curriculum, information exchanges and discussions should become more commonplace. Even without the statutory compulsion to bring citizenship education to Key Stages 1 and 2, many primary schools already demonstrate excellence in their approaches to Citizenship education (see Case Study #2) so there is no need to wait for someone to set up exchanges

and discussion. When these do take place, they have to be on the basis that both phases have developed insights and experiences from which the other can benefit.

4. Teachers who claim to 'know' their subject should write a book on it – one of the consequences of the introduction of citizenship education was a plethora of books, not always written by teachers who could justify any claim to know the subject well. This has made the observation of principle 1. above all the easier to achieve and might equally apply to the overwhelming array of citizenship education related websites. Many teachers, not only those involved in citizenship education, already spend much of their time adapting textbooks, rewriting resources and developing their own; it is worth considering how their pupils might be involved in the process.

5. Dissolve all subjects, courses, and especially course requirements – this would require a seismic shift beyond the influence of citizenship education, indeed beyond the control of any state school, as it runs in opposition to the imposed National Curriculum. Many schools are ahead of the National Curriculum in their development of problem based learning, integrated curricula, focus days, and other approaches which emphasise commonality of subject content rather than the traditional separations. Citizenship education can lead the way with regard to course requirements – that every pupil is a potential citizen of somewhere should be enough. Leave grade expectation and entry grade requirements to others.

6. Limit each teacher to three declarative sentences and fifteen interrogatives per lesson – citizenship education teachers need to be more interested in developing skills of articulate discussion among their pupils than in showing their own talents of oratory. It takes confidence in subject knowledge, a range of professional skills, classroom management which fosters involvement and learning rather than obedience and silence, and the belief in pupils' ability to engage for a teacher to step back from telling and asking, instead allowing pupils to ask and tell and discuss and challenge and learn. Limit the quantity of teacher talk without forsaking the quality.

7. Ban teachers from asking questions where they already know the answer – All teachers should strive to exercise such self-control. Clemintshaw (2008) points out that questioning is a vital technique in any teacher's armoury and, with care and forethought, teachers can use questioning strategies to great effect. Questioning is essential, but not those questions designed to show how much teachers think they know rather than those which develop pupils learning and understanding.

8. A moratorium on tests and grades – Many teachers resist pressure from pupils to offer grades while others see examination as a route to subject acceptance. The requirement to report on attainment and progress prevents any moratorium – which does not mean it is not worth considering, but that currently movement is in the opposite direction. If work must be assessed, teachers should consider formative feedback over summative grading; pupils will learn much more from reasoned advice than they ever will from a National Curriculum Level number written in a particular colour.

9. Psychotherapy as part of in-service training – perhaps even as an occupational entry requirement. It is certainly essential to have a strong support network – not sycophants, but people who will listen and understand. This might be why so many educators have partners who are also educators, because they can listen and understand; this might also account for the divorce rate between educators.

10. Classify teachers by ability and make the lists public – this is effectively one aspect of what league tables and, more explicitly Ofsted inspections, are doing. Criteria for 'ability' are contentious and contested, and this 'principle of practice' smacks of naming and shaming. Much more useful, and much more in the spirit of citizenship, would be to have learning mentors where pupils talk with and work with teachers to identify what works well for their class and what does not. If this is non-judgemental – reflecting 8. above and not grading or assessing the teacher – everyone benefits.

11. Pupils test teachers on what pupils know – This happens daily in the citizenship education classroom, when pupils will offer examples and insights potentially alien to the

teacher. Just as we remind our pupils, the teacher should remember that it's okay to get things wrong; indeed, it could sometimes be a really smart move which empowers pupils.

12. Make every subject optional, with teachers paid only if their next option is taken – it is becoming the case that some schools choose not to run courses which are undersubscribed, expecting teachers to then teach other subjects outside their specialism or move to other schools. The guiding principle in such cases is 'value for money' rather than quality of pupil engagement. This strategy would undoubtedly be both subversive and radical; whether it would be practical or helpful is more open to question. If, however, we planned and taught as if it were the case that our employment was dependent upon our pupils' engagement, we can be confident that teaching and learning would improve.

13. One year off in every four for teachers to work outside education – My anecdotal observation is that those students who come to teacher education with prior employment experiences, and who can recall them, do seem to have great tenacity and creativity in the classroom. The benefits are not all one-way, either. Participants in Teach First, for example, agree to teach for two years before going into the industry or profession of their choice. While many find that teaching is much more rewarding than they expected and build careers in education, those who do develop careers in other fields take a range of skills and insights with them which benefit them, their colleagues and their employers. The greatest concern must be that teachers who experience the pay and conditions in other sectors might not return to teaching.

14. Requirement of evidence that a teacher has had a loving relationship with at least one other human being – the word 'other' is crucial here, as the teacher who puts personal preferences before pupils' needs is not much of a teacher at all. While in no way belittling the love and support of my family, I have also found that sharing a house with a cat has helped me to keep my social worth in perspective.

15. All graffiti from school toilets be reproduced on large paper and hung in school halls – whereas the tendency is to use anti-graffiti paint. School desks remain a valuable source of information on student angst, and the growth in popularity of websites of pupils' views of

schools is also instructive. A really effective citizenship education school, with its opportunities for pupil voices to be heard and identities and diversity to be celebrated, would not have graffiti anyway.

16. Ban these words and phrases: teach, syllabus, IQ, make-up, test, disadvantaged, gifted, accelerated, enhancement, course, grade, score, human nature, dumb, university material, administrative necessity – progress here has been uneven and not very impressive. ‘IQ’, ‘dumb’, ‘human nature’ and ‘disadvantaged’ have largely disappeared from formal educational discourse but can still be heard in staffrooms either explicitly or in barely disguised euphemisms. ‘Enhancement’ has a variety of synonyms dependent on context, often in relation to a student being ‘gifted’, which is in turn usually accompanied by ‘and talented’, without anyone being particularly clear about what they mean. Government attempts to blur any distinctions between academic and vocational experiences while aiming to enrol 50% of school leavers into higher education with others entering further education, renders ‘university material’ all but meaningless. ‘Teach’, ‘syllabus’, ‘test’, ‘course’, ‘grade’, ‘score’ and ‘administrative necessity’ clearly remain with us, with no signs of reduction in the near future.

To some extent these principles of practice could be regarded as an educational equivalent of the Charter for Parliamentary Reform which was promulgated several times in Britain in the mid-19th century. At the time many of its demands were seen as far-fetched, outlandish and unworkable, but only one – annual Parliaments – has yet to be introduced. It may be that, in 170 years, Postman and Weingartner’s list will be viewed as old hat; for now we should recognise that some of it is being achieved, most of it is achievable, and some aspects might have to remain aspirational.

SUMMARY

Citizenship education teachers come from many backgrounds, offer many skills and have many differing needs. When citizenship education is allowed the freedom to develop most effectively and creatively, it can subvert the security and controlled environment within

which so many teachers are cocooned and/or in which they cocoon themselves. This is both their greatest strength for their pupils and their greatest threat to their colleagues.

2. SCHOOL ETHOS

It is important to note that the National Curriculum for Citizenship (QCA, 2007; pp26-49) does not state what pupils should be taught, instead requiring that 'pupils should be able to . . .', 'the study of citizenship should include . . .', 'the curriculum should provide opportunities for pupils to . . .' The emphasis is not on teachers' ability to impart a body of knowledge; instead, pupils are expected to explore creative approaches, reflect on their own progress, debate, campaign, work in groups, have contact with NGOs and pressure groups. Crucially, pupils are also expected to have opportunities to be actively involved in the life of their schools, neighbourhoods and local communities which in turn presents 'opportunities for schools to address their statutory duty to promote community cohesion' (QCA, 2007; p29). All of this requires planned movement away from traditional classroom activity, away from teacher-led learning, and away from the passive receiving of assumed (or confirmed) truths. Teachers and pupils need to know that the school not only supports and encourages such approaches to learning and development, but that it both insists upon them and provides an ambience within which these things take place as a matter of routine.

Blake et al (2000) argue powerfully that, as educators, we should be concerned with the development of personal qualities, not simply of a body of knowledge and/or a range of skills.

'A caring person is generally caring (but) [t]o have caring skills or competences is rather different. . . The skilful doctor, as Plato observed and recent grisly events in Greater Manchester have confirmed, makes an unusually skilful poisoner. But if you are a caring person . . .you will abhor the misuse of those skills through which your personality expresses itself' (Blake et al 2000; pp17/18).

Similarly, a radical approach to teaching citizenship education is one which requires that pupils have opportunities through which to develop into socially constructive and involved citizens, people who not only know what is expected of citizens in relation to rights and responsibilities but who also see beyond statutory provision and the characteristics of good

citizenship – to be aware, as Werder (2010) puts it, of their *response*-abilities, of how and why and to what extent citizens can and should respond.

This chapter considers how and why the day to day atmosphere, activities and relationships in a school indicate the true nature of that school, and how they are central to the status and development of citizenship education. It also looks at what schools can do to take citizenship education beyond the confines of classrooms to make it an integral aspect of how schools function and how people within them think and act. While it has been observed that citizenship education ‘must involve the whole school and there must be a clear and reiterated rationale for the ideas of shared governance and distributed responsibility if participatory democracy is to prosper in the classroom and in the institution’ (Reid et al, 2010; p14), it does not always follow that those who run schools want democracy to prosper.

BACKGROUND

It is almost thirty years since White and Brockington noted that a ‘vast, untapped resource of human potential seems to pass through our schools unrecognised’ (1983, p8) but it is fair to say that it remains true today that schools fail to make the most of what pupils bring with them. If citizenship education is to be successful this has to change. In Chapter One we touched upon some of the issues facing the effective development of citizenship education with regard to subject specialist teachers, but by far both the biggest hurdle and the greatest opportunity is the ethos of a school and the extent to which this supports and advances the aims of citizenship education. Many schools will have a mission statement or endorsed policy or some such awkwardly designated eulogy to how wonderfully inclusive and developmental and holistic it strives to be, but what really matters is what the school does and what it enables to be done.

It is tempting to take a leaf out of the autobiography of former Arsenal, Bradford City, Newcastle United, Sunderland and England football player Len Shackleton – more accurately three leaves – when discussing the place of citizenship education in determining school ethos. According to Best and Scott (1994, p174), Shackleton’s chapter on what club directors know about football consisted of three blank pages; the same would appear to be an equally fair representation of how much many head teachers and school governing bodies know or care about citizenship education. I have resisted the temptation to go quite that far, settling instead for agreement with Ofsted where they observe that ‘[t]here remain schools where leaders have done little or nothing to respond to a National Curriculum requirement that has now been in place for seven years.’ (Ofsted 2010, p32) Some school management teams and governing bodies clearly consider that it does not particularly matter who teaches citizenship education, if it is to be taught at all. This belittles both the subject and the qualities of the staff involved, and it limits the opportunities for school pupils to understand and to make progress; it is also a position of both social disempowerment and rank hypocrisy.

When school leaders emphasise the importance of obedience to rules and authority they are in no position to then ignore the decisions of government, refuse to implement the National Curriculum and abrogate their legal obligations. When they claim to have school pupils’ interests at heart, they should not then refuse to recruit expert teachers of citizenship education but instead require teachers whose expertise lies elsewhere to teach the subject to the detriment of all concerned. Those school leaders who proudly defend their autonomy on the grounds that the future of society is safe in their hands should not then prevent young people from being prepared for social involvement and social leadership. Such posturing is tantamount to saying ‘citizenship education doesn’t matter, you don’t matter’. Pupils are citizens now, not some vague time in the future, and their roles, involvement and entitlement needs to be continually developed, as they do for us all. As Alderson observes in her critique of myths surrounding the place of citizenship education in schools, the notion that it is to prepare them as future citizens rather than current

citizens is to regard 'school students as human beings, and less than fully human beings. It is illogical . . .' (Alderson 2004; p33) It is hypocrisy of this sort which is symptomatic of the social reality citizenship education must seek to expose and subvert.

In the very early days of statutory citizenship education I was regularly told by experienced teachers who were supporting the development of my students that 'we don't do discussions in this school/department' and that 'the trainee needs to learn from me, not me from her/him'. Such narrow approaches to learning and to teacher development appear less frequently now, but were and are symptomatic of an authoritarian model of teaching and professional self-image which sits uneasily with citizenship education. That school management teams consulted with staff in only 29% of those few schools where the subject had been introduced in the light of National Curriculum requirements in 2002 (Cleaver et al, 2003) does not bode well for the extent and outcomes of pupil consultations with regard to citizenship education in particular as well as with other aspects of their educational experience, and suggests that pupil voices (see Chapter Five) will have to be raised loud and long if they are to be heard. When established teachers expect specialist student teachers to work with non-specialist materials or wholly in ways conventional to and developed for other subjects, lessons are rarely as successful, nor are placements as successful, as when there is collaboration and innovation. Nonetheless such expectations are commonplace. It is also becoming clear that some schools welcome and develop a critical and questioning approach, inviting pupil contributions and striving to make sure that citizenship education is not only taught in innovative ways but that its content is and remains relevant.

It has been consistently shown (Leighton 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Ofsted 2006, 2010; Kerr et al 2007) that schools approach the delivery of citizenship education in a number of ways, the effectiveness of which can vary enormously. Some schools integrate citizenship education into other subjects; this is often within one or more of the humanities, with RE featuring prominently, but also through English, or across the whole curriculum. In other schools it is conflated with PSHEE or sometimes subsumed into an existing programme, both circumstances often giving rise to acronyms which look like the product of a random letter

generator (should such a thing exist), while in other cases a hybrid such as Personal and Citizenship Education (PACE) has emerged. There are many - a growing number – where citizenship education exists as a separate timetabled subject, others where it is presented through a series of collapsed time-table days or events, some which offer various combinations of these approaches and, regrettably, some where there remains no formal recognition or provision in fact even if there is in a policy document and aforementioned mission statement.

Even in those schools where there is distinct timetable provision of the subject, delivery is neither uniform nor consistent – not within each such school and certainly not across all such schools. There are schools, and there are teachers within schools, who follow the schemes of work and lesson plans available on-line made available by the Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency and/or produced by commercial agencies, some following these to the letter while others use them to guide rather than dictate lessons. There are schools, and there are teachers within schools, who recognise the spirit of the National Curriculum for Citizenship and who have developed and present their own interpretation of it – and others who have developed and present their own version without necessarily paying close, or even scant, attention to either spirit or specified content. There are schools, and teachers within schools, who have relabelled lesson plans and re-jigged schemes of work which were originally intended for other subjects and other purposes so that they can pursue a pet theme irrespective of its relationship – if any – to the National Curriculum for Citizenship.

Although teachers of all subjects have been expected to contribute to pupils' entitlement to a citizenship education programme which is 'coherent . . . in terms of the concepts, values and dispositions, skills and aptitudes and knowledge and understanding to be acquired' (Advisory Group on Citizenship 1998; P35), not all are doing so, able to do so or being enabled so to do. The latest form of the National Curriculum requires that all teachers of all subjects ensure that their pupils are supported in identifying links with all the other subjects, but there is not yet conclusive evidence that this is happening on a wide scale.

Even where it is happening, and ignoring the difficulties inherent in establishing such links if some subjects are either not taught by specialists or not taught at all, it is essential that the character of citizenship education is established throughout all aspects of the school – it must go beyond the classroom and into meeting rooms, social spaces, laboratories, study areas, sports and athletic arenas, publicity materials, websites, public presentations, dealings with suppliers, and the myriad other places and spaces which comprise the operations and sphere of influence of a school.

Citizenship Education – a whole school imperative

It is not enough for pupils to be involved in citizenship education lessons once every week or so, if the rest of their school experience does not support and reinforce the value and values of the subject. Indeed, as Harber notes, ‘the introduction of a subject aimed at democratic citizenship has merely highlighted gaps between the stated aims and practices of this area and the rest of what happens in schooling’. (2009; pp89/90) We can predict with confidence that most schools in England expect the conventions of the English language to be observed in school communications, in assemblies, in taught subjects, on their website, by clerical and other administrative staff, and, where they are not, for the context and justification to be made clear or corrections to be made. It is equally predictable that schools will expect the laws of physics to apply in the day to day running of the school where appropriate, and would investigate a sudden loss of gravity or, a more likely event, disruption to the electricity supply. They will expect those with financial responsibilities, or with registration responsibilities, to be able to add and subtract in accordance with accepted arithmetic practice. IT systems will be expected to work, doors will be designed to open and close effectively, catering will be nutritious. In other words, the essence of most subjects pervade schools in their daily existence as one element of the hidden curriculum (Bowles and Gintis, 1970); if citizenship education is not equally embedded in all aspects of a school and in all those who act on behalf of a school, it is not part of that school’s ethos, irrespective of fine words and mission statements. If we want pupils to treat people with respect, they should be treated with respect; if we want pupils to participate, they must have opportunities to do

so and be encouraged to make use of them; if we believe that pupil voice matters, we must listen.

Florio-Ruane offers us the wonderful term 'culturallectomy' (2001, p 23) in her observation that schools often appear to conduct themselves on the assumption that issues of ethnicity, language and identity are irrelevant to teaching and learning, and she clearly demonstrates the fallacy and the potential costs of such an assumption. Schools, as with any other organisation or social structure, are not value free institutions; they either incorporate the cultures of the people who constitute the institution to synthesise a new, dynamic and inclusive culture, or they operate under an imposed and non-negotiable culture. As Florio-Ruane makes abundantly clear, schools tend to the latter model to the detriment of all people involved. Teachers and other staff members bring with them a range of cultural perceptions, as do pupils and student teachers; these perceptions will overlap with each other as well as with the overt culture of the school, and there will be times and places where the differences are as significant as the similarities. A school which ignores such diversity ignores the resource of human potential that it constitutes, a theme to which we will return in Chapters Three and Four.

Schools should be celebrating that diversity of background, outlook and experience, and seeking to build upon it. Recognising the rich variety of humanity which comprise a school can be achieved through lesson content in all subjects, through formal assemblies (whether religious, humanist, or simply informative), through wall displays, extra-curricular activities, school trips, fund-raising events, social activities, web-site content, newsletters, publicity materials, school policies and practices, governors' meetings, and any and all other aspects of a school. If there are any exceptions – for example, if belonging to a faith is held to be superior to having no religious faith, or if one faith is held to be of greater truth or value over others, if there are no vegetarian options at social events, if parents and other carers feel excluded, if local communities are seen as irritants or irrelevant – then the ethos of the school is not a citizenship education ethos.

Acting in accordance with the old adage that actions speak louder than words, the next case study illustrates what one school has done to demonstrate the commitment to ensuring that pupils have the opportunity to become effective citizens. Of particular importance is that these things are not simply being done to meet legislative requirements, but because they are understood to be the right things to do.

CASE STUDY #2

Merrylee Primary School in Glasgow is a non-denominational co-educational primary school with 283 pupils aged between five and twelve on roll (in 2010), serving a socially and economically diverse area. After several years as a split site school, a new building was opened in 2009. The National Curriculum is not in place here because it applies 'to every British child's well-being (apart from those in Scotland and Northern Ireland and those attending independent schools – this is a National Curriculum in only a highly idiosyncratic sense of the term).' (Bailey, 1996; p 15) While there are the recommendations of the Scottish Curriculum to consider – according to the Scottish Government website, '[t]he curriculum is non-statutory in Scotland and so is not dictated by the Government. Responsibility for what is taught rests with local authorities and schools, taking into account national guidelines and advice' – as well as a school improvement plan to achieve and a number of National Priorities to be addressed, the impression given by this school is that these things are being done because they are the right things to do.

What is striking about Merrylee is that almost everything about the school is redolent of good citizenship education and active learning. What is presented in this case study is an example of what can and is being done to involve pupils, staff, parents and other carers, communities, the local economy and the regional polity in the life of the school as a matter of course. Some of the opportunities which the school has taken advantage of will not present themselves to everyone – just one example is the school's good fortune in both having a new build and simultaneously having an architect on the school parent body – but many more are the result either of careful and integrated planning or of the essence of

citizenship education being the essence of the school. If it is the first then those involved are to be congratulated for planning for the future and with education as their focus; if it is the latter then so much more can be expected as and when needs and opportunities are identified. Whichever is the case, it is an example many other schools would do well to follow.

The new building has been designed in consultation with children, staff and parents. Built using materials which were lightweight and, where possible, from recycled sources (for example, newspaper serves as cavity wall insulation), it is oriented for maximum use of natural light and some walls are partly glass so that everyone can see the construction methods and materials and the insulation – ensuring a daily reminder of the importance of conservation. There is also a dedicated eco-classroom which looks out over the school's own wind turbine, itself partly financed by Scottish Power.

The school grounds also house the Urban Jungle. This is the first Natural Play site on any UK school campus, and is the outcome of discussions with pupils and consultation with the Forestry Commission, the school's own environment committee and its parent council and with Glasgow City Council. As well as making another contribution to environmental awareness, this is also an illustration of collaborative working, local democracy, working with a non-governmental organisation (NGO) and practical and effective parental involvement.

As well as having a pupil-elected school council in which every class has representation and which meets regularly with the head teacher, pupils at Merrylee have other opportunities in which to have their voices heard. Older pupils are consulted on some matters of curriculum development, while peer mediation and a buddy system allow a range of pupils to become involved in working with and supporting each other and to make representation to the school management team about issues which arise. Pupils also have the opportunity to be appointed to posts of responsibility which include referees, gardeners, litter patrol, ICT

technicians, and librarians. In chapter four we will go on to consider issues of identity – one of which is the notion that identity is about rights whereas it is character which is about obligations. If this is the case then Merrylee is clearly aware of the importance of character education.

The school offers many activities beyond the classroom and other designated learning spaces. It runs nine different sports clubs, including football for both girls and boys – an activity which is augmented by the school having its own, Scottish Football Association-approved pitch. There are ten other activity clubs including a pupils' allotment society, which was joint winner of the Millar Cup for Best Children's Allotment in Scotland. All such activities provide opportunities for healthy living, engagement with the local community, and for pupils to achieve a sense of fulfilment and achievement other than the academic. When pupils at the school were invited to test a new virtual reality game by the BBC and the University of Westminster, one outcome was the teacher involved addressed an international conference on children in virtual worlds.

Even in the best run, most pupil-friendly, most inclusive and citizenship focused schools, there will be times when someone's behaviour is seen as unacceptable. At Merrylee, the response to poor pupil behaviour is to try to engender a sense of responsibility for one's actions and the pupil makes amends by helping within the school community.

Many schools have PTAs and/or Friends' groups, generally seen by teachers as sources of fundraising for the school and providers of tea and cakes at open events, sports days and concerts. The approach at Merrylee is different.

The Parent Council has worked closely with the rest of the school community to go well beyond tea and cakes, pennies and pounds, while not neglecting these essential contributions to the school. By recommending a particular charity shop as the place to

donate unwanted or outgrown items of school uniform, the Parent Council is simultaneously supporting the local community, a good cause and the principle of recycling; it is also a sensitive way to draw the attention of less well-off carers to a relatively inexpensive source for sought after items. Their 'plant a tree scheme' not only contributes to improving the environment of the school; it is marketed as one way to offset carbon footprints and as a source of revenue for the school. A less obvious but none the less important contribution to the environment has been the Parent Council's preparation of information about safe parking and safe routes to school and their campaign for traffic calming measures; these not only involve the local community but also contribute to a safer school. The Parent Council was awarded £1000 by the Millennium Commission, and used the money to fund a programme in which local children and older people worked together and with artists and entertainers to produce a community show, thereby crossing age boundaries and enabling everyone to learn new skills.

We have not, of course, looked at the curriculum offered by the school, but we have looked at those aspects of the school over which those who run it have authority and autonomy. What we have seen is a community in which there is daily engagement with democratic processes through regular consultation, collaboration within and outside the school, with elected representatives and with NGOs. It is a school with environmental awareness at its heart, an awareness which is raised in many ways without scaremongering or shrill assertions, but where pupils can see and learn for themselves. School processes support the development of pupil character, offer a range of opportunities, reinforce gender equality and community involvement; pupils experience working with adults in a secure environment and on practical issues. Staff are also well supported in their development, with research involvement and conference presentation being a part of that. Parents and other carers are involved with, and on behalf of, the school.

When I left Merrylee Primary School in 1966 it had classrooms, a school hall, milk monitors, a playground and a red gravel football pitch, and recognition of pupils' non-academic

achievements was the 'Citizen of the Future' prize voted for by pupils in their final year – I came second. I hope I have made some progress since then; the school most certainly has.

SUMMARY

If those involved in running a school are not committed to the development of pupils as citizens, the subject will be no different to any other. School leaders, governors, administrative and other support staff, parents, pupils, visitors, the wider community – everyone has to be involved. Once they are fully involved and fully committed, opportunities to develop are limited only by the collective imagination.

3. IDENTITY

Identity and diversity are combined within the National Curriculum for Citizenship (QCA 2007) as one of the three key thematic areas of study; the others being democracy and justice, and rights and responsibilities. If pupils are to appreciate that all identities are complex, not only their own, and that these can change over time, they need to understand how our/their identities affect and are affected by social circumstances and historical events and that identities are formed and influenced by many things. This leads to the need to consider not only 'how democracy, justice, diversity, toleration, respect and freedom are valued by people with different beliefs, backgrounds and traditions' (QCA 2007; p28), but also how these social processes and institutions are experienced differently by disparate individuals and groups. The quotation neatly brings the three themes together but we need to go much further than that.

While there can be no doubt that identity and diversity are inextricably connected – if we do not all share one common identity then there must inevitably be diversity – it serves neither concept for them to be forever paired. Like rhubarb and custard, or Lennon and McCartney, neither can perhaps exist in our consciousness without the other, but each element has a worth and contribution of its own which we need to examine and understand.

Below we build on and go beyond some of the issues raised by the Ajegbo Report (Ajegbo et al, 2007) to examine the centrality of pupil identities to what they do, how they learn, how they perceive their world and themselves. It is not until schools recognise and allow the development of individual pupil identities that we can expect young people to demonstrate an appreciation of the multiplicity of identities which they will experience in themselves and which they will encounter in others. It is also considering the extent to which the identities of others in the school – teaching and support staff, members of the local community, for example – are supported, explored and celebrated. Kolb (1984) and others have consistently both argued and demonstrated the effectiveness of learning through experience, so that to be exposed to a range of identities can only help young people to understand that there are

many more identities out 'there', some elements of which they share and others they do not. One particularly challenging aspect of identity within the Citizenship National Curriculum is the desire to generate an understanding of Britishness; one successful approach to recognising and addressing the identities which together comprise 'Britishness' is outlined and explained.

BACKGROUND

Identity is both fragile and complex; everyone with any relationship to a school has an identity made up of multiple roles and elements, not all of which might be recognised or valued by the school. It may be trite and clichéd, but true none the less, to note for example that an adult can be all of teacher, line manager, employee, carer, counsellor, colleague, governor, friend, female, foreign national, heterosexual, faith adherent, political activist, new to the profession, over forty years of age, sports fixated – and there probably exist other categories not covered by that list. Equally, a young person connected with the same school might be pupil, peer-group leader, volunteer, male, carer, political activist, friend, homosexual, migrant, faith adherent, classical music fixated, and again might relate to other categories not included here. The observation that '[e]ducators need to understand how different identities among youth are being produced in spheres generally ignored by schools' (Giroux, 2000; p190) applies equally to those adults associated with schools – those with home responsibility for the pupils, support staff, teachers, visitors, governors and a host of others. When teachers are encouraged or expected to relate the content of their lessons to pupils' prior knowledge, this can and should include knowledge gained outside the classroom and away from the school. Otherwise the message is received – whether or not it was intentionally transmitted – that the knowledge and experience of schooling is taken as superior to any other knowledge, any other experience. Any school's first responsibility must be to the pupils in its care, so that to ignore the sources of identities other than 'pupil' is to ignore a part of what makes that person who s/he is.

Pupils have a range of identities, based variously on their own and others' perceptions of them within dimensions such as gender, ethnicity, economic class, self-perception, self-

worth, home circumstances, and youth culture(s). Some might be carers for siblings or other family members, others will be cared for by someone of no immediate familial connection. Some will be seen by some teachers to be bright and breezy; the same pupils might be seen by other teachers as lightweight and cheeky. Those seen as gifted by some teachers will be seen as nothing greater than diligent by others, and as 'fooling everyone else but not fooling me' by a few. Their identities are the outcome of subtle negotiations and liable to even more subtle changes. As teachers we expect (hope?) that our pupils will understand that we are only human, that we also have a home and family relationships to maintain and develop, interests outside work, only 24 hours in the day, needs for a cup of tea/coffee, a toilet break, a life. Our pupils deserve the same from us. While I would not disagree with Foley (2010) where he writes that '[t]he age of entitlement does not seek character, which demands obligation, but identity, which demands rights' (p85), in the context of citizenship education we do not need to be bound by this potential dichotomy but should instead challenge it. A society based wholly upon entitlements is one which will disintegrate through selfishness, while a society based wholly upon obligation will disintegrate through oppression. For teachers and pupils there has to be space both for rights and for obligations, for character as well as for identity.

The previous chapter considered the importance of school ethos and, within that, how the structure and content of lessons and timetables can indicate the citizenship culture of a school. They can equally support the development of positive identities and positive attitudes. Illich (1973) has eloquently shown that, while schools tend to be organised in ways which meet the needs of teachers, this is neither necessary nor desirable. With regard to timetables, for example, we might understand why a teacher prefers a limited number of subject options and a consistent class size, but education has to be about the needs of learners rather than the preferences of teachers.

WHAT CONSTITUTES OR CREATES IDENTITY?

The 'culturallectomy' identified by Florio-Ruane (2001) and briefly discussed in Chapter Two is of particular significance to issues of identity. By noting that schools appear to ignore the

effects on education of the cultures of the young, she draws our attention to how crucial culture and identity are to learning. In his study of asylums, later extended to other total institutions, Goffman (1961) coined the term 'mortification of the self' for the way in which an individual's identity was systematically dismantled in order for the institution to then make that person present themselves in the way that the institution required; while he was originally discussing total institutions – those which affect their members all day, every day – the principle is applicable to pupils' experience of school, and to other circumstances. Whether we call it culturalectomy or mortification, it is what many schools do and it is not good news for anyone. Halualani discusses at length the limits of 'culture as a knowable entity' (2010, p38), certainly in any absolute terms, and the need to recognise that there are tremendous variations in cultural concepts such as 'gender status' and 'social justice', even if we are not able to fully comprehend what these variations or specific interpretations are; at the very least we need to recognise that there are variations, and that individual interpretations are real to those who hold them.

Language can be a powerful identity characteristic, as Labov (1969) and Bernstein (1973) showed in their very different ways, in that it triggers or reinforces certain assumptions in teachers which, in turn, have direct bearing on academic progress and sense of belonging. Labov demonstrated that the complexities of non-standard English, and the multi-linguistic skills of those who use comparable structures in their everyday lives while coping with the standard English of teachers in school and the often impoverished English and another language in the home, are discounted by teachers often significantly less linguistically adept. The social class implications of Bernstein's identification of restricted and elaborate language codes clearly demonstrate that the middle class values of teachers hold sway in the school. Those teachers who claim to be working class – despite being graduates, with secure white collar jobs, who value educational qualifications, who exercise authority in the workplace – are deluding themselves; there is more to social class than jeans, an open necked shirt and a few glottal stops. The status and identity conferred by language arises from communal interaction and it is not only the structure of language which matters, the content is vital as well. When Goodman wrote that '[s]peaking is a way of making one's identity, of losing oneself in others in order to grow. It depends not on prior consensus with

the others, but on trust of them' (Goodman, 1975; p70), he was indicating that it is through the interaction of language that we not only learn who we are but also who others think we are. It follows that, if our language or the content of our speech is ignored or ridiculed, so is our identity. That doesn't mean we all have to speak the same way – for to mimic another's accent or speech patterns might easily be interpreted as ridicule – but that we show respect for how others speak, and for what they have to say.

It has been suggested – certainly in staff rooms and governors' meetings I have attended – that a school uniform creates a sense of identity and community, that the wearers can immediately identify with others in the same colour scheme. What a great pity it must be for those young people in France, Palestine, Israel, The Netherlands, The USA, Canada, Germany and so many other countries who have been cast into the wilderness of isolation by not having to wear identical tie, shirt, trousers/skirt, shoes, jacket as others who attend the same school. How terribly lacking in community spirit and a sense of worth they must all be.

The real purpose of any uniform is indicated by the name – to make all wearers of it uniform, to mortify the self rather than to strengthen it. When a student is found to violate uniform regulations they will be punished, the irrelevance of the colour of a pupil's sweater to their ability to solve a quadratic equation or to translate text from one language to another does not matter here; a rule has been broken and so the perpetrator must be seen to be punished. Pupils quickly learn that it is by being one of the herd – by not expressing identity or individuality – that life is smoothest, safest, easiest in school. Just what the hidden curriculum requires. They also learn, however, that rules exist to be broken, and that it can be fun trying to find increasingly innovative ways to break them.

It is true to say – as many teachers do say – that there are many teachers who have to wear a uniform of sorts to school and that many workplaces impose a dress code on staff. It does not follow, however, that school pupils should wear a uniform; it might be more

constructive to question whether teachers should dress as formally as many are required to do, and whether other professions and occupations need necessarily be so determined to remove choice and variety from appearance. There are some types of work where it clearly does matter – those working in sterile, potentially dangerous or in contaminated environments, for example – and it would help pupils to understand why and where it matters if there were discussion rather than a blanket ruling. Another argument in favour of uniform is that so many teen fashions are expensive that it puts pressure on those with low incomes. This might be more persuasive if uniforms were not often so extremely expensive.

There have been many ‘debates’ – rarely more than editorial diatribe followed by ill-informed reader correspondence – conducted in the UK media regarding whether people should be allowed to wear particular religious symbols at work. Often, these have been part of a not very subtle strategy to create a moral panic (Cohen 1994) over myths that white Christians cannot wear a crucifix while black Muslim women can wear the burkha because Britain is in the throes of some imagined Islamic take-over. The issue of colour is irrelevant here, as Muslims need not be black and Christians need not be white, but it is often a focus in the orchestrated panic none the less.

In relation to schooling, there is no reason why should not people be able to express their faith affiliation. It is unlikely to stimulate argument as pupils will know each others’ faith allegiances just as they learn their football team allegiance, their musical genre allegiance, and their fashion preferences. Nor is there any reason why one faith should be given priority over another, or why being a faith adherent is considered better than being agnostic or atheist. Faith adherence or rejection, in themselves, have no effect on learning. There have been Muslim philosophers and mathematicians, for example, whose ideas have shaped much of the modern world, and the case to be made for role models is now well established. Recognition amongst the non-Muslim population of the positive influences and impact of Islam would also foster understanding of similarities between faiths and differences within them. If we substitute ‘Jewish’ or ‘African’ or ‘female’ or ‘homosexual’ or

‘vegetarian’ in place of ‘Muslim’ and ‘Islam’ in the previous sentence, we might begin to foster understanding of both similarity and otherness on a significant scale.

Possibly worse than being perceived as part of an amorphous mass – if there is anything worse in the reflections of young people in an affluent society; there are, of course, many things which are far worse in terms of human experiences – is that mass being stereotyped, particularly as anti-social or threatening or unpleasant. Such labels often accrue despite personal experiences to the contrary. When Cohen (1994) describes the process of cognitive dissonance for those who try to balance the conflict between what they see and what they are told thus:

in a purely statistical sense, the number involved . . . must be a minute proportion of the whole age group, yet so many things that young people get up to today disturb me . . . and who knows what this sort of thing can lead to . . .? So I can’t help thinking that this is evidence of a much deeper malaise . . . (Cohen 1994; p60),

he is writing about events from the 1960s – the period of adolescence of current senior educators, politicians and grandparents. Either the negative labels were true of most young people but most adults have grown out of such behaviour, or they were untrue of most young people and should therefore be discounted; there is no reason to assume that young people today are significantly socially or developmentally different or will become significantly socially or developmentally different to their grandparents. If the current authority generation held that their identities mattered, it is perfectly reasonable to expect the current youth generation to hold the same belief.

As well as being a matter of principle, of Baldelli’s (1971) concept of ‘integrity’, awareness of the range of identities and their meanings which pupils bring to the classroom and other parts of school has a pragmatic value. When it was reported that ‘understanding of multiple identities and allegiances, different and shared histories is important if teachers are to show credibility in their teaching in these areas’ (Ofsted, 2010; p55), a crucial point was being made, one which transfers equally to other parts of the citizenship education curriculum

and – in all probability – to all aspects of teaching and learning. If we are to enable and encourage young people to develop awareness of the needs and complex identities of others, it makes no sense to ignore their needs and their identities. If we are going to talk the talk of understanding and recognition of variation and of difference, we need to walk the walk which does the same; there is no place for “do as I say, not as I do”.

It is not enough for schools to provide balance in their assemblies – whether of a broadly Christian nature, whatever that might mean, or not – if they do not consider the content of what they teach and the environment in which teaching and learning takes place. In Chapter Two we discussed the singular importance of school ethos to the successful development of citizenship education, and it follows from this that subjects must reflect that ethos if we bear in mind the cliché that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. If it is implied through teaching – either by statement or by omission – that all scientists are men and of European origin, that all artists are men of European origin, that all philosophers are men of European origin, where does that leave Marie Curie, Ben Okri, Confucius, Sappho, Hokusai, Freda Kahlo, and Siddhartha, for example? More importantly, where does it leave those with similar potential and skills who are not being directed to the role models who can give them hope and belief in themselves?

Those politicians and academics who advocate the teaching of a British (in this case, as so often in British life, mistakenly used as a synonym for English) history in England’s schools, one which looks only at success and national interest without considering meanings, costs, unequal benefits, power, ethics and repercussions are trying to instil jingoism and narrow patriotism by depriving young learners of the opportunity to learn about themselves. The intended social engineering is blatant, the principles are questionable, and the intended deceit is disgraceful. Reference to Magna Carta as evidence that Britain was the cradle of democracy ignores that this document predates the existence of Britain as a monarchy by nearly 400 years and as a parliamentary entity by almost 500 years, ignores that it transferred a modicum of power from the monarch to the barons but gave none to the common people, and ignores that there were numerous elected assemblies in other

countries long before the Houses of Parliament became in any way either democratic or representative. The histories and roles of the other constituent members of the United Kingdom and of the Commonwealth are thus downplayed or ignored in such an approach to history, as is the radical tradition of Wat Tyler, The Levellers, and other opponents of excesses of power, and as is any consideration of the ethics and often destructive effects of imperialism and exploitation. By all means identify and discuss success and development, but we need to present a complete picture to young learners.

It is all very well to praise Wilberforce for involvement in the movement to abolish slavery, but not at the expense of identifying and praising those others who fought longer and harder, and that must not mean Britain's role in the slave trade should be underplayed. By all means discuss and analyse the development of trade and barter with other countries, but the subjugation of people and the exploitation of their resources is part of that process. We should indeed examine developments in science, medicine, the arts, and other aspects of human endeavour, but this has to include what women did, what non-Britons and non-Europeans did, what the poorly educated and exploited and impoverished achieved. Everyone deserves to be given the full picture so that they can understand where they are, who they are, and to know something of those around them.

The ill-informed chant of 'one world cup and two world wars' which is dragged out whenever England play Germany at football ignores the latter country's significantly greater success in various international competitions and in head to head meetings, as well as glossing over the fact that England has never fought a world war. England has not existed as a sovereign state since 1603 nor as a parliamentary one since 1707. The chant and the xenophobic ranting which has often accompanied it – although thankfully absent during the German dismantling of English football reputations and fantasies in South Africa in 2010 – are a direct outcome of the misrepresentation of history through mass media distortion and school teacher inaccuracy. It is truly the product of ignorance when people do not know or understand their own identities, and it is worth considering why generations have been misled with regard to meanings of English and British.

CASE STUDY #3

A major feature of the PGCE 11-18 Citizenship course at Canterbury Christ Church University has been collaboration with school-based subject mentors in developing, planning and delivering collapsed timetable events (focus days) for some partner schools. As well as developing a wide range of student skills and preparing them to be involved in or lead such events once in employment, it also helps to develop other teachers' awareness of a range of strategies and activities which they can usefully deploy with their pupils and therefore strengthen the quality of teaching and learning in those schools.

There is awareness throughout the process of planning, delivery and reflection that collapsed timetable days do not compensate for a lack of adequate curricular provision in school. Breslin (2005) observed that such days can only work when carefully planned by people with appropriate subject specialist expertise and delivered as part of a carefully constructed and sustained programme. In their most recent report on the inspection of Citizenship Education in schools, Ofsted made essentially the same point when recording that 'schools which relied too heavily on suspending the timetable for citizenship were most unlikely to meet National Curriculum requirements' (Ofsted 2010, p4). The report goes on to state, however, that 'such days can complement a core curriculum effectively, particularly by providing opportunities for active participation and team projects designed to bring about change' (Ofsted 2010, p25). Therefore Ofsted's findings were not that focus days do not work, but that they should be part of systematic curricular development rather than a bolt hole or refuse bin for those things schools might rather not do.

What follows is a summary of the nature of one such focus day which was chock full of active learning and decision making, and intended to encourage participants and other pupils in the school to reconsider their attitudes towards and perceptions of each other.

The school with which the student teachers worked on this focus day has featured regularly in my published research as 'School A'. It is located in an area of England where the local education authority operates a policy of selection at 11 which directs those identified through tests as in the 'top' 25% of the most academically able to grammar school and the others to high schools. All pupils at the school follow a short-course GCSE in Citizenship Studies and the AS has been introduced as a popular option. Pupils achieve outstanding academic results e.g. in 2009 almost 75% of A level grades were A/B and just short of 58% of GCSE grades were A*/A, with Citizenship Studies GCSE grades of A*/A achieved by 75% of pupils in Year 10. It is therefore not a typical school but, there again, neither is any other school.

Three of the fourteen focus days developed by Canterbury Christ Church University Citizenship PGCE students to date have been at grammar schools, with the others at high schools, an academy and a faith comprehensive. Evaluation of focus days as a strategy (Leighton 2010b) indicates that the type of school is immaterial; what matters is careful and contextual planning. The materials developed – in this case for use with able and motivated year 7 girls, and across the age, phase and ability ranges in other focus days – could be and have been adapted for other circumstances and contexts. Details of the plans and the processes involved in this particular focus day can be found in Knott (2007).

At the time that this particular focus day was planned and presented, School A had discrete timetabled lessons in citizenship as well as cross-curricular provision and a series of focus days. There was a department of two experienced Citizenship specialists as well as many supportive colleagues, a tradition of Citizenship Education which has included giving training places to PGCE Citizenship students since the inception of the course at Canterbury Christ Church University, and a senior management team which was both well-informed and fully committed to the development of Citizenship Education.

It was a happy coincidence that the school had chosen 'Britishness' as the theme for a focus day which was delivered in the same week as the Ajegbo Report (Ajegbo et al 2007) was published. The day was the outcome of a series of meetings between students – face to face and through the university's virtual learning environment – where ideas, strategies and plans were exchanged, discussed, dissected and rebuilt. The process began when the Citizenship subject leader and mentor at School A delivered a session early in the course about the realities of being a student teacher and life in that all-important first post, and to introduce a planning activity. It is that activity which eventually became the 'Britishness' focus day.

The student teachers worked in groups to plan and deliver the sessions, with one student acting as a conduit for ideas and information during planning and as a support and 'gopher' on the day, while another co-ordinated activities on the day. The materials which the student teachers developed came from a variety of sources and were particular to that school and those Year 7 pupils; different schools in different circumstances would be best advised to develop resources appropriate to them. Sessions were presented concurrently so that there are some overlapping details. One way of adapting the plans and principles behind them would be to use them as a unit of work so that all pupils experience all activities; this would require some pruning as well as a reconsideration of the final session, but should not be beyond the skills of any teacher.

Having been set the task of developing a focus day on the theme of 'Britishness', by the end of a day spent planning the student teachers had decided to divide the Year 7 cohort into seven groups, each of which would work on aspect of the theme in collaboration with 2 or 3 student teachers. Each group would also be supported by a member of the school staff. They decided that each group would be allocated a letter which, when brought together, would form the word 'BRITISH' and illustrate that there are many strands which come together to give a sense of national identity. They decided against making this explicit in the hope that it would become apparent at the final presentation session. There would be a common introduction and discussion, based around a homework task set in advance in

preparation for the day, after which the groups were told 'their' theme. They were then introduced to a range of activities which always including forms of research, building towards a presentation to each other at the end of the day.

The letters were taken to represent:

Belonging: simultaneously to the local and the global

Respect: communities that make up Britain

Identity: shared and overlapping identities.

Tradition: traditions from the composite regions of Britain.

Immigration: the origins, diversity and vibrancy of migrant communities and their contribution to Britishness.

Stereotypes: What perceptions do we have of each other, and do others have of the British?

History: what events have shaped our ideas of Britishness and of who we are?

Activities included discussions; identifying origins of clothing; origins of words; music; peer teaching; dressing up; voting; drama; image recognition; advocacy; investigation; fun; acting; on-line research; artwork; book research; statistical analysis; newspaper research; an adapted television quiz game; writing; radio; and, almost inevitably, powerpoint presentations. Sessions were designed to fit into the school day so that pupils were able to go to break and lunch at their customary times. The biggest difference for pupils was the opportunity to examine an issue in depth and for a sustained period, while both pupils and staff benefited from working with committed subject experts willing and able to innovate.

While such activities can have assessment built into them, and Ofsted (2010) expresses concern that such assessment is not built into focus days often enough, formal written assessment need not and should not be a priority. As focus days should be used to

supplement ‘a clear core Citizenship programme that addresses the key themes’ (Breslin 2005, p310), assessment can be more formally identified and recorded in subsequent related lessons. None the less, pupils do have the opportunity for peer and self assessment when working with others, when making presentation to their group or to the whole year cohort. A focus day makes learning fun, and follow up activities to this and other focus days clearly indicates that deep learning takes place.

Clearly, not all schools have the benefit of a local university with an available cohort of skilled and committed student teachers of Citizenship Education. Focus days need planning, as do all learning activities. With appropriate forethought and awareness of pupil needs as well as clarity of focus, they can be a highly effective innovation for discrete subjects and for cross-curricular collaborative activities. Although this focus day was specifically for Citizenship Education, it also included art, design technology, English, geography, history, ICT, media studies, religious studies, sociology, and theatre studies. Fun, integrated cross-curricular connections, deep learning, opening minds, peer assessment opportunities, collaboration, creativity, a greater understanding and celebration of the multiplicity of factors which influence identity – what more could anyone reasonably ask of one day in school?

SUMMARY

Whoever they are and wherever they are, if pupils bring nothing else to school, they bring themselves. What a wonderful resource for their own and their peers’ learning. By building on who our pupils and colleagues are we can ensure that they learn more about themselves and about each other.

4. DIVERSITY

One of the areas of concern or perceived poor professional preparation identified consistently by those who complete the annual Newly Qualified Teacher Survey in England – a small, self-selecting sample which is none the less taken very seriously by the TDA – is that

of teaching in a diverse society. This does not have to be interpreted as a lack of adequate input and attention by universities or other ITE providers, but could equally represent an awareness on the part of new teachers that there are particularly powerful and complex challenges in responding to the diversity of the classroom and the diversity of local and national society – and that there is not always a great deal of similarity between these. The discussion presented here follows directly from the previous chapter to recognise the complexity and richness of diversity. While attention is given to diversity of ethnicity and some of the ways in which pupils who find themselves placed outside the dominant culture are institutionally disadvantaged, other socially constructed categories by which pupils can be identified as different or diverse will be identified e.g. issues of gender, social class, sexuality, pupils as carers.

BACKGROUND

One way in which the approach to citizenship education contrasts between that taken in England and, for example, those of France and the USA, is in the attitude to difference. In France and the United States of America considerable emphasis is placed on similarities, on what makes pupils French or ‘American’ – although, in the case of the latter, there would appear to be no discussion on what binds them to other ‘Americans’ such as Peruvians, Canadians, Venezuelans, Hondurans, Brazilians, Mexicans etc; while terms such as African American and Asian American have entered into common use in the USA, they are constitutionally considered only to be Citizens of The United States of America. In England there is a conscious focus on difference, effectively an entitlement to being different, at the same time as pursuing that ephemeral and probably non-existent condition known as ‘Britishness’. While it has been frequently proposed that this celebration of diversity and difference does little to foster social cohesion, it cannot be persuasively argued that the enforced uniformity model of France or the USA is any more successful in that regard. Indeed, Halualani’s (2010) work in the USA identifies an underlying uncertainty among undergraduates regarding their own as well as others’ cultures and cultural identities which it is not unreasonable to extend to the rest of that society.

This concept – ‘Britishness’ – is relatively new and remains largely unformed. When the Conservative politician Norman Tebbit spoke in the late twentieth century of a cricket team test to determine national loyalties, asserting that immigrants who supported the team from their country of origin rather than their country of adoption were not really British at all, he was really considering English rather than British – a common confusion in the south of Britain, and one which simultaneously does little to help clarify issues and serves to illustrate one of the difficulties in determining ‘Britishness’, that regional and (sub)national identities are very strong. Former Conservative Prime Minister John Major’s eulogy on warm beer and cricket again had an English rather than British focus. In both cases, the notion that cricket is character or identity defining is highly revealing with regard to a particular subnational, and to some extent social class, perception of being British. The complexity of Britishness as an identity is discussed in Chapter Three, and one approach to dismantling and reconstructing it is offered in Case Study #3.

In their discussion of issues of culture and of cultural difference Peters and Bulut (2010) remind us of Willis’ work in relation to subcultures, that subcultures are not just systemic but also that it is the exercise of choice by young people to ally with their parental cultures. Before we resort to unsubstantiated generalisations, it is also worth remembering that Preston and Chakrabarty (2010) helpfully show that the choice is not always thus e.g. despite stereotypes, it is not always the case that young British Asians adopt the values and practices of their parents. Some aim to assimilate while others become more ‘traditional’, although such traditions vary between faith and region/country of family origin as well as between such regions. As a middle-aged, Scottish-born, secular Jew of multiple national origin, I can confirm that the phenomenon of being pulled in two or more directions is not restricted to young British Asians in present day England, while Jackson and Marsden (1970) have described and analysed in great detail a similar pressure on academically successful working class undergraduates.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Britain is a country of multiple identities – as are many other countries to varying degrees – so that recognition of difference cannot sit comfortably

with a desire for a single identity. If we consider the informal but widely recognised regional categories in England such as Cockney (East London), Scouser (Liverpool), Geordie (Newcastle), Brummy (Birmingham), and then add to these the often derogatory images from other parts of Britain such as Jocks (Scotland), Micks (Ireland) and Taffies (Wales), we might conclude that one characteristic of Britishness is diversity, and another is, paradoxically, suspicion and derision of difference. Throughout Britain there are also Jews and Muslim, Sikhs and Hindus, Christians and Humanists, Buddhists and Taoists – and within each of those there are subdivisions and categories of ‘other’. There are also people of other European origin as well as Asian, African, North and South American, Pacific, and other ancestries, again with many subdivisions and categories of ‘other’, and people whose heritage is a hybrid of two or more of these. If we add other variables to this already complex and multidimensional matrix – such as sexuality, age, preference for music, eating habits, computer literacy, social class, social attitudes, gender, employment prospects, attitude to law, attachment (or lack of) to a particular football club – then we could argue that we are all simultaneously very similar and thoroughly unique. However, as Manzoor observed at the conclusion of his account of being a Muslim journalist who had spent a week as a Jew, there is a ‘banal but powerful truth, that underneath the skull caps and the headscarves, whether we eat chicken soup or chicken jalfrezi, we really are more similar than we are different.’ (Manzoor, 2010; p7) It is significant to remember that so many Britons are the product of variety, and that the specific composition of that variety is permanently in flux.

However, it may be that the overlapping varieties drive us to seek and emphasise difference, not as diversity but as exclusivity. It is over a generation ago that Illich warned us that ‘society can be destroyed when further growth of mass production renders the milieu hostile . . . when it isolates people from each other . . . when it undermines the texture of community by promoting extreme polarization’ (Illich, 1973; p11). The increasing uniformity, predictability, homogeneity and standardisation of everyday life – the mcdonaldization of existence – is creating false differences to fill the vacuum left by lack of real choice. The differences exist, but the emphasis on them rather than on shared values and potential comes not from within the matrix but from those whose interests are served

by a divided society – not only the bourgeoisie and their acolytes, but often also those who wield some level of power within social divisions and who wish to maintain some notional control and status at the expense of the common good. The Marxist concept of divide and rule, where divisions within the proletariat are either manufactured or over-emphasised so that the exploited oppose and compete with each other instead of uniting against a common foe, is clearly applicable here beyond the construct that is social class.

Schools can address this by creating space for recognition of and open discussion about difference, ensuring that citizenship education is about everyone and for everyone. Park (1950) identified ignorance as the greatest contributor to animosity between host and migrant groups; if we change the nomenclature to ‘dominant’ and ‘minority’ groups, using access to power and/or numerical presence as our determinants, the same applies. The solution must therefore be to address ignorance; not through some vacuous notion of avoiding offence at all costs but through the informed and reasoned exchange of views which facilitate what has been described as a ‘dialogue through disagreement’ which leads to people ‘finding ways to reasonably disagree’ (Smith et al, 2010; pp 5/6). This means that young people need to be informed – deserve to be informed – and to have the opportunity to develop and express reasoning. Disagreement is healthy and to be encouraged, both for the variety of experience it reflects and for its potential to change minds, and it is best expressed and encountered through dialogue; discussion around a common theme with common views expressed and disagreement avoided is not a dialogue but a monologue for several voices.

Citizenship education must allow and encourage young people to enter into dialogues, to express and encounter opposing views and learn how to argue their perspective while listening to, understanding, and taking account of others’. Freeman (1995) writes, and Cole (2000) reiterates, that education in Britain allows for very little freedom of expression or right to participation, despite these and other entitlements being laid down in UN charters, conventions and declarations, the European Convention on the Rights of the Child and the 1998 Human Rights Act. A start can be made to rectifying this state of affairs by allowing

freedom of expression in the classroom and presenting a forum for participation. For these to be most effective they would have to be replicated throughout the school as part of its ethos (see Chapter Two) as well as responding positively and constructively to ideas and arguments put forward throughout this book. A successful and sustained approach to the development of citizenship education will not be achieved by piece-meal reform and tinkering around the edges; it has to be radical and complete. If we are to teach about diversity and about United Nations charters and Human Rights Acts, it would not go amiss to allow into our classrooms some of the freedoms enshrined in these.

It can appear that equality and diversity are mutually exclusive, and that a society which aims to give everyone equal respect and equal opportunity cannot therefore have room for difference and diversity, and this is indeed a challenge. With specific regard to education, Gipps and Murphy (1994) summarise Woods' research in identifying four separate groupings of definitions of 'equal opportunities' which we can scrutinise.

1. Equal life chances – which are impossible to achieve unless all life chances are state micro-managed. Such management would have to go far beyond the extremes of soviet interference in schooling, mass media control and the manipulation of political thought, beyond even the worst excesses of fascist states in their extermination of disapproved groups. While many people also experience discrimination in the UK, this does not generally extend to state-authorized murder. Absolutely equal life chances require a homogenization of social provision, removal of choice, levelling out of income and wealth differences, and a standardisation of the gene pool which would be impossible to achieve and, of greater fundamental importance, which is morally abhorrent.
2. Equal competition for scarce resources – which might seem appealing but would simply serve to perpetuate inequalities. Those who enjoy advantages by dint of inequalities of wealth or influence already extant would continue to have such advantages and, it can be safely assumed, would continue to make full use of them.

3. Equal cultivation of different capacities – this was the claimed objective of the education reforms of the 1940s. For many people the 11+ was or is the ideal but parity of esteem never happened because, while it is possible to regard each human being as of equal worth, some attributes are valued more highly than others. The pressure placed on many primary school pupils in those parts of England where the local education authorities have retained selection, and the amount of money some parents/carers are willing to spend on extra tuition and on launching expensive and emotionally draining appeals, stand as testament to this. While this is not evidence that we cannot celebrate and cultivate different capacities, it does demonstrate the challenge it presents.

4. Independence of attainment from social origins – which is unlikely to be achieved in even the most regimented and managed economy. It did not happen in the Soviet Union and it did not happen on Israeli kibbutzim; indeed, Darwinism would suggest it is neither socially desirable nor biologically possible to achieve such independence. We are the sum of our social origins and, while it is possible to challenge or change some of the effects, such challenges and changes are themselves a reaction to – and therefore not independent from – social origins.

Further, we know that reforms in educational provision throughout the twentieth century, whatever else their motives or outcomes, were neither framed nor likely to achieve equality through diversity. Not only in single sex schooling but, even in co-educational establishments, there were different activities for male and female pupils, different play areas, and different expectations. Evidence of formal and planned divisions based on ethnicity are less easily identified in the UK, following more a pattern relating to urban migration and zonal location as identified in the USA in the first half of the twentieth century by Burgess and Park, more recently in the UK by Rex and Tomlinson as examples of 'structural breaks. One exception is the rise of faith schools, lessons about which can be learned from Northern Ireland, where, it has been argued, there was a consistent and conscious policy of favouritism in provision for the Protestant majority at the expense of the Catholic minority. Those who organised and presided over the educational provision for

either side of this divide ensured that children were taught about difference and hatred much more than about similarity and acceptance. Indeed, McGlynn (2004) argued that integrated schooling would stimulate 'natural' acceptance of diversity, while Hayes et al (2006) found that pupils who had been educated in an integrated system were more likely to lose their traditional and national identities and allegiances than those who had experienced segregated institutions.

Where for most of the last century members of minority ethnic groups who wished their children to learn about their faith were more likely to establish out-of-hours faith schools than to replace or complete with state provision, faith schools now attract state finances. The laissez-faire approach which had contributed to at least tolerance has been replaced, in the face of increasing social division and increasing concerns about ethnic division, to an approach which is based on separation and exclusion. The centuries of evidence from the southern United States, from Northern Ireland and from South Africa tells us that separating people out emphasises difference and reinforces inequality, which is a far cry from celebrating diversity.

Most schools will claim to be inclusive. While they might mean to imply a largely integrated learning experience for people with recognised and registered disability, inclusion is not the same as integration. Integration is largely about enabling a few pupils to merge with the many. As the Centre for Studies on Inclusion in Education continues to remind us, inclusion centres on increasing the participation of all pupils in all aspects of their local schools. It must be concerned with the full participation of all pupils who might either be considered by others or who perceive themselves to be vulnerable to exclusionary pressures. And "all pupils has to really be all pupils.

We know that minority ethnic pupils, and from some minority groups more than others, are more 'vulnerable to exclusionary pressures', as are some economic groups. If 'exclusionary pressures' include bullying – which can result in self-exclusion – then gay pupils, religious

pupils, red-headed pupils, Goths and other subculture affiliated pupils, pupils perceived to be overweight, pupils perceived to be underweight, butch, effeminate, sporty, academic, not at all academic pupils are all vulnerable.

As a teacher you will be expected to provide suitable learning challenges for *all* students, by planning effectively to overcome potential barriers to learning and by responding to diverse learning needs...it is about access to the curriculum and to learning for all. (Price, 2002; p119).

'For all' does not carry any implication of exceptions. In effective, educationally inclusive schools

the teaching and learning, achievements, attitudes and wellbeing of every young person matter...This shows not only in their performance, but also in their ethos and their willingness to offer new opportunities to students who may have experienced previous difficulties. This does not mean treating all students in the same way. Rather it involves taking account of students' varied life experiences and needs. (Clay and George, 2002, p 133)

Considerable media, policy and public attention has been given to the differences in achievement between boys and girls. However, we are reminded that

Gender is ...only one factor that affects schooling and achievement. Other factors such as class and ethnicity are strong determinants of educational achievement and thus it is dangerous and inaccurate to imply that all boys underperform and all girls do well. (Clay and George, 2002; p138)

Research indicates that the gender gap is significantly smaller than the gap associated with class and race:

of the three best-known dimensions of inequality . . . gender, and in particular boys' underperformance, represents the narrowest disparity. In contrast to the disproportionate media attention, [our] data shows gender to be a less problematic

issue than the significant disadvantage of 'race' and the even greater inequality of class. (Gillborn and Mirza 2000, p 23)

As discussed in Chapter One, many teachers – and not only teachers of citizenship education – would benefit from appropriate support and development to address areas of concern and self-perceived weakness. Managing diversity is one such area, and Case Study #4 offers one example of some highly effective training. It is the report on a three year project funded by Oxfam and the Big Lottery Fund between 2007 and 2010 which was conducted under the auspices of the World Education Development Group (WEDG), the Canterbury based Global Education Centre for East Kent, which can be contacted via their website at www.wedg.org.uk. Elsewhere in the UK there is likely to be a similar organisation nearby, and there are comparable groups in many other countries; if you have the opportunity you should get in touch and find out what they have to offer, and what you can offer them. Support should be a two-way process, and networking is usually both time and effort well spent.

This case study is included because it gives a realistic picture of what can be achieved and of how much more there is to do. It also stands as evidence that it is possible to address complex issues with very young children, negating the arguments that issues of diversity should be left until pupils are old enough (whenever that might be), and that it is never too early to begin to address such issues. The project serves as a reminder to those of us whose main interests are in secondary education that there is a great deal of excellent practice taking place in earlier phases and that pupils do not arrive at secondary school experience free. Above all, it draws attention to the need to support and develop staff – in this case, in relation to issues of diversity. The details given below are taken verbatim from the WEDG summary report, and I acknowledge the generosity of WEDG and of Dr Linsey Cameron, of the University of Kent, who conducted the evaluation of the project, for their kind permission to include their findings here.

[The Persona Dolls referred to in the report are widely available and intended to enable trained staff to encourage children to develop empathy with others and to challenge discrimination and unfairness. They are cloth dolls which can be used to help counter the misinformation and prejudice which children might absorb irrespective of the extent (or lack of) their contact with members of a diverse range of social groups. More information, including how to purchase or borrow dolls and how to access training, can be found at <http://www.persona-doll-training.org/ukhome.html> or from WEDG.]

CASE STUDY #4

Attitude is Everything: developing cultural diversity in pre-school education

THE PROJECT

The project took place in three nurseries in Sheerness, Dover and Margate and was based on the idea that building up a positive attitude towards cultural diversity is an essential part of preparing young children for successful lives in the 21st century. The project worked with practitioners in building up their knowledge, self-confidence and a positive attitude to cultural diversity which would then be reflected in their daily interactions with young children.

WHAT HAPPENED

A major aim of the project was for cultural diversity training to take place in a supportive and enjoyable atmosphere where political correctness would not inhibit questions and discussion. Each setting had a programme that included training, resources and activities for the practitioners to use with the children. During the training practitioners had the time and opportunity to clarify with colleagues their own thoughts on often difficult and sensitive issues such as terminology and responding to difficult situations.

Cultural ambassadors were recruited, briefed and visited all three settings taking with them food clothes and other items to show, try on and discuss with both children and adults. This was especially important for practitioners who appreciated having the opportunity to ask questions and clarify their knowledge. By going through these processes practitioners were very definite about their improved self confidence in how to include cultural diversity in their planning. Many also commented on their increased confidence to address negative comments and actions by children towards others when they arose in everyday situations.

A range of activities and approaches were tested by the practitioners with the children and the best of these can be seen at www.wedg.org.uk.

Objects, photographs of varying scale, games and Persona Dolls were used to introduce aspects of cultural diversity in an engaging and enjoyable way. Each setting used Persona Dolls and adapted the techniques to suit their own situations as circumstances changed. Young children can be harsh judges and with a child led, freeflow policy in the three settings it soon became clear to practitioners what did and did not work.

WHAT WE ACHIEVED

Better Understanding and Awareness of Cultural Diversity Amongst Children and Adults “You start to be interested in something that really you were never interested in before. Like ‘oh that’s why they do that’ and it breaks down barriers which is the main part of the project isn’t it?” (Meadow Nursery Practitioner)

Increased Self Confidence and Skills of Staff “It came out of nowhere! Suddenly these children were saying things about S’s hair and that she looked like a boy. I thought

right, time to get out the Persona Doll, before they go home, and it worked! I changed the story a bit of course but they listened and had lots of suggestions." (Shepherdswell Pre-school Practitioner)

Improved Understanding About Racism – What It Is and What It Is not "You know how to react, more than you did before. You would have been stunned if someone came up with a comment like that before but now, having that input has helped." (Meadow Nursery Practitioner)

Greater Creativity "Because the children were so interested in the Russian dolls and the way they fitted into one another, we decided to make boxes that fit into one another." (Meadow Nursery Practitioner)

Increased Use of Resources for Cultural Diversity "Yeah, we've had quite a lot of the photographs and things like that and we've been using those with the children: 'what can you see? What can you see that's the same?' So its making comparisons and chatting. That goes down really well." (Shepherdswell Pre-school Practitioner)

Development of Caring Attitude to Others "Harley is very much a boy's boy. When Lola (Indian Persona Doll) was introduced he really took to her and his usual 'frown' disappeared." (Seashells Sheerness Neighbourhood Nursery Practitioner)

Greater Links with the Wider Community "An Indian visitor showed the children a toran and explained that in India they are often hung over the doorway as a sign of welcome. The children were proud of their welcome sign they made and parents were interested in the reason for the toran." (Meadow Nursery practitioner)

THE WIDER COMMUNITY

At each setting parents/adults were kept up to date with the project as it evolved through what their children had been doing and the close, frequent contact with staff at the settings via newsletters and notice boards. Although most parental reaction to the project was very positive, at all three settings practitioners reported occasional negative, often off-the-cuff comments about this project or cultural

diversity in general. This needs to be taken into consideration in future planning given the close and frequent contact between parents/adults and practitioners.

SPREADING BEST PRACTICE

The best learning and everyday practice from the project has been shared with the wider Early Years community. Over 500 Early Years practitioners in East Kent have received training and workshops on successful ways of introducing cultural diversity to young children. This has provided a catalyst for the on-going development of different approaches, ideas and attitudes within pre-school settings.

THE EVALUATION

The evaluation was carried out by Dr Linsey Cameron, Department of Psychology, University of Kent and aimed to determine

1. Children's attitudes towards diversity and their self-confidence.
2. How frequently and in what way the materials were used by the practitioners.
3. The wider effect on the community, particularly whether it had increased practitioners' knowledge of diversity and confidence in delivering a multicultural education.
4. How WEDG can better support nursery settings in delivering multicultural education.

Main findings from interviews with children:

- Children made decisions about who they wanted to play with based on the playmate's ethnic background.
- Children were more negative towards some ethnicities than others. Children were particularly negative towards Asian children. Children may have picked this up from social influences e.g. parents.

- The materials have different effects on boys and girls.

MAIN FINDINGS FROM INTERVIEWS WITH PRACTITIONERS:

- Practitioners lacked knowledge about diversity issues e.g. terminology. The project increased their knowledge and confidence in these areas but they still felt they needed ongoing information on different cultures and approaches.
- Practitioners working in pairs when using Persona Dolls were most effective.
- Sharing experiences with staff from other project nurseries boosted self confidence and generated new ideas

THE FUTURE

- Must continue to use cultural diversity education resources to develop positive attitudes to avoid playmate preference based on ethnicity.
- Should target interventions at tackling attitudes about groups who are particularly stigmatized in local communities.
- Need to create materials that engage both boys and girls.
- Need for ongoing training in cultural diversity for all settings due to high turnover of staff and low levels of confidence in this area amongst practitioners.'

SUMMARY

The best way to summarise the discussion above is to start with the words of Peter Brett, who observed that

Celebrating diversity, but ignoring inequality, inevitably leads to the nightmare of entrenched segregation. ...There can be no true integration without true equality. But the reverse is also true. The equality of the ghetto is no equality at all. Multiculturalism is in danger of becoming a sleight of hand in which ethnic minorities

are distracted by tokens of recognition, while being excluded from the real business.’
(Brett 2007; p3)

We then need to extend this beyond issues of ethnicity to ensure that it encompasses all areas of human diversity, eschewing tokenism and ghettoisation so that we can enjoy being safe, being different, and getting on with each other, and perhaps take comfort from the reminder that ‘[t]here are complex and creative fields of resistance through which class-, race- and gender-mediated practices often refuse, reject, and dismiss the central messages of the schools.’ Aronowitz & Giroux (1986. p72)

5. PUPIL VOICE(S)

Pupil voice is commonly trumpeted by many schools as being a well-established component of their citizenship education provision, yet there is rarely compelling evidence that such schools allow pupil voices to be heard in relation to more than the quality of toilet paper, whether uniform should be worn in hot weather, and the colour of the common room. The National Curriculum for Citizenship explicitly states that young people should be encouraged ‘to take an interest in topical and controversial issues and to engage in discussion and debate’ (QCA, 2007; p27) and that they should learn to argue a case on behalf of others as well as themselves and speak out on issues of concern.’ (QCA, 2007; p41). While clothing, common rooms and sanitary arrangements will all rightly be important to young people, we can be confident that there are bigger and more wide-ranging issues of pupils’ concern within their schools.

Most teachers’ classroom experiences will tell them that pupils can and will ask about any number of issues, often under the guise of academic interest but just as likely to be a ruse to distract the teacher from lesson objectives and learning outcomes. Those same teachers

understand that one very effective way to deal with such distractions is to ignore the questions or opinions being put forward, safe in the knowledge that the pupils will eventually tire of asking unanswered questions and so turn their attention to matters which the teacher regards as important, or at least fall into a passivity which allows teaching to take place uninterrupted by pupil involvement or engagement. The same applies to pupil voice. It doesn't take long for pupils to realise that the only opinions and arguments of interest to head teachers and school managers are those which reproduce the opinions and arguments which those same teachers and managers have already aired. Lukes (1974) clearly illustrates how those with authority can manage and manipulate their minions to voice only those statements and opinions which have been approved, while Michels (1949) had previously demonstrated the inevitability of this within his Iron Law of Oligarchy. If we want to facilitate change and enable young people to voice their opinions, concerns, beliefs, prejudices and preferences, we have to enable them to unlearn the hidden processes whereby they express the views expected of them, and to learn to find their own voices. Those voices must be listened to, but it does not follow that everything they express will or should come about; listening to pupil voices need not always be synonymous with doing what those voices ask.

There are many opportunities for young people to learn how to construct and present arguments, and this chapter examines ways in which pupils can develop their voices and gain opportunities to be heard. It discusses ways in which those in authority in schools can be encouraged to listen, and addresses the thorny yet essential issue of the importance of taking young people and their views seriously while not necessarily always doing what those young people want.

BACKGROUND

Postman and Weingartner (1976, pp 131-3) cite a newspaper article from 1967 in which high school dropouts addressing a conference of teachers (an interesting and rarely replicated event) decried the way in which teachers refused to listen to or take account of the attitudes and experiences of the young. No doubt many teachers would say that this

situation has been rectified and that we are all alert to the life experiences of the young. Over forty years later the Guardian newspaper carried a report (Williams, 2010) from the annual conference of the second biggest trade union for teachers in England regarding a 'debate' which complained that pupils' opinions were being sought with regard to appointments and quality of lessons and that this was 'stripping teachers of their professional dignity'. In 1967 teachers in the USA said they were too busy to listen and that it was their job to teach, in 2010 their English counterparts complained that pupils were distressing teachers and it is those pupils' job to learn – by implication, to learn passively those things which teachers have decided they should learn. It is clear from the second article that, while some of the questions posed by pupils would seem irrelevant or fatuous to some teachers, most of the teacher complaints were about punctured dignity; if pupils think someone with a first class degree lacks substance or they can render an applicant speechless with a question about behaviour management – two of the examples quoted in the article – perhaps some teachers need to be less inflated with a sense of their own importance. We cannot tell young people to keep quiet until they know better if we don't do all we can to enable them to develop their knowledge – and then we should still not tell them to keep quiet.

Williams' article in The Guardian raises another important issue – and not the union general secretary's stated dismay at how unprofessional children can be (what did he expect, adolescent human resource specialists?). Knowing what questions to ask and how to ask them is a challenging skill, and there is no reason to assume that a child's ability to question is the same as her or his ability to ask pertinent questions. As with almost any other aspect of human endeavour, this has to be learned. Interview panels are one way, practice panels are another. It is clear to anyone who has been involved in interview panels, whether as members or as victims, that young people have not cornered the market in irrelevant, insensitive or nonsensical questions. Developing a range of questioning techniques in classroom interaction and having a range of opportunities to find and develop their voices is the citizenship education route to enabling young people to develop the skill to know what to ask and when to ask it. Any practising or aspiring teacher who finds what children value to be either 'frivolous' or 'demeaning', as the members of that union were said to find those

things about which they were asked by children at interview, should question whether teaching is really the career for them.

A commitment to pupil voice is a commitment to democratic schooling. This should not be confused with schools run by pupils any more than democratic societies are run by the general population. There is no convincing case to be made for pupils being excluded from all decision making processes in schools any more than there is a convincing case for pupils to be responsible for making all such decisions. In democratic societies we learn to express our opinions in ways which are governed by laws made by what Mills (1980) described as the power elite. We also learn to participate, to oppose, to conform, to contribute, to work and to make countless daily decisions, again in circumstances dictated by that same elite. To allow pupils to run a school without any authority exercising control over them would not be to prepare them for democracy but to prepare them for a utopian (or perhaps dystopian) world. We can therefore build on Jensen's statement as Minister for Education in Denmark that '[i]f an education must prepare for democracy it must be democratically organised . . . We don't suggest a connection between democracy and education. We insist upon it.' (quoted in Mahony and Hextall, 2000; p9) to say that such a connection must be realistic and effective.

The future of society depends on generations in development or yet to come, so it is purely a pragmatic decision to ensure that young people are enabled to express themselves coherently and constructively. For them not always to be listened to is to give a taste of reality, for them never to be listened to is to say that they and their opinions don't matter. If they are only listened to when saying what those in authority want them to say, young people will not become acquiescent but they will become disillusioned with authority. The lines between comprehension, concession and condescension must be walked with sensitivity and assurance.

The notion that pupils speak with one voice makes no more sense than television presenters' proclamations that 'the nation has spoken' when some viewers have texted votes for an aspiring music star, and many claims by school managers that they listen to pupil voice – whether school council, pupil surveys, suggestion boxes, pupil focus groups or whatever – are of little more accuracy or value. As Lukes (1974) demonstrates, one of the most effective ways in which debate or dissent can be stifled is to create an illusion of choice, to set and control the agenda. Before considering how to ensure that more pupils are heard, that they are heard more often, and that something comes of them being heard, it is worth considering whether what pupils have to say is worth being listen to and acted upon or if it is a) just teenage angst, b) not their role or responsibility to run the school, c) just as well to prepare young people for their adult role of being ignored by those in power by ignoring them from the start.

While enabling pupils to identify and complain about perceived injustices and those things which irritate them are important elements of a radical approach to citizenship education, it is worth remembering and worth reminding our pupils that 'no major thinker has ever recommended or endorsed whingeing. Philosophy from the Stoics to the existentialists rings with denunciations of complaint. Has anyone ever become happier by whingeing?' (Foley, 2010; p90). Whether or not their dissatisfaction or complaints are justified, the reality is that pupils – just like the rest of us – are more likely to get a response if they phrase things constructively. Much more effective than pupil whinging or strident gainsaying would be to enable them to engage in 'dialogue through disagreement' (Smith et al, 2010; p 5), recognising that disagreement is healthy – indeed essential in a democracy – and can be channelled constructively to produce either consensus or, through the process of synthesis, to produce an entirely new idea.

Pupil voices need not only be heard, if they are heard at all, inside the classroom and the school. We do not live in the land of 'Summertime Blues', where elected representatives can get away with being willing to help only those who are old enough to vote – schools can invite local councillors to meet and discuss issues with pupils, as the school of which I am a

governor does on a regular basis. Pupils can be encouraged to write to MPs and MEPs, although I recommend that letters should be checked before posting in order to avoid unfortunate consequences.

Few of us respond positively to abuse and being cursed, and it is not middle-class sensibility to expect courtesy and rational argument even in the height of disagreement – it is more likely to get things done, or at least get ideas and disagreements listened to. Pupils will readily accept that they would not like to be disrespected and, through that, recognise that others might feel the same. So we don't – indeed, shouldn't – ask or expect pupils to temper their arguments or change their beliefs, but we must encourage them to understand the benefits of a considered and at least approximately polite approach. If they choose to reject such a strategy that is their choice, but discovering how to get people to listen and take one seriously is it is part of the process of developing a voice. It is also essential to the continuing place of citizenship education on a school's curriculum that pupils do not commit to paper vituperation and spleen venting directed at the recipient – councillors and Members of Parliament are no happier than anyone else to be on the receiving end of such missives and are liable to make irate and speedy representation to head teachers when they do. That response, and the personal fall-out from it, is a part of learning which pupils (and student teachers) might best imagine rather than experience.

Labov (1969) and Bernstein (1973) showed in their different ways that pupil voices are not heard when teachers don't operate on a pupil frequency. Labov's analysis of the language of an African-American teenager, designated at the time as educationally sub-normal, showed him to be eminently capable of abstract thought and rational discussion, while Bernstein demonstrated that working and middle class people use different speech codes; the former understood both but the latter only understood their own. As teachers are, by any useful definition and despite any claims to proletarian origins, middle class, this inevitably means that middle class pupils have an advantage in educational processes – their language as well as their manners constituting parts of what we have since come to know as cultural capital.

The pernicious invasion of 'synthetic phonics' into the teaching of reading – as if there is only one way to teach and one way to learn and one time scale for this most essential of skills – is liable to be doing and continue to do extensive damage to generations of readers. I am not an expert in reading or the teaching of it, but it is clear to anyone with the wit to learn from their own and others' experiences that there is more than one way to learn to read, and that many children start school able to read while others do not and might not have opportunities or encouragement at home – their needs are clearly different. However, to control how people learn to read and what they read is also to control how they think, as Dixon (1979) among many others has demonstrated, and to control how they speak and what they speak about is to exercise similar control. It is therefore essential that, while we encourage and enable young people to use the language codes which will get them heard, we do not do so at the expense of their own language and heritage. Work must also be done to enable teachers to better understand those with whom they work and who depend upon them.

The ability to make constructive contributions to discussion must be developed as part of radical citizenship education. Rudduck noted in the early days of the National Curriculum that '[t]he critical thinking that fosters scepticism and independence of mind is too much absent from the curriculum' (1991, p33) and this seems sadly to be as true over twenty years later. While there is an A level in Critical Thinking, it is not the most commonly offered or taken subject and in any case the experience of critically engaging with ideas needs to begin long before pupils reach the age of sixteen. There is also an admirable programme called 'Philosophy for Children' – by no means universally present in schools but being increasingly adopted by some, to their credit. Scepticism and independence of mind are crucial aptitudes for constructive and critical citizenship, but they do not sit easily in the teacher psyche; clearly there are teachers who also have some learning to do.

The most recent Ofsted report on the teaching of citizenship education identifies how effective school councils can be in developing learning and understanding when modelled on democratic processes. The report also draws attention to the need to ensure that council members are not passive, but that they are enabled to research into matters of concern to them and that they can campaign for change. Where the report states that such councils 'encapsulated many of the intentions of citizenship education' (Ofsted 2010; p11) this should not be read as implying that such councils compensate for inadequate curricular provision; after all, school councils only involve a few pupils for a limited amount of time.

Teachers and pupils can both learn a great deal by pupils having some say in their own learning. Fears that this would result in riotous behaviour and lack of academic rigour are not borne out by evidence – despite allegations, rumours and (other) staffroom myths, learning does take place in Steiner schools and establishments such as Dartington Hall and Summerhill without excessive teacher imposition nor do riots and general mayhem feature in the daily experiences of pupils and teachers. Pupils have a say, teachers have a say, and everyone survives. Indeed, Morgan and Morris write of a need to 'confront [pupils] about their own learning and . . . challenge them to take appropriate actions' (1999, p135) in order to enable them to understand the processes as well as the details, and to engage in decision making which matters to them.

One fascinating outcome of Morgan and Morris' research is in the polarity between pupil and teacher perceptions of the major factors in pupils learning more and learning better. While there are a few reasons about which both groups agree, 62% of teachers think that pupil learning is primarily influenced by the pupil and only 18% that it is an outcome of teaching. The pupils' perspective was that 23% thought it was to do with the pupil but 60% that it was to do with the teacher. Perhaps pupils and teachers should talk to, and listen to, each other more, as they do in those schools where pupils observe and feedback on teaching so that teachers can better ensure their lessons are understood by pupils.

We cannot just dismiss young people's opinions say as 'what their parents say' or 'unoriginal' or 'predictable' – there are few people who can claim with any justification to be original in their insights and ways of expressing them. Most of us repeat, adapt or synthesise opinions from those we hear around us, as do young people – it is what socialisation is all about, and what maintains the equilibrium of society. It is therefore both harsh and folly to ignore the young for doing what everyone else does simply because they are young.

If citizenship education is to facilitate change and enable the achievement of the aims of the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998), the development of a generation which possesses and demonstrates social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy, it must not only ensure that young people are informed of their rights and responsibilities but also that their imaginations are stimulated and that they have ownership of their own futures; not a sense of ownership, but real and effective control of their own development. We cannot assume that the young do not already have active imaginations or the skills with which to articulate their views of the present and their desires for the future; research and observation shows that they have these in abundance.

CASE STUDY #5

The young people quoted below might not be a representative cross-sample of their generation, but neither are there grounds to assume that they are exceptional or unique. It is clear that these young people have voices, and there can be no doubt that they have many peers who could be equally vocal; whether or not adults listen to them is another matter. I don't necessarily agree with any of the quotations offered below; that is not the point. Pupil voices represent their views of the world, not something to be edited down to fit an adult perception of what this is or could be. As it says on the homepage of the English Secondary Students' Association,

[y]oung people are not citizens in waiting. We are here and now. In organising and educati[ng] each other we hold the potential to change a system in which we are not

represented. Involving young people is vital to a future that works for everyone.
(Rowan Rheingans)

There are very few examples of academic research which has seriously engaged with the views of young people. One study which set out to do just that was White with Brockington (1983), which clearly showed that young people a generation ago were thinking, assessing, criticising and articulating and from which I offer some quotations below.

‘Freedom is not just within yourself if you’re involved with other people. It’s something you can only work out as a group, and schools could help you to learn this.’ Jo Chadwick (p 19)

‘Teachers have to find a way to make it enjoyable for you to want to come to school.’ Brian Carr (p 53)

‘I’d make teachers pass a second certificate at thirty-five and another at fifty – just to keep them up with the ideas of today. In fifteen years a lot can change.’ Leslie Howie (p 59)

These comments are about school not because that is all young people thought about thirty years ago, but because they are the quotations I selected. They show that some young people have a rather different view of their relationship with schooling than the views which teachers might either hold or expect their pupils to hold. I wonder how many teachers consider how to enable their pupils to engage with ideas and experiences of freedom within a group while making learning a fun experience. For those who don’t, perhaps the idea of retraining is particularly appropriate.

Following the 2010 General Election in Britain, some pupils were asked what they would like to see the new government do. Perceptions of political apathy and adolescent inarticulacy would suggest that responses would range from the irrelevant to the incomprehensible. Riley (2010) found the reality rather different.

Libbie Kolokoh (age 6) ‘Couldn’t we have a web page set up where children can have their say in the country? They need to listen to us.’

Natalie Hughes (age 11) 'We like teaching and teachers to be fun. In our school we are taught how to learn, not what to learn.'

Eduardo Navarro (age 13) 'I want a cleaner city. There is so much rubbish everywhere.'

Ayesha Begum (age 14) 'If schools work collaboratively, rather than in competition with each other, they perform better. It is about the quality of teaching rather than statistics.'

Mohamed Takow (age 15) 'I would like my views to be heard more. I would also like more help for hard-working single mothers.'

Bikesh Rama (age 16) 'If we are to compete, particularly in science and technology, we need to invest in those areas properly.'

Shareen Khaliq (age 17) 'The idea of letting parents take control of failing schools is an ineffective idea. Many "failing" schools are in deprived areas and parents may lack the cultural capital and expertise to run a school.'

Sarah Sarwar (age 18) 'I want to grow up in a country where the balance of my parents' bank account will not determine my experience at school.'

The Learning for Life Values Poster competition aims to encourage young Scots to reflect upon the human condition and to consider their own core values; in 2006/7 there were over 10 000 pupil submissions from 65 schools. While some adults might scorn or ridicule youthful adoration of celebrity, these young people can justify their admiration of particular people – some of whom are household names while others are family members or friends, fictional characters or ordinary people who have done extraordinary things. Their posters can also include the retelling of stories which, for them, have an important message. More information about the structure of the competition and the nature of the posters can be found at www.learningforlife.org.uk; the quotations are taken from Lorimer (2008), which is largely comprised of extracts from prizewinning entries. Scotland does not operate in years 1-11 but by primary and secondary phases, and the comments are organised here in accordance with that structure.

S1 (12/13 years old)

David McKenzie 'Learning how to forgive is one thing and that is hard, but learning to be open is another thing that is even harder' (p124)

S2 (13/14 years old)

Bhupinder Singh-Sihota 'To fight for your independence is not a crime.' (p63)

S4 (15/16 years old)

Jade Macdonald 'In a world as messed up as ours, no one can have a hero or inspirational figure . . . because, at some point that 'hero' or 'inspirational figure will screw you over to help themselves.' (p114)

The quotations identified by the poster makers as worthy of reflection include the following:

Anton Chekhov 'Any idiot can face a crisis. It is day-to-day living that wears you out.' (p26)

Stephen Covey 'You can't talk yourself out of what you've behaved yourself into' (p101)

Albert Einstein 'Anyone who has never made a mistake has never tried anything new.' (p52)

Henry Ford 'Whether you think you can or you can't, you're usually right' (p134)

Mohandas Ghandi 'The future depends on what we do in the present.' (p40)

Peter Wentz 'If you aren't just a little bit depressed, you aren't paying very much attention to what's going on in the world.' (p57)

Amongst the role models and inspirational figures included in posters were the following; if we don't know who they are, perhaps we should, and if we don't know why we certainly should:

Camila Batmanghelidh

Ruby Bridges

Bethany Hamilton

Mary Hartis Jones

Harper Lee

Jason McElwain

Nelson Mandela

Wilfred Owen

Rosa Parks

Jacqueline du Pre

The African Children's Choir

Narayan Toden

Women of the Second World War

FURTHERMORE

If teachers were asked to predict who their pupils would identify as outstanding role models, I do not know who would appear on the list but I am confident it would not be the list above. Similarly, if teachers were asked to identify quotations from the great and the good which their pupils find motivational or inspiring, it is unlikely that many – if any – of those taken here from the Learning for Life Values Poster competition would feature.

Presenting an improving quotation for adult consumption does not mean that a young person has hidden depths or a profound personal philosophy – it could simply mean that they know how to play the assessment game. As teachers we need not only to enable young people to voice their thoughts and to be heard, but also to realise that there are consequences to their voices. If a pupil holds a particular person to be a role model, it is reasonable to expect them to aspire to the same ideals, if they claim to admire a particular phrase there is every reason to look for it reflected in their behaviour. We also need to recognise that there can be other outlets for pupil voices than those offered and managed by the school. An example of this is an article by Sophie O'Connor, written when she was a 16 year old and about to begin her A level studies, which appeared in my local free newspaper. It is reproduced here with Sophie's permission and the permission of the Kentish Express Group.

CASE STUDY #6

WHY AM I ALLOWED TO WORK AND MARRY BUT NOT VOTE?

At 16 you can start work and leave home – but not vote. The question of whether or not this is right is aired here by . . . Sophie O'Connor [who] is about to start A levels in history, government and politics, maths and English and wants to go to university and be a writer.

Being only 16 years old I am unable to vote and, with all of the political mayhem which built up to the election in May, I wish I could be more involved. The shame is

that due to my age, the most I could do to have my voice heard is join numerous Facebook groups supporting or scrutinising policies, parties and leaders. From doing some basic research I have learned that this is actually quite a predominant political issue. However, each and every article regarding the voting age has been written by a 30-something journalist or political correspondent.

This got me thinking – what do other young people feel about the voting age? After posting a provocative comment on Facebook, I immediately got a response. One 16-year-old commented: “If we are old enough to move out, start a family and begin a career, then surely we are old enough to vote.” She was followed by another girl, again aged 16, describing the voting age as similar to “taking candy off a baby”. I believe that these girls both raise a good point; if we are supposedly mature enough to form a permanent independent life by getting marrieds, having children and getting a job (which allows us to pay taxes), are we not mature enough to vote?

Many responses suggest that if the voting age were to be lowered to 16, the national curriculum should contain political knowledge. This would install political awareness in us from an early age.

The majority of people who replied to my post were unaware that the national curriculum already contains compulsory units on politics. As the system stands at the moment, only citizenship lessons teach young people about politics, and in many schools these become optional once pupils reach 13.

I was one of the unsuspecting victims to study citizenship at GCSE. I found the curriculum was quite limited. Information on party politics is skimmed across in no detail, thus not satisfying my craving and students’ need for a developed understanding of national government.

Political knowledge (or lack of it) aside, why else do people feel that voting at 16 is a bad idea? Many people my age (and often, also older) are incredibly impressionable. One girl who replied to my Facebook post was considerably rude about Gordon Brown with no evidence to explain why she felt that way.

What I feel people must remember is that at all ages there will be a percentage of people who are uninformed and flippant when it come to politics. Similarly, there will also be a percentage of people who are clued up and who genuinely care about politics. Young people are no exception.

Nevertheless, from the numerous responses I received on Facebook, it became quite clear to me that, although there are many mature people of my age who would vote wisely, the majority of adolescents would sooner wipe their rears with their polling cards than vote responsibly.

SUMMARY

There many voices to be heard in a school, some are rich with insights and advice while others overflow with gripes and grievances; all deserve to be heard but none have the automatic right to be acted upon. Those who are less articulate have to be supported in developing clarity of language and delivery, but we must never confuse eloquence with pertinence or entitlement nor should we forget that, as a proverb puts it, 'Being in the right does not depend on having a loud voice.' (quoted in Lorimer 2008, p27). In schools we are forever exposed to young voices; we need to ensure that all voices are heard, that all voices are listened to, and that everyone learns how to listen to others, how to express themselves, and how to deal with the consequences.

6. POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT

Citizenship education in the National Curriculum for England came into being because of the enthusiasm of Tony Blair's first Education Secretary, David Blunkett, and the outcome of the report to him by the advisory group he established which was chaired by Bernard Crick. That report tends to be known as the Crick Report, but it was not only an inquiry into a general notion of citizenship education; the full title was 'Education for Citizenship and the teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship' (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998), which makes it as clear as anyone might need it to be that the teaching of democracy was and is central to citizenship education. There are, of course, many forms of democracy and many ways in which democracy might be taught. All or any of these models of democracy can be propounded in the classroom and brook no discussion or negotiation – along the lines of 'we are all entitled to our own opinions, don't dare disagree with that sentiment', and 'democracy revolves around freedom of speech – don't interrupt me' – or we can have confidence in democracy, take it seriously and open it to scrutiny.

If pupils are to 'learn about their rights, responsibilities, duties and freedoms, and about laws, justice and democracy' (QCA 2007: p41) they will have to engage with the political system, even if only to the extent of trying to gain some understanding of it and even if they ultimately reject it. For pupils to grasp the opportunity, to understand how they can hold to account those in government and others in power, or explore community cohesion, or develop skills of advocacy and representation – above all, how they can take informed and responsible action – requires much more than familiarity with their rights and responsibilities. Once they have developed the knowledge and skills required 'to influence others, bring about change or resist unwanted change' (QCA 2007: p45) and put them into practice, pupils will have started to become politically engaged in a formal sense; many pupils will already be politically active outside of their school lives, through activities such as green and other forms of ethical consumerism.

This chapter builds on ways in which schools can enable pupils to develop political skills and understanding to consider opportunities currently open to pupils to become politically active. This could include party allegiance (but should not be limited to it), considering also pressure and interest groups, starting or supporting local initiatives etc. As a starting point, however, we need to be clear about what constitutes political engagement and to debunk the perception – expressed in the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998) and by others before and since – of young people as politically apathetic.

BACKGROUND

To assume that young people are politically disinterested, apathetic, inept or inert depends largely upon one's perception of what constitutes political engagement and what criteria are employed to identify and measure it but, by most rational measures, it is an assumption clearly contradicted by Case Study #6 above, and one which is unsupported by evidence (Kimberlee, 2002; Henn et al 2005). From the USA experience, for example, it is reported that 'it is incorrect to say that young people take no interest in the broader world' (Bernstein 2010, p16). On a more global scale, the large sample cross-national study conducted by Ross and Dooly enables them to report that 'children and young people do implicate themselves in political behaviour . . . in contrast to frequent narratives suggesting that indifference to political issues is commonplace among youth' (Ross and Dooly 2010, p43).

The commonly held misapprehension that the young are significantly more politically apathetic than preceding generations appears to revolve around the impression of a sudden drop in teenage voting. This is an unreliable indicator in as much as most teenagers do not have the right to vote, and even those aged 18 and over will not always be able to vote as teenagers, given that general elections do not need to occur more than once every five years and that the voter turn-out in local and European elections is low for all age-groups. Even if we were to accept teenage voting as any more than a snapshot rather than a reliable indicator, it is worth remembering that the fall in turnout is far from sudden as 'voting participation has gradually declined over the past thirty years, and informal political activism

has risen sharply' (Ross and Dooly 2010, p44). Indeed, their data suggest that, if young people manage to fulfil their own expectations, they will be considerably more active than their parents' generation on all levels.

According to Ross and Dooly (2010), 55.8% of young people expect as adults to vote in elections and another 26.2% consider it a likelihood; 16.9% will discuss politics with friends while 27.5% think they might; 11.5% expect to join campaigns or NGOs with a further 22.7% considering it likely; and 6.5% are certain that they will join a political party and a further 10% recognise this as a possible action as adults. If we combine the 'definites' with the 'possibles', bearing in mind that reality may well lie somewhere between the two, there is a possibility of 82% voting – unprecedented in the UK for almost 100 years. The intention of 17.5% standing for election with only 16.5% joining a political party is an indication of either an as yet naive understanding of how electoral politics work, or of a new politics yet to be established. Even if they do not live up to their own high aspirations, at least these young people have those aspirations and that in itself indicates political engagement. With almost 35% expressing some intention to engage with the political system through campaigning or NGO activity, we are reminded that there is a great deal more to political involvement than the infrequent opportunity to put a mark in a box.

We saw in Chapter Five that there are many ways in which pupils can become involved in the micro-politics of the school, and that Rudduck (1991) among others has noted the need for schools to do much more to stimulate scepticism and independence of mind through engaging the creative thinking and involvement of pupils. Even in those schools where the teaching and learning of politics is taken seriously, operating wholly on a micro scale does not meet pupils' needs; indeed, we should be concerned that those schools which enable pupils to develop a good knowledge of citizenship education where 'good knowledge sometimes omitted the central areas of parliamentary government and politics' (Ofsted 2010, p9). It does not follow from this that teaching about parliamentary politics necessarily results in a knowledgeable and competent body of pupils, as '[w]here standards were low, students' knowledge was based on completing factual exercises about topics such as

parliamentary procedures rather than exploring and discussing current issues' (Ofsted 2010, p9). There may be a place for such exercises, although I am at a loss to offer an educationally valid justification for their regular use, but they do nothing to develop understanding or competence, inquiry or independence of thought. There is little purpose and less value to pupils knowing about the colour and categorisation of parliamentary papers, the number of readings a specific type of Bill might have to go through, the roles of select and standing committees, simply for the sake of that knowledge; these are things which teachers of citizenship education, particularly the non-specialist teachers, might find out and then present to their pupils as a substitute for teaching and learning about involved citizenship. Of much more use to the pupils, however, would be for them to find out for themselves through inquiry and exploration, and to develop a context for why and how it all works. It is fervently to be hoped that such inquiries will go far beyond naming committees and other easily found, regurgitated and forgotten minutiae.

While it is untrue to allege that all young people are politically disengaged, it would be equally misleading to claim that they are all as astute/cynical as the pseudonymous pupil 'Tory Crimes' who stated that 'A party can say we're going to do this, we're going to do that, and you need to be able to see whether it'd possible, or whether they're just talking crap' (White with Brockington 1983; p37). There will be young people at either extreme of engagement, with the majority somewhere in between. The extent to which pupils develop politically will be influenced by their domestic circumstances and their peer groups, among a range of agencies, and we should not underplay the significance of their teachers in that development. School ethos will enable either conformity or rebellion – the same ethos can generate either response, as illustrated in the Lindsey Anderson film 'If . . .' – and pupils deserve a foundation of scepticism and critical analysis from their teachers. After all, '[i]t is unlikely that students will acquire a resistance to propaganda unless their teachers have done the same' (Powell and Solity, 1990; p6). As Durkheim and other functionalist sociologists have consistently shown, social change is essential for social development, and it comes about through questioning and criticality rather than through meek acceptance; after all '[i]t is through disobedience that progress has been made, disobedience and rebellion' (Wilde 1891; p72).

One of the three elements of citizenship education proposed by the Crick Report was the development of political literacy, which arose from concern about the 'worrying levels of apathy, ignorance and cynicism about public life' (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998; p 8). As noted above, the evidence for the existence of such apathy etc is sparse to say the least but it would be foolish to completely discount such concerns. Rather than blaming the young for apathy, ignorance and cynicism – a notion which implies that all other age-groups are involved, informed and innocently enthusiastic, and that the young are somehow a particularly powerful influence on social mores – it would be more helpful to consider the causes and extent of such attitudes, and to address them. Before doing this it is useful to further clarify what is meant by political engagement and how it can be measured.

The perception that the current young are significantly less engaged than previous generations were, or less than other generations currently are, and that political disillusion is a modern phenomenon, must be examined. Kynaston (2008) cites a great deal of Mass Observation (MO) data which indicate a whole range of attitudes to politics around the time of the 1945 General Election. Bearing in mind that the Mass Observation respondents were disproportionately likely to be middle class, and therefore statistically more likely to be politically aware, two quotations stand out – 'each party running the other down, and when they get in, they'll be bosom pals' (p69) and 'Dunno who I'll vote for. I don't like politicians anyway – they're all crooks' (p69) – as being echoed in 'Tory Crimes' observation above over forty years later, and not uncommon another generation further on.

While the theory and some of the proponents of democracy might tell us that everyone is equal in law, in access to power and in social engagement, we know that this is not true in reality. Early in the Twentieth Century, Weber (2009) explained the need for clear rules and structures, to prevent bureaucrats from assuming the authority of their office and to inhibit their opportunities to manipulate decision making to their own ends. Michels (1949), a student of Weber, developed his 'Iron Law of Oligarchy' in order to illustrate and

demonstrate the inevitability of people becoming more answerable to their hierarchical superiors than to the system both purport to serve. We know that our political leaders and business directors continue to be more likely to come from a few particular schools, two specific universities, one particular ethnic group, one specific gender, a particular social class – and that they are happy to operate in cahoots with their middle-class, white, independently educated Oxbridge graduate male clones in the mass media and the civil service. When Mills wrote about the power elite, his subject and focus was the formative years of the United States of America but, as with Postman and Weingartner, much of what Mills wrote can be applied to another time and another place – for example, the United Kingdom in the early twenty-first century.

It is not that there are no working class, black or Asian, comprehensive educated, non-graduate women in positions of power – but there are precious few. If we add self-identified as disabled and open about their homosexuality into the mix, as discussed in Chapters Three and Four, then the numbers will be even smaller. It must either be that all of these socially constructed categories are accurate determinants of political ability – that women are less able than men, that homosexuals are less able than heterosexuals, etc. – or that there is a systemic and institutionalised imbalance in favour of the few and against the majority. This is not what most people would offer as a definition of democracy. To say that young people notice these things is not to offer a startling new insight and can be verified in even the most cursory conversation with school pupils. To deny that they notice imbalances in power is to patronise and to seriously underestimate young people.

The concepts of bureaucratisation, of oligarchy and of power elite domination are not simply for sociological consumption. From television's 'Yes, Minister' through 'House of Cards' and onto 'The West Wing' and 'The Thick of It'; the populist and popular work of Michael Moore; news coverage and popular street mythology; we are continually exposed to a perception that the same could be said for capitalist democracy as was often said about state communism – it is fine in theory but unworkable in practice. In its defence we should

note that capitalism is generally more colourful, for many it is also more comfortable, and there is a wider choice of television channels.

We might ridicule political leaders but they continue to be our political leaders, irrespective of incoherent speech patterns, internecine – and, occasionally, sibling – rivalry, mud-slinging, corruption, double-dealing, deception and dishonesty. We have been told ‘there is no alternative’ when clearly there are alternatives, that weapons exist when there seems to be no apparent evidence of their existence, that politicians have our interests at heart when many consistently demonstrate the opposite, that they are upright and honest people when evidence is regularly uncovered which indicates that many of them are not. It may be that the perceptions of alternatives, clarity and consistency are not true but, as Thomas’ Theorem has it, ‘[i]f men (*sic*) define situations as real, they are real in their consequences’ (Thomas and Thomas 1928, p 572). In other words, we base our actions on what we perceive to be true, irrespective of the accuracy of those perceptions. It follows from this that, if people believe they are being fed rubbish, they’re going to stop swallowing the message; they may well also bite the hand that tries to feed them unpalatable untruths.

Postman and Weingartner (1976) argued that there is a need for ‘a new education that would set out to cultivate . . . experts in crap detecting’ (p16). Teaching is no longer about the dissemination of information, if it ever was. The teaching of citizenship education in particular is about the cultivation of skills of communication and informed participation, the development of both knowledge and understanding of structures and relationships in society, and how such skills and knowledge can be deployed. In order for young people to understand “what can be” and possibly “what should be”, they need to look at and understand “what is”. Many of them bring a perception of how life and society operate, rejecting politics in its party sense with its emphasis on economic strategies and the acceptance and admiration of one’s alleged betters, while developing interests and opinions on environmentalism, im/emigration, Islam and Islamophobia, concepts of crime and punishment and a range of other political issues. That such opinions might appear partly

formed is no bad thing if it means they remain open minded and able to change their opinions in the light of evidence rather than set in their ways and unwilling to consider that which contradicts their long-held but no longer substantiate beliefs. Such young people comfortably fit Postman and Weingarten's (1976, p204) criteria for 'crap detectors'.

The perception of politicians that political activity and political literacy are synonymous with voting is one of the areas of crap most frequently detected. Fiona Mctaggart, Home Office Minister at the time, was reported in The Times of January 20th 2005 as having declared that society would benefit from a rite of passage for 18 year olds in which they could assert their commitment to British values and the British way of life, then be given a pocket guide to the constitution and be more likely to vote, showed a marked lack of awareness of many issues – and not only that Britain does not have a constitution to be reduced for bite-sized consumption. It is unlikely that disillusioned or even simply socially self-conscious 18 year olds would flock to such ceremonies, making it probable that – if anyone does take up the idea – they will be attended by those who already feel committed and attached to society and who are probably therefore likely voters. The notion that there is such a thing as 'Britishness' – for which we might usually be expected to read 'Englishness' – is discussed in Chapter Three, is at best unproven and is clearly at odds with the approach to citizenship education supported by Ms Mctaggart's then colleagues in government. Equally unproven is the notion of any correlation between citizenship ceremonies and increases in voting; if the USA is to be considered an example of oath taking and ceremonial coming of age, their particularly low rate of political participation would indicate that the opposite is true.

The USA has long has ceremonies both of citizenship and to mark the coming of academic, if not majority, age. The consistently low electoral turnout and rarity of underclass involvement in ritualised civic progression in the USA can be taken to indicate that such ceremonies would not be well received; they were not when suggested by Estelle Morris when Education Secretary in 2002, nor when Fiona Mctaggart raised them three years later. There has yet to be legislation introducing them in England and the current likelihood is that, if introduced, they will not succeed. Failure will not be due to the 'unBritishness' of

such rituals – after all, many other US-inspired attitudes and forms of behaviour have been successfully transplanted in the UK and elsewhere – but because involvement in them requires and implies some commitment to the values and principles being espoused. For these ceremonies to succeed they would need to have meaning in the lives of the participants; at the moment it would appear that they would have little meaning and no relevance to potential participants.

If politicians are serious about engaging the minds of young citizens, focusing their attention and harnessing their energy, then practical opportunities have to be provided which enable action and engagement rather than passivity and ritual. If school leaders are similarly serious about developing citizens who can play a part in the political life of the country, they must press for and take advantage of those practical opportunities as well as ensuring opportunities exist in and through school for the relevant skills to be practised and developed. In Chapters Two and Five above and Chapters Seven and Eight to come, attention is given to a variety of strategies which, as well as involving school ethos, pupil voices, active citizenship and social order, also involve the development of the skills of political engagement. Chapter Nine deals specifically with developing the nuanced skills of identifying what knowledge matters and ways in which young people might apply such skills and knowledge. All of these issues overlap each other, and they coincide with political engagement. The case studies in those chapters relate to provision in the UK; Case Study #7 below outlines two opportunities in Australia which could be replicated in England if the political will exists.

CASE STUDY #7

Two Australian programmes which share a focus on sustainability – ‘The Australian Sustainable Schools Initiative’ (AuSSI) which **encourages schools to take systemic, whole-school approaches to sustainability, and ‘are you making a difference?’ (ruMAD?)** – give us some insight into ways in which pupils can consciously influence social order and develop skills which will enable them to continue to do so. It is important to note that these

programmes were not established primarily for that purpose in the way that, for example, school councils are expressly to give pupils a voice or that community action projects exist to encourage awareness of and involvement in local communities. The impact on and understanding of political engagement and political change which develops is, in both cases, a by-product of the activity – in Merton’s terms, an unintended consequence – which is what makes them so effective and real. Social order and social change do not and cannot exist in a vacuum, but arise from social activity.

Both programmes consciously focus on whole school approaches to sustainability for the simple reason that piecemeal programmes do not work; we can no more be a bit sustainable than we can be a bit pregnant or a bit dead. Participating schools are in a variety of contexts – urban, rural and remote; primary, secondary and straight through; ethnically diverse and mono-cultural.

A common aim for AuSSI schools, like Bradshaw Primary in Alice Springs, is to improve pupil learning and increase pupil engagement in their communities through incorporating sustainability into current school practice. The school has large areas of grass and a number of plants and gardens; it is also in the desert, so water conservation matters to everyone. A school project on water conservation compelled pupils to engage with a current problem likely to become a real threat to them and to their community. In response to this, pupils worked with a production company to make an advertisement about water conservation which was shown on local television, as well as developing three powerpoint presentations subsequently posted on the school website, and reflect real, effective and potential long-lasting engagement with a locally significant issue. Pupils engaged with a range of people on related trips, they worked in groups to plan and co-ordinate their activities, they presented their findings at school assemblies. In doing these things they simultaneously developed skills for political engagement and the realisation that they could literally make a difference to their community.

Almost 140 miles (220 km) north west of Bradshaw is Laramba School, with fewer than 100 pupils all of whom are aged between four and seventeen. Their engagement with AuSSI

revolved around horticulture and healthy eating, enabling pupils to make healthy life style choices and to reconnect with their own culture and traditions. Pupils created and maintain a vegetable garden, have worked with horticulturalists to grow appropriate indigenous trees from seed, and produced a landscape design. All pupils were involved in action planning and decision making at all times, including what should be planted and where. The benefits of collaboration became clear, and the opportunities to be given and develop personal responsibility readily accepted. Consultation with the community informed decisions about planting to ensure that bushtucker traditions were understood and given an environment in which to return and thrive.

Wondai is a small rural town in an agricultural area of Queensland, dependent on crops and timber industry, so that water is again a very important resource. The school has forests on two sides and a showground on another, caters for 300 pupils from preschool to year 10, and has a sustainability ethos within which enterprise education is the fulcrum of the school curriculum. The school produces an annual sustainability action plan covering all areas of the curriculum and all year groups, and incorporating a number of local and national initiatives. For example, some pupils were involved in an Earth Dialogues International Forum in Brisbane where, according to one participant, there were debates regarding how economic resources could and should

be redirected toward the well-needed restoration of the world's forests, oceans and waterways and also to help completely wipe out global poverty. Overall the (Earth Dialogues) weekend was very inspiring to myself and I'm sure to every student that attended, and it made me feel like becoming an environmental/animal/human/civil rights activist. ('Tully', yr 10)

Tully also wrote an article which was published in a Green and Healthy Schools newsletter, on the basis of which he presented his reflections at the Green and Healthy Schools State Awards teachers' forum. Unlike the Postman and Weingartner (1976) example offered in Chapter Five, here were teachers who would listen to their pupils and who would recognise that education is not all about what 'we' can tell 'them', it is about learning from experiences and from each other. In another activity, year 10 pupils had the opportunity to

develop skills for self-sufficiency and collaboration on a large-scale river expedition. One participant commented that

I've seen things and done things I might not see again. If I could do it again I definitely would and I would recommend it to anybody that gets this opportunity to take it! We learnt how much the pollution changes as you get down the river, how to tell how polluted the water is by the plants and animals living there and how empty the dams are! ('Brielle')

These activities were well publicised by the school, leading to discussions between pupils and community leaders, councillors and the mayor. Pupils shared ideas with others, prepared and delivered speeches, and represented themselves and their community and local, state, national and international levels. They became and continued to be politically engaged; in the words of Sue Gibson, the teacher who co-ordinated this activity for Wondai School, "One hand can make a difference, many hands can change the world" and I believe we are in the business of teaching many little hands that they can make a world of difference!

'are you making a difference?' presents its self as 'a toolkit that enables young people to lead social change and become active citizens. It is focused on values and led by pupils but benefits the whole community' – which is as good definition of political engagement as we might find. As outlined on its home web page, *'At the educational core of this program is a student-centred approach . . . By being flexible, ruMAD? is also adaptable across varying curriculum and learning environments.'* (Lucas Walsh, Director of Research, FYA) and *pupils 'learn that they are important today, for what they can do, for the dreams and hopes they hold, and for the changes they can bring about.'* (Roger Holdsworth, University of Melbourne AYRC)

At Gagebrook Primary pupils started by improving the local sports ground then shifted their focus to helping children affected by landmines in Cambodia before deciding to support people less fortunate than themselves and to make a difference to the lives of animals - an eclectic range of activities which reflects young peoples' diverse priorities. Among other activities, pupils conducted interviews, created artworks, wrote letters, circulated a petition,

recorded a song, organised activities - including an art auction - attended a conference and spoke in public. As the ruMAD? website states,

[t]he main focus was on increasing student engagement through positive social action. Students were encouraged to take more responsibility for their learning and thus come to deeper understandings of the community issues they tackled. The process enabled students to develop leadership, life and critical thinking skills. They became active change agents in their own community’.

In the state of Victoria, a cluster of six primary schools and one secondary college in Brighton formed a partnership with The Big Issue to raise awareness of homelessness through the lens of sport – in particular, the Homelessness World Cup. Elsewhere in the same state, pupils from Eumemmerring College addressed racism and interethnic tensions by reaching out to local communities to collaborate in building an amphitheatre. They invited local people with appropriate skills to contribute to this whole-community project for which they had to negotiate on construction quotes, plan a conference, deal with local media, and put forward a business plan to the local council. The college’s Student Leadership Co-ordinator, Marina Prassos, summed up the positive impact in that

[t]heir values (were) reinforced through every activity and I think they’ll be better people because of it. After being involved with the Youth Ambassadors Conference, I don’t think any of those students are the same . . . they’ve been affected in a very positive way.

These things do not happen by accident. There is no possibility of Mickey Rooney turning to Judy Garland, smacking a fist into the palm of his hand, and saying, ‘I know! We can change the world, and we’ll start right here!’ Projects and programmes such as those discussed above need funding, they need expertise, they need commitment and time and, more than anything else, belief in the potential of young people. Both of these projects are state funded and supported by expert individuals as well as trained and dedicated teachers. Australia has a land mass almost sixty times that of England, with a population of 30% of

England's. If they have been able to overcome the challenges of distance and relative isolation, of rural as well as urban conditions, so can other countries if there is the will.

SUMMARY

Citizenship education will affect pupils for the rest of their lives far beyond the ways in which any other subject will. They will be affected by science but they will not necessarily be scientists; they might speak another language, but only at those times it seems necessary to do so; English and mathematics will exert influences they are not always aware of. Whether they are awake or asleep, at leisure or at work, in the UK or in another country, alone or with family or with friends, they are and will be citizens. All their interactions will be influenced by political considerations, and we disable our pupils if we do not ensure that they understand the possibilities of political engagement and provide opportunities for them to become skilled in influencing their localities and their futures.

7. ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP

Taking informed and responsible action is a significant step towards political engagement as discussed in the previous chapter, and it is at the very heart of a radical approach to citizenship education. As the National Curriculum for Citizenship (QCA 2007, p27) reminds us, the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998) established three principles of effective citizenship education; one of these, community involvement, has to be experienced actively for the simple reason that passivity and involvement must be mutually exclusive concepts. In a properly structured programme of citizenship education there should also, of course, be an abundance of opportunities for young people to become active in relation to the other two principles – social and moral responsibility and political literacy. Active citizenship cannot and must not be exclusively about young people becoming a conscripted army of involved community members – not that there is anything wrong with involvement in the community – as taking social and moral responsibility and developing political literacy both require action on the part of citizens; it is not simply, or even necessarily, about doing things for other people. This chapter is mainly concerned with active citizenship as it relates to community involvement, but the potential for action in other spheres must not be ignored.

Furthermore, the National Curriculum for Citizenship identifies with varying degrees of frequency the following explicitly active approaches to be intrinsic to pupils' experiences and development in learning to become citizens: taking part in decision making; playing an active part in the life of the school and other communities; questioning values, ideas and viewpoints; communicating with different audiences. As the National Curriculum states, 'active participation provides opportunities to learn about the important role of negotiation and persuasion in a democracy' (QCA 2007: p28) and one of the three key processes demanded of the teaching of Citizenship Education by the National Curriculum, along with 'critical thinking and enquiry' and 'advocacy and representation' – both of which offer many opportunities for active learning – is again 'taking informed and responsible action'. This is clearly at the heart of active citizenship.

It should by now be clear that a radical approach to citizenship education, while it might have to take account of the National Curriculum, should be neither limited to that statutory content nor merely a reflection of it. There are many anecdotal cases of pupils being compelled to take part in 'voluntary' activities, or of being directed to participate without the opportunity to discuss, plan or evaluate the activities in which they are participating. The former situation is clearly oxymoronic, while the latter I have described elsewhere (Leighton 2010a, from which the broad thrust of this chapter is developed) as simply reducing active citizenship to a series of worthy acts. Such circumstances arise when teachers have tried to produce evidence that their schemes of work reflect National Curriculum guidance or to ensure that their pupils meet public examination specification requirements to the letter without taking or being given the time to consider what it is that young people are being required to accomplish, and why.

The importance of active citizenship seems to be agreed upon by teachers, voluntary agencies and politicians; what is less clear is whether those same groups of people agree what the term means either in the abstract or in practise, and it is essential that some common understanding is established. In order to move away from the fixation with worthy acts and the oxymoron of compulsory volunteering, this chapter considers the principle of active citizenship and ways in which schools can facilitate pupils' decisions to become involved. It also draws attention to examples of young people as active citizens outside of their schooling, involved in activities about which their schools know nothing. Active citizenship is not simply about doing good, although it would be unreasonable to oppose good deeds; it is primarily about enabling young people to see that their actions have consequences, that they can make a difference for good if they know how to and choose to do so. The emphasis has to be that we should be most interested in finding ways in which pupils can experience ownership of – and take responsibility for – their actions and the repercussions of those actions.

BACKGROUND

Opportunities to promote and demonstrate active citizenship in the classroom might not always be easy to identify, but they are there in abundance. We have considered in previous chapters the signal importance of pupils being involved in decision making at many levels. Case Study #2 illustrates how one primary school has ensured that pupils are consistently aware of their own and others' environmental impact, and how they are enabled to reflect upon and respond to the potential consequences of their actions; that is an example of active citizenship within the school. When pupils work in groups to make decisions, to collaborate on activities, to evaluate their own and others' contributions to an activity, they are involved in active citizenship. Therefore, classroom group work on any topic is an example of active citizenship and both teachers and pupils should be aware of this in developing and celebrating pertinent skills.

Once these and other opportunities are identified, however, it can prove even more of a challenge to engage the support of senior managers and the willing involvement of pupils. In England, participation is not only central to the citizenship education curriculum, it is also an essential component of one of the key aims of the National Curriculum which apply to all subjects – that of making 'a positive contribution to society' (QCA 2007 p.7) – and making a contribution cannot be a passive process. All teachers, not only those with 'citizenship education' on their timetables, are required to ensure that their pupils are able to take informed and responsible action based on research and investigation, and to analyse the impact of their actions. This is not simply because it is an effective teaching and learning strategy, which it undoubtedly is, but also because it avoids the contradiction inherent in demanding compliance in order to initiate independence – the sort of dichotomy which children of all ages see through and which comfortably fits that category of educational experience described by Postman and Weingartner (1976) as being uncovered by young people's inherent crap detectors.

It is not clear why some educators refer to active participation as this is a tautology. Participation requires some action; to be passive or inactive is not to be involved. Its opposites are either 'active non-participation or 'passive participation'. The first of these is a

clumsy description of the position many people might claim to take, deciding that 'the system' is not for them. This is rarely really the case as such people will generally still be in employment or in receipt of state benefits, pay taxes, interact with their neighbours; they might have decided not to vote, and their decision is often taken on the basis of partial information or disillusion with the relationship between democratic principle and reality. 'Passive participation' describes the condition in which some people do not openly opt out but equally do not obviously support a given system or aspect of it – perhaps being registered to vote but not voting, or watching a party political broadcast because it takes too much effort to change channels. Rather than become embroiled in a debate which might not yet exist, and which – if it did – would be a distraction from those things which I want to address here, I use the term active citizenship as it represents acceptable custom and some current practice, and bearing in mind Crick's observation that 'it seems elementary – except to some nervous head teachers – that there is a difference between being a good citizen and being an active citizen.' (Crick 2004; p6) People who are being active are not necessarily performing as citizens – it depends upon the activities in which they are engaged – and those who chose not to become involved can still be good citizens, but they are not active ones.

It should be within our individual and shared competences to find a generally applicable definition of active citizenship but a significant barrier to this has been identified by Peterson and Knowles (2007) where they found a significant lack of consistency amongst citizenship education student teachers in England regarding their perceptions of active citizenship as a concept and whether that concept has a shared meaning. In essence, their respondents agreed that active citizenship was highly desirable and that everyone knew what it meant but, on further investigation, the respondents offered a very wide and disparate range of personally held definitions of active citizenship. If this is the case for specialist student teachers of citizenship education, there is a strong likelihood that it could be equally true for those who have already qualified to teach and for those teaching the subject without any specialist background or support. As Peterson and Knowles (2007) state, the National Curriculum guidelines on active participation are clear and they freely

available; they further observe that it does not follow from this that these guidelines are regularly accessed nor that they are either generally discussed or understood.

The purpose of active participation must not simply to get pupils to 'do' things, but to enable them to be creative and reflective about the activities in which they become involved – otherwise it is all about 'active' and not at all about 'citizenship'. If such activities are performed only because a teacher says they will be performed, for example because they constitute a public examination requirement or the school authorities see a way of getting something done at little or no expense – or, worst of all, as some sort of punishment – they are unlikely to have any long standing positive impact; indeed, the opposite might be more likely. If we want to encourage lifelong participation and involvement, we have to ensure pupils' learning experiences are positive. We must also, therefore, ensure that active citizenship is a learning experience.

To say that the learning experience must be positive should not be misinterpreted to mean that everything should always work out in a pupil's favour, or that all activities are fun and laughter, ending in smiles all round and prizes for all. It may be an unfortunate truth but, as Powell and Solity (1990) remind us, '[r]ecognising you cannot have everything your own way is a painful but essential lesson to learn.' (pp143/4) Active citizenship, as with all other learning activities, should be geared towards pupils finding things out – about themselves, about their neighbours, about their neighbourhood, their city, their country, their planet. Not everything there is to find out is a good thing, not everything works out to each person's satisfaction. Young people have to learn this as well as those things about themselves, their peers, neighbours and society which might be considered measurable 'facts'. If, for example, they enter a competition in relation to active citizenship, e.g. to run a project which engages with the needs of a particular group in their locality, they might not win; if there is more than one other entrant to the competition, the odds against them winning will increase. An aware teacher of citizenship education will realise, however, that the pupils should have experienced conceiving, planning, delivering and evaluating their

contribution – individually as well as collectively – which means that a lot of learning can and should have taken place.

The National Curriculum (QCA, 2007) makes it clear that active participation should be both informed and responsible. This cannot and does not mean that the teacher informs the pupils and then either takes responsibility or passes the buck to them if things go awry, but that the pupils ensure that their decisions are informed by research and understanding, and that they are responsible for their actions. Such an approach to learning requires imagination, creativity, research, planning, negotiation, co-operation and, at times, opposition and regrouping. The activity itself should not be mistaken for the purpose of active citizenship, but the means through which pupils learn how they can become involved and the vehicle for assessing the consequences of their actions on themselves and others around them. If pupils are simply forced to do something which people in authority decide upon and monitor closely so that they can all tick a series of boxes and move on, without the opportunity to reflect upon their actions and with no consideration of impact, potential improvements and subsequent developments, they are being put through the motions rather than being given an opportunity to become active citizens. A great opportunity will have been wasted and another group of young people will have been deterred from becoming involved.

Motivating pupils to engage in active citizenship can be a challenge, but this can be true of almost any learning experience. Research by Csikszentmihalyi into personal satisfaction indicates that

teenagers who watched lots of television and hung out in shopping malls, also scored lowest in all satisfaction ratings, whereas those who studied or engaged in sports scored highly on every rating – or on all except one. They believed that the mall rats and couch potatoes were having more fun. (cited in Foley 2010, p152)

In other words, some people are achieving high levels of personal satisfaction and others are not, and both groups think the other is having more fun. Leaving aside whether

existence can be built exclusively around the expectation of fun, Foley's summary of Csikszentmihalyi's findings indicate that motivated young people will enjoy and they will achieve; the more of them we can motivate, the more achievers there will be and the more they might collectively and individually achieve. If this includes everyone, there will be no 'mall rats and couch potatoes' of whom to be mistakenly envious.

The literature on motivating learners is extensive and not something to be rehearsed or summarised here. However, the immediate function of active citizenship is that it should 'involve, engage and empower pupils' (Davison and Arthur, 2003; p21), and there is no doubt that people who feel involved, who are engaged in an activity, and who feel positive about themselves and their peers as a result of that activity, tend to become highly motivated – it is not the motivation which leads to involvement, but the involvement which leads to motivation. If an activity is decided upon and organised by teachers without involving their pupils at the earliest stages, this activity might somehow still be worthwhile but it is certainly not 'active citizenship'. Such an approach is to be found in teachers' frequent and mistaken belief that active citizenship is just another form of, or term for, work experience or unpaid and unskilled social service provision. This perception serves to deprive young people of their educational entitlement in relation to gaining useful experience of the world of employment and to developing the skills and insights which should arise from active social engagement.

Work experience and active citizenship need not be mutually exclusive, however. In considering the British notion of 'work experience' in relation to the concept of 'service learning' prevalent in the United States of America, Lockyer identified an essential difference in that service learning 'involves students engaging in, and reflecting upon, voluntary service in the community . . . the experience must involve reflection and deliberation.' (Lockyer 2003; P12). Work experience, on the other hand, need involve neither reflection nor deliberation; indeed, insights I have gained both as a teacher and as a GCSE chief examiner would suggest that it need not always involve much work or any useful experience. That service learning is voluntary, engaging, and requires reflexivity and

deliberation clearly distinguishes it from work experience. Active citizenship requires pupils to take action on problems and issues in order to achieve clearly identified outcomes in relation to them; they cannot do this as part of work experience or work shadowing, where they are expected to find out about the expectations and performance skills associated with a particular occupation or workplace rather than to unionise disadvantaged workers, report breaches of health and safety legislation, or direct a company's profits towards supporting the habitat of indigenous peoples in the Amazonian rain forests. As I have written elsewhere, '[p]upils have to research and plan actions, try to bring about or resist change, offer critical assessments and reflections; these are skills and processes which rarely if ever feature in work experience diaries.' (Leighton, 2010; p137) Any event or activity which is planned and developed by teachers or other adults, which does not allow pupils to develop and to learn, is not an example of active citizenship. No matter how worthwhile such events and activities might be perceived to be, and no matter how altruistic the teachers' motives and how enthusiastically their pupils follow instructions, these are – at best – worthy acts, where a short-term good has been met at the expense of long-term engagement.

We also need to question whether such acts are always worthy, just as we should question whether all events planned and run by pupils will necessarily be wholesome examples of active citizenship. To illustrate this with one example of the latter, pupil-run cake stalls which are intended to raise awareness and money for an identified cause can involve a great deal of planning, organisation, role allocation, mutual learning, research, informing and motivating peers, costing and various forms of decision making, and therefore have the potential to be effective examples of active citizenship. They can also create demands for costly ingredients and time consuming preparation and tidying which falls to those with home caring responsibilities, who might not have the financial or time resources required. Households with insufficient disposable income, time and skill resources to meet the needs of some grander plans could therefore experience tensions which spill over into the activity and into other school-related relationships, particularly where such activities exist in a 'who can raise the most' environment. These are effectively 'who is the best citizen?' competitions, implying that those who raise the most money are somehow better than

those who do not. Pupils selling food will also have an impact on pupil diets and on catering provision; on a large scale such an impact could have a detrimental effect on pupil health and on the employment of catering and meal-time supervising staff. Such activities will have a disproportionately adverse effect on lower income households and, what appears on the surface to be an example of doing good, might well be a case of doing substantial and lasting harm. If the pupils are making and selling cakes simply to raise money for something but not to raise awareness of that something, the citizenship value of the activity is difficult to ascertain.

In order for pupils to understand and reflect upon the activities in which they have been or will be involved, to move these activities from possible worthy acts to clear examples of active citizenship, they need to be aware of the possible consequences of their actions, both intended and unintended. As Merton (1968) identified, unintended consequences can have a greater and more lasting effect than those which we intended or expected. It is not necessary for active citizenship to be world changing – indeed many pupils will be more interested in and aware of their immediate environment – but it is essential that they can identify the possible repercussions of their activities beyond their (or the school's) doorstep. By asking questions and seeking answers, by interrogating their own ideas, pupils will be preparing for active citizenship on a larger and longer lasting scale. Every time a pupil questions the status quo, argues in favour of or against a particular action or event, suggests another way of doing something (which doesn't have to be an inherently better way, if such a thing exists, just a different one), says that they will 'do it differently next time' and can begin to justify any such changes, they are demonstrating active citizenship.

There appears to be an assumption by teachers of citizenship education that active citizenship must mean going out and doing something – fundraising, helping the helpless, tidying the playing fields, bringing about world peace – but this need not be the case. Citizens have their status by being part of society, not by performing good deeds. Active citizenship, therefore, constitutes doing those things expected of members of society – which can include fundraising, etc, but need not be limited to it. Asking question, offering advice, reflecting upon what another pupil says – all of these are examples of active citizenship in the classroom. Some opportunities for participation will arise outside the citizenship classroom but elsewhere in school and provide useful reference points from

which to develop pupils' understanding of and engagement with comparable issues. For example, during school council elections issues such as reasons why people decide to stand or not stand; why and how they decide to vote or not vote; how effective the council is or could be or is perceived to be; whether voters are more influenced by the style or the content of election campaigns. These can be related to voting behaviour in local, general and European elections to enable pupils to understand such behaviour and to inform their own future actions; this is one of several cases where we might not see participation until pupils have left school, but we can see citizenship.

Ideal opportunities can arise for active citizenship without planning or teacher forethought, and be particularly useful for their spontaneity. See these rather contrasting examples.

CASE STUDY #8

When I returned to school for my final year in 1971, my hair was a lot longer than the head teacher liked boys' hair to be and I had grown what I thought of as a beard. The same was true of several other boys and we were called down to the head's office, expecting to be sent home (if we were lucky) or to the hairdressing department of the nearby technical college.

Instead, we were told that we were each to take responsibility for ourselves and each other. It was explained that the head teacher had no objection to long or facial hair but he had every objection to dirty, untidy or unsafe hair. We were told, therefore, that if any one of us was seen scratching his head, or had a hair-related workshop or laboratory accident, or became slovenly in our appearance, each one of us would have to have our hair cut. I am sure it did not surprise him at all that we became the cleanest, the safest, the tidiest and the most mutually vigilant people in the school.

The head teacher could have given us the usual reprimand followed by the usual temporary exclusion, with the usual lack of sustained impact. Instead, he gave us responsibility for ourselves and each other and a sense that we had been listened to, and we gave a commitment to the school community.

CASE STUDY #9

As a teacher I was asked by some Year 11 pupils to intervene on their behalf as they wanted an end-of-year trip but they said their head of year did not think it would be allowed. When I spoke with her it was clear that the head of year had no problem with pupils having such a trip but she did not have the time to organise it. I therefore convened another meeting with the pupils who had approached me and we agreed that they would plan a trip and I would support them approaching the head of year and the head teacher – both of whom I kept informed of developments throughout.

The pupils surveyed their peers regarding possible dates and destinations. They then investigated the costing of the more popular options, taking into account entry fees, coach hire, catering prices – making all contacts with external agencies themselves, using my name solely to lend authority when needed (which it rarely was). The pupils asked school support staff about relevant suppliers, policies, pro forma and anything else they would have to deal with to satisfy school requirements. Having got all their information together, the pupils again surveyed their peers with potential costs and possible destinations. They also approached staff they thought would be willing and able to accompany them. Armed with their information and planning, they arranged a meeting with the senior management team from which they emerged with permission for the trip to go ahead.

These pupils initiated the idea themselves. They took responsibility. They were doing something for themselves and for others. They had to explain and justify themselves. They had to deal with outside organisations. They had to conduct themselves responsibly. They

had to handle money. They had to present a case to people in authority. They gained some understanding of the complexities of others' work. They enjoyed themselves. They had a sense of achievement. They identified, used and developed skills which they could see would be useful to them in life after school. What more could active citizenship, or any learning experience, be expected to offer?

A BIG SOCIETY?

There is no reason why schools should limit active citizenship to the classroom or to the school grounds. There are many other social arenas where pupils can be or already are involved. Those schools which require pupils to volunteer to work with or on behalf of others remove the notion of choice implied by the term 'volunteer'. Pupils who decide that volunteering is something they want to do are already involved in active citizenship, whether or not they have actually volunteered. If they can reflect upon why there might be a need for their involvement, the intended and unintended consequences of that involvement, the skills they have developed and the effects of their involvement on themselves and others, then their active participation is particularly secure and impressive. If they just want to do something and have not or do not wish to reflect, it is not active citizenship but it is still to their credit. Many pupils are involved in such a way, and that involvement could become something from which they develop learning about themselves, their skills and the nature of active citizenship.

The UK Government has initiated a pilot of summer schools where young people will come together to work for the benefit of society. These are to be run by charities and will be open to all. As yet, there is no indication whether attendance will be proportionate to the adolescent population by social class, region, ethnicity, gender, physical and mental capacity. I suspect that households which depend upon a school-leaver's income will be less well represented than those which do not, and that those households where a sixteen year old is the primary carer will be less well represented than those where this is not the case. It is likely that these Big Society summer schools will break down a few social barriers and

enact many worthy deeds, but they do not represent opportunities for social reorganisation or active citizenship.

In 2010 senior politicians recommended that pupils who did not get the grades required by their universities of choice should spend some time volunteering instead. How this would help the aspiring student was not made clear, nor was there any apparent discussion about 'volunteering' as a very poor second choice option. Similarly, unemployed graduates were being encouraged to 'volunteer' for internships with major companies – unpaid work experience which, it was alleged, would prepare them for employment and look good on a curriculum vitae. Unpaid employment is not the same as volunteering. Internships are simply a way in which employers can get work from people in return for nothing at all, and only those with independent financial support could afford such a route to employment. Volunteering is open to all, irrespective of income or academic ability, as it simply requires a desire to get involved and then getting involved. While it is not the same as active citizenship, it can be part of the process.

Schools have a responsibility to develop and enhance community cohesion (as if they do not have enough to do in educating young people). Teachers are required by the National Curriculum for Citizenship (QCA 2007) to take a creative approach to active participation, and to engage their pupils' experiences and imagination. Their pupils are involved in a range of communities, with a greater sense of allegiance to some than to others, and they are much more likely to be willing and able to engage with those communities with which they can identify than with those communities about which they have not heard or which they do not think relate to them. It is by building on their relationships with their own communities that pupils will begin to learn about the communities of their neighbours, then communities possibly further afield. Once they know they have the skills with which to make a difference, it is up to pupils whether they do, how much of a difference they make, and for whom. Six-week long 'doing good' camps might foster some cross-class or cross-cultural bonding or understanding, but they will not and cannot replace the benefits of year-long shared experiences and mutual support.

SUMMARY

There remains a great deal of confusion about what constitutes active citizenship, with the emphasis being placed too often on 'active' rather than 'citizenship'. As with other aspects of citizenship education, attempts have been made to graft an adaption of extant arrangements onto a new policy, amply illustrating the folly of 'innovation without change' (Rudduck, 1991; p26) which I comment upon in the Introduction. Teachers of citizenship education and school leaders need to recognise that it is the citizenship element which needs to be at the core of such activities, that these should be both about and by the young people involved. People will not know what to do with responsibility if they are never given any, nor be able to apply skills they have not developed. Active citizenship has to be an opportunity – or a series of opportunities – where those skills can be learned and nurtured.

8. SOCIAL ORDER

This chapter reflects upon and develops some of the issues raised in the three previous chapters to assert that social order has to mean progress and development and not social stagnation and repression. Comte's analogy of society as an organism proposes that survival depends upon adaptability; a society which stagnates is one which is dying. We must also recognise that one generation's order and stability is likely to be another generation's moribund strangulation; social order and social control are not synonymous as the former relates to both the nature of society and the relative stability of it, while the latter is concerned with who controls, manages, and benefits from the nature and degree of social change.

While there could be a perception that 'social order' and 'radical' are mutually exclusive concepts, this is far from the case. Challenge and change are at the centre of the radical approach to citizenship education, enhanced by an understanding of what is and what might be and, in the wonderful definition attributed to Raymond Williams, the recognition that 'to be truly radical is to make hope possible rather than despair convincing.' This has to include an understanding of the current social order and what maintains social order, how to question these and – if and where they are found wanting – what alternatives might be considered, for social order means both the maintenance of an orderly and regulated society, and an established social hierarchy. If the regulations of society are open to question, development and change, as they must be in a democratic society, so must the social structures upon which they depend.

When the National Curriculum for Citizenship requires that 'pupils learn about their rights, responsibilities, duties and freedoms and about laws, justice and democracy' (QCA 2007, p 41) it is requiring scrutiny and understanding of social order. When we 'equip pupils to engage critically with and explore diverse ideas, beliefs, cultures and identities and the values we share as citizens in the UK' (QCA 2007, p 27) they expose the established social order to scrutiny and gain an understanding of social change. To avoid such examination of the nature of society and of social change suggests that we either do not trust young people

to understand how things are and how they have come about, or we fear that our society does not bear scrutiny. Neither position is tenable – education cannot be built on distrust and fear, but on honesty, co-operation and confidence.

BACKGROUND

As an undergraduate I appeared in a play which retold the story of the followers of the ancient god Dionysus, who were sometimes known as the Bacchae, priestesses of ancient Greece who had a penchant for excessive drunken revelry. Playing the part of a senior civil servant, my first lines referred to Thebes' ordered society in which work and recreation each had their time and place, and where citizens had homes and the opportunity to have a say in the running of society. That the play is not more widely known says much more about the limitations of my acting skills than it does about the talent of the playwright, but the message that some things are constant remains true; ours is still an ordered society, there are times and places for work, as there are for recreation, and many of us have some say in how things are organised and run. That is not to say that society is unchanged and unchanging – after all, the work we do, the pastimes we might enjoy, their times and their places are all very different in 21st Century Britain than they were in pre-Common Era Thebes – but that changes do take place in stable and well-managed stages. They have to so that social order changes without becoming long-term social disorder, so that society develops rather than stagnates.

One of the concerns which gave rise to the introduction of citizenship education was a perception that social order was breaking down. There had been demonstrations, sometimes characterised as violent, in relation to industrial disputes, the 'poll tax', road developments, 'New Age travellers', and wars in the preceding decade. A young black man, Stephen Lawrence, was murdered in South London by white youths who were never brought to justice, and a young white boy, James Bulger, was murdered in Liverpool by two children not very much older than their victim. Philip Lawrence, a London head teacher, was fatally stabbed when intervening in an argument outside his school. Newspapers were regularly reporting increases in violent crime, possession of knives and firearms.

Engagement in traditional political activities such as party membership, trade union membership and voting in elections appeared to be at their lowest point for many years. The political establishment was alarmed at what it perceived to be a rending of the fabric of society, and felt it necessary to address such serious damage before it became irreparable. Whether there really was a breakdown of social order is not something which was then exposed to particular scrutiny, and we must consider whether that interpretation of circumstances is an accurate one.

For events such as those outlined above to truly constitute potential disaster, they would have to be unusual in both nature and frequency in relation to former times; this was not and is not the case. The miners' strikes of the 1980s and 1990s were in response to a clearly stated government policy to take on and destroy the power of trades unions. There is little evidence that this policy was other than successful, with violent clashes between police and striking workers not being a characteristic of industrial unrest in the last decade of the twentieth century. It is far from clear that the violence was the product of strikers' behaviour and aggression, given the well documented taunting of miners by police, and the stated police strategies of isolating and intimidating strikers. Such conduct by those who were expected to protect ordinary citizens, plus the limitations placed on personal mobility during the strikes – with motorists from active strike areas being prevented by police from travelling to other parts of the country – is, if evidence of anything connected with social order, perhaps indicative of an oppressive and increasingly martial state rather than of a disintegrating society. By the 1990s, there were few industrial disputes and even fewer examples of anything other than placid and highly controlled industrial protests.

The Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998) offers two of the murders mentioned above as evidence of social disintegration amongst the young. However, Stephen Lawrence's death, no matter how tragic and distressing for those who knew and loved him, was not a freak event in as much as there is roughly one murder each day in the United Kingdom that year. The mass media, however, raised the profile of this killing above all the others; other killings which resulted in other tragedies and others' distress. The focus

on Stephen Lawrence might have been a media reaction to the victim being apparently well-liked, academically able, respectable and responsible – in other words, he did not fit the media stereotype of young black men. The Daily Mail placed itself at the forefront of those newspapers which decried this murder and offered it as evidence of social decay – going so far as to run a front page which named as guilty those thought to be suspected of the murder by the police and calling on the men named to sue the newspaper if the statement was untrue – before returning to its more customary vilification of immigrants and non-whites which remains evident today.

James Bulger was a four year old boy enticed away from a shopping centre while his mother's back was momentarily turned, then brutally mistreated by his ten year old abductors before being murdered in 1993. Again, the mass media raised the profile of this killing above others before and since, as if it were one example of a particularly pernicious social trend, and continues to do so. There was considerable media and public pressure for the murderers to be given exemplary punishments, to never be released from prison, to be made to suffer. There seemed to be scant consideration given to the nature of a society run by adults that can produce children who commit such horrific crimes, and a lot of attention given to how to punish two particular perpetrators. No evidence was offered that 1993 saw an increase in juvenile murder (it didn't) nor that young black men had suddenly become victimised by young white men (such victimisation was certainly not sudden). There seems also to have been precious little discussion about young people's much greater likelihood of experiencing violence, including unlawful killing, at the hands of adults.

This whole process of media identification of a problem – whether youth apathy or youth crime or youth whatever-an-editor-decides-to-condemn – is sometimes referred to as a moral panic or media amplification but, while both concepts are relevant and possibly applicable, it more closely typifies the 'Signification Spiral' described by the CCCS Muggings Group (1977, p77). An issue is identified and, with it, blame is heaped upon an alleged subversive minority. The initial problem issues are then linked to other problem issues so that further escalation appears inevitable, often in the UK with explanations and prophecies

invoking parallels with the perceived decline of social cohesion in the USA. Then there is a call for strong action. A raft of sociologists throughout the 1970s, most prominently Cohen (1971, 1994), Young (1971), and Hall and Jefferson (1975), outlined and critiqued this process to identify the manipulation of public consciousness towards some 'renegade' aspects of social misbehaviour and away from the questionable conduct of those of run and manage society. This is not to say that all such news is necessarily manufactured but that it can be and is frequently distorted, creating a fear of circumstances which far outweighs their extent or probable impact.

Social order, as with most aspects of social existence and all aspects of citizenship education, is an apparently straightforward concept which operates on many levels and in many ways, making it a much more complex and dynamic process than it might first appear. Preston and Chakrabarty (2010) make the point that social order depends upon social cohesion and that there can be conflicting systems of integration which can simultaneously enable cohesion within a group and threaten order in wider society. Therefore a group of people, simply by dint of being a group, can simultaneously be integrated within and by themselves – be orderly – and yet present a real or perceived danger to the social fabric. The virulent Islamophobia of much of the popular media is predicated upon this being true for some if not all Muslims. Previously, and with at least a little more accuracy, the same process of simultaneous internal cohesion and outsider threat could have been identified in relation to the Red Army Fraction in Germany, Brigado Rosso in Italy, and The Angry Brigade in the UK, for example, groups whose threat to society and whose internal cohesion was considerably less than the media portrayal.

Significantly less violent but none the less equally accurate examples of this phenomenon are the political developments of Scotland and Wales within the UK – not, perhaps, a physical threat to the UK, but certainly a threat to the Union. A radical approach to citizenship education does not require that all pupils are encouraged to take an oath of allegiance to the state and report to the thought police all those whose loyalty is

questionable, even though such oaths have been suggested by a series of Education Secretaries and other politicians (see Chapter Six).

When Preston and Chakrabarty (2010) observe that there can be conflicting loyalties, they do not suggest such conflict to be inevitable. There are many groups to which members feel loyalty while also being law abiding, accepting of society at large, and generally little threat to anyone. Indeed there are some organisations, such as the Scout movement and Neighbourhood Watch groups, where group identity can help to foster wider social cohesion. There are, of course, also examples of group cohesion reinforcing social cohesion to such an extent that there is a real or perceived threat to social order – the more extreme club and subnational football fans being just one example. It is therefore essential that we strive to facilitate a social order which is not nationalistic, exclusive, chauvinistic or narrowly focused but one which celebrates and values difference while sharing what is common to all.

Such a shift, from the familiar to the unknown, is much more likely to appeal to the young than to the old. In part this is because the old tend to become more conservative, wanting to protect what they have and fearing the unknown. The young, on the other hand, see the mess they are likely to inherit from the old and recognise that anything would be an improvement. This is not new; it was thus when my generation was young, when my great-grandparents were young – which is why they migrated to the UK, to get away from situations and circumstances they wanted to change but could not. When Oakeshott, doyen of the oxymoronic ‘radical right’ in the UK, proclaims the superiority of ‘the tried to the untried . . . the convenient to the perfect, present laughter to utopian bliss’ (Oakeshott, 1962 p162), he does not appear to consider whose convenience is best served, whose laughter rings out, when processes and objectives remain the tried and established; it is unquestionably in the interests of the older, the white and the more powerful that things do not change, while it is in the interests of now and the future that they do. Foley (2010; p5) offers an account of the deliberations of the Gross National Happiness Commission of Bhutan, describing as ‘lamentable’ the perception that young Bhutanese 50 years ago would

have chosen the king as their hero whereas now it is the rapper 50 Cent. It is an odd state of affairs when someone expresses concern that the young prefer their heroes to have achieved status through talent and to speak to them in ways and about things which connect to them rather than idolising an hereditary monarch whose only achievement is an accident of conception. The preference might be viewed as either one of the negatives of globalisation or evidence of incipient republicanism but, whichever interpretation one prefers, it is clear that the social order in Bhutan is shifting, even if both more slowly and more suddenly than in some other societies.

We currently live in a society where young people, predominantly black young people, are being shot at in chip shops, on the street, at family celebrations, in their homes. It is little wonder therefore that they have limited faith in the current social order. That those who carry out the shooting might also predominantly be young and predominantly from minority ethnic groups serves only to emphasise the extent to which those members of society feel suspicious and alienated. The media amplification of these and similar events distorts their frequency and increases people's perceptions of their likelihood, and it is this fear of becoming the victim of violence which motivates and informs our social attitudes and social behaviour, and which the British Crime Survey reveals is most apparent amongst minority ethnic groups in the UK who accurately perceive themselves to be the most likely victims of violence.

Fear of violence and victimhood of other crimes, limited educational opportunities, restricted employment opportunities in terms both of the number and the nature of job available all militate against young people feeling positive about themselves and about the current social order. For many of those who might have a less fearful outlook, a reluctance to both incur a huge debt and face higher rates of taxation deters some from becoming undergraduates, thereby limiting both their opportunities and the benefits which would accrue to society from the maximum development of socially desired skills and attributes. If the traditional choices look bleak, it is can be little surprise when young people opt for alternatives which place them in a vicious cycle not of their making. Some politicians might

claim that we are all in this together, but it is clear that ‘our society as presently structured will continue to generate problems for some of its members – like working-class adolescents – and then condemn whatever solution these groups find.’ (Cohen 1994; p1 and p204)

Although a fictional character developed by a writer who is also a teacher in Morrall’s ‘The Man Who Disappeared’, 12 year old Millie reflects a truth for adults as well as making a telling observation about school life when she says that ‘unwritten rules are much more important than written ones’ (Morrall 2010, p 35). Much later and with equal prescience, Millie also notes ‘[t]hat’s how you get new ideas, people thinking different things, not agreeing’ (Morrall 2010, p 375) and surely most of us would recognise that the alternative to new ideas and change is dependence on old ideas and stagnation. We need new ideas and members of my generation need to reflect upon our discomfort with these – whether we fear the idea itself or simply its newness.

To suspect or fear the new simply because it is new or because we do not understand has no more merit than a pupil refusing to learn something because they have not already been taught it. As adults, whether teachers, parents or other carers, we know that young people will have to encounter things for the first time; we expect them to deal with it and we offer guidance and support to help them to do so. The same has to apply in reverse – if we as adults encounter a new idea we should have to deal with it, and might have to seek the guidance and advice of the young to manage. If the idea is to be rejected because we have considered it, dismantled it, have evidence which undermines or contradicts it, then we are engaging with the idea in the way that we would expect our pupils to engage. If we fear the idea because we don’t like the change it might bring about, such fears should be aired but they are not in themselves a reason to expect others to reject the idea.

Those who want to bring about change are always a nuisance – just consider the irritation which Jesus and Mohandas Ghandi caused to the authorities of their times – but they are essential.

Agitators are a set of interfering, meddling people, who come down to some perfectly contented class in the community, and sow seeds of discontent amongst them. That is the reason why agitators are so abundantly necessary. Without them, in our incomplete state, there would be no advance towards civilization. (Wilde, 1891; p73)

If we want to ensure that such an advance is ordered and effective we must not attempt to silence our pupils and stifle discussion. Much more effective will be to enable young people to practise the skills they need to identify those things they wish to change and then to effect those change they desire. This can be done in a number of ways as discussed above and as shown in Case Study #10, which outlines the approach to social order and ordered social change established at Denbigh School in Milton Keynes.

CASE STUDY #10

Denbigh School has some 1400 pupils and has been described by Ofsted as having outstanding effectiveness, with the rationale of 'doing what is best for each student' (Ofsted 2009). Of particular relevance to us here is the observation that pupils 'have a vested interest in its success, respect each other and are proud of their school. Their voice is heard extensively in all manner of developments, including helping in the drive to improve teaching and learning.' (Ofsted 2009) As has already been shown (see Chapter Five) opportunities for the expression of pupil voices are essential to equipping young people to bring about orderly social change; at Denbigh, the opportunities are more extensive and more varied.

Pupils volunteer for training to provide peer mentoring, which serves three purposes; it creates a sense of security and well-being for mentees, a sense of purpose and achievement for mentors, and a school community which is comfortable with itself – and which is an example of active citizenship. There is also a learning partner programme through which

pupils observe lessons and feed back to teachers their thoughts on what seems to work and what does not, and why. Pupils and staff are trained in this relationship so that all parties benefit; it is not a case of pupils managing the teachers or teachers designing lessons to court popularity, but a programme intended to ensure that everyone gives of their best and maximises the benefits available to them. There is no doubt about who is in charge, but this is not based on a fixed or zero-sum theory of power; teachers and the school management team are confident enough in themselves and in their pupils to be willing to engage in discussion and be open to suggestions for change. This openness and confidence not only provides pupils with an opportunity to contribute ideas and observations – it challenges them to do so. Pupils have long complained about this teacher and that strategy, those text books and one approach or another. Instead of exchanging complaints and endless whinges, secure in the knowledge that nobody is listening to them so they can be as irresponsible and negative as their imaginations allow, the pupils at Denbigh have to face up to the realities of the classroom and to what can be achieved. The right to become engaged in managing their learning carries with it the obligation to be effectively engaged.

There is a school council which is elected via nominations, manifestos and a school funded election day. It meets weekly to manage its budget and to monitor the progress of its projects and priorities. There is a house system in the school, and each house has a similarly elected council which works closely with the school council. This avoids one of the major problems of school councils, of a relative concentration of influence and experience in the hands of a few – usually older – pupils. Councillors serve for two years, ensuring continuity while allowing change. There is also a series of 12 satellite groups evolved from and reporting to the school council, concerned with the school governing body, behaviour, citizenship, uniform, recruitment, teaching and learning and a range of other activities covering all aspects of the school. In this way pupils can come to understand the complex community of which they are members, and constructively contribute to its development. Ofsted (2009) described the school council as ‘a key force . . . through which the school seeks students' views and actively responds to their concerns . . . (giving pupils) a clear message that the school wants to treat them respectfully and listen to their views’. All pupils in Milton Keynes benefit from a website run by school pupils on behalf of the City Council,

ensuring that it is informed and that young people express their views and concerns; this clearly includes Denbeigh pupils, whose links with the local business community are extensive and have been recognised by local and national awards.

Pupil opportunities to engage in orderly change go beyond school council, house councils, satellite groups, mentoring, learning support, charity activities, and representation of the governing body. After all, not everyone can be elected or selected, not everyone has the time or the desire to become involved in such activities. The school website draws pupils' and other browsers' attention to individual and group achievements by pupils – in sports and performance, as well as community and academic activities – as well as being a source of information about numerous activities which offer a window on the wider world.

An insight into the school's weltanschauung can be found by examining its website from 27 September 2010. That day was identified as National European Languages Day on which Denbigh adopted Turkish, with facts and phrases links available online. Also listed for September were World Reflexology Week and the Jewish festival of Sukkot. Indicated as on their way for October were [Black History Month](#), [Breast Cancer Awareness Month](#), [International Walk to School Month](#), [International School Libraries Month](#), and [World Blind Awareness Month](#); a wide range of active or commemorative events offered without judgement or detail, serving purely to remind everyone that there are lots of different people and interests beyond the confines of the school, lots of opportunities for involvement and many ways in which to try to make a difference.

The philosophy which underwrites the broad and detailed approach taken by Denbigh is summed up in the headteacher's welcome '[t]he school fosters personal development that helps students to find meaning in their lives and respond with creativity and determination to the challenges that arise through the rapid pace of social change'. The social order is changing, and here we have an example of one school's approach to ensuring that such

change is managed in an orderly fashion and that its pupils are equipped to manage it effectively.

SUMMARY

We know from experience and from current circumstances that social order is in a permanent flux. To pretend otherwise is to delude ourselves and to deceive our pupils. We therefore have a responsibility to them to enable those pupils to understand the nature, rate and processes of change in the social order, and to equip them to play the part they wish to play in shaping that change.

Some school leaders might fear – or at least argue – that this can only happen at the cost of schools' primary responsibility, that of maximising examination performance. Denbigh School clearly illustrates that pupils can develop the skills and awareness demanded to be able to shape social order and social change without jeopardizing examination results; there is even a powerful case to be made that the approach at Denbigh reinforces pupils' academic work and strengthens their achievements. The point must also be made that schools' main responsibility is not to maximise examination performance but to educate pupils so that they fulfil their potential and, with a bit of luck, for the good of society.

9. POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

Political knowledge is not synonymous with knowledge of politics. A truism has it that 'knowledge is power' and, as politics is the organisation and exercise of power – and, if we're lucky, of responsible authority – political knowledge is knowing what knowledge matters, when it matters, how to find it and how to use it. Gobbets of information such as why seats in the House of Commons are green and those in the House of Lords are red, or why the Speaker's Chair used to be a commode, might win points in pub quizzes, prizes on television game shows or marks in classroom tests and public examinations, but they don't really matter.

Citizenship education can and should provide access to what Apple (1990) refers to as powerful knowledge, rather than simply being the transfer of facts about civics from the forefront of one person's brain or lesson plan into the recesses of another's brain or rarely read notepad. This chapter brings together some of the knowledge implied or explicitly raised in previous chapters. The relative places and merits of 'content' and 'skills', much discussed in teacher education, are scrutinised as we bear in mind that it is impossible to generate worthwhile discussions among and between pupils unless those discussions are properly informed and about something, that '[g]ood discussion cannot take place in a vacuum'. (Ofsted 2010, p14)

While often well meant, the outcome as much of misplaced good intentions as a lack of wit or imagination, there are many teachers who seek to provide 'the truth' to pupils – and pupils often seek such truth, even (or particularly) where it does not exist. Rudduck identifies a crucial and complex issues regarding political knowledge when she writes that

teachers and pupils often conspire in perpetuating a false security that manifests itself in a reliance on right answers and on a view of the expert as one who knows rather than one who uses knowledge to refocus doubt. Teachers, prompted by a

kindly concern for those they teach, often over-simplify the complexities of living and learning; they seek to protect their pupils from uncertainty. (Rudduck 1991, p33)

Such protection is short-term and exceedingly harmful as it inhibits intellectual curiosity, subscribes to the myth of omnipotent expertise, and deceives pupils into believing that there exist right answers to all things. Blake et al (2000) have explained that learning must develop the potential for emotional engagement while, for Geelan (2010), an awareness of ambiguity and the ability to face up to and deal with it is crucial. Such engagement and awareness can combine to equip pupils with the tools necessary for the acquisition of political knowledge.

BACKGROUND

The content of the National Curriculum for Citizenship, as with all other National Curriculum subjects, was decided initially by civil servants and ultimately by Parliament, following a consultation process with teachers and their subject organisations. A significant difference in the case of Citizenship Education is that there was also an advisory group appointed by the Secretary of State for Education to identify appropriate knowledge and skills to meet the aim of extending and encouraging democratic and responsible involvement. As with Hargreaves' (2004) otherwise very encouraging and often perceptive discussion on the need to consider the aspirations and expectations young people hold regarding their education, and despite the insights offered and the example set by White with Brockington (1983) and Morgan and Morris (1999), one important group not included in the discussions about what young people think and believe, what they know, do not know and possibly ought to know, was the young themselves.

One of the main concerns of the Ofsted (Bell 2005a, 2005b; Ofsted 2006, 2010) has been the way in which citizenship education is delivered in schools with what often appears to be only a cursory relationship with National Curriculum requirements. Structures of delivery have been addressed elsewhere (Leighton 2002, 2004), but a common approach is to see the subject combined with Personal Social and Health Education (PSHE), or with Careers

Education, perhaps once a fortnight. It therefore becomes a subject perceived as of little academic value and little valued by the school, taught largely by non-specialists, and considered at best an irrelevance and often a distraction from the 'proper' business of schooling. At least one school has moved from 'Citizenship' to 'Life Skills' in response to pupils previously changing the final letter to a 't', others offer PACE (Personal and Citizenship Education) or some other locally created but not necessarily even locally understood name.

There are many ways in which pupils can and do develop their political knowledge. Following on from Case Study #3, one such way is briefly outlined and evaluated below.

CASE STUDY # 11

We constructed a carousel of five different workshop activities on a range of issues related to sustainability and global environmental responsibility. Pupils had advance notice of the activities and were asked to sign up to a first and second choice. The workshops ranged from 'Bin Bag Fashion' (a creative activity relating to sustainable clothing) to 'Fossil Fuels Forever?' – a discussion and planning session about consequences and alternatives in the energy industry.

Focus days were a major part of curriculum at the school and also a very valuable one. Staff were assigned every second Friday to a year group and focus event; they were not a flagship event that necessarily guided the building of the school calendar but an integral part of the curriculum. It could be argued that their effectiveness might therefore be reduced, as students succumb to routine and boredom; however this was not the case. Students find such days interesting and a welcome break from the routine of their own timetable. With specific reference to citizenship education, such days give the pupils chances to explore the subject in ways they might not have conceived as relevant or possible in their classroom lessons. The cross-curricular links with the work we did with them on that day were self evident, but pupils often

struggle to see the relevance of the subject within the confines of their regular citizenship education classes.

The themes of Science, Art, Design and Conflict Resolution were central to the pupils' experiences on our focus day, more than just vehicles for us to address the citizenship education aspect of the topic. Some people regard the best citizenship education as that which cannot be identified, traced or marked out, like an implicit theory of learning you might say...and what better way for students to develop into rounded, knowledgeable and informed adults who are able to make links with thoughts, actions and consequences across myriad issues and dilemmas, privately and publically, as well as locally and globally, than to have them regularly engaging in focus day type exercises?

In my experience, the more you expose students to learning scenarios outside the classroom, the better they are able to contribute to, understand and take advantage of the learning opportunities being cooked up by teachers in them.

For the sake of government statistics on the number of children getting A* - C in some token of formalised qualification in citizenship education, we shouldn't be reducing it to a discrete subject that happens only in the citizenship education classroom. You can hear kids around school refer to that room as the 'CE classroom' and even that teacher as the 'CE teacher'.... soon followed by the question, 'CE? What the f**k is that?' Sadly, followed by the same old answer . . . 'dunno exactly'. Citizenship education teachers should all want to change the world....and I think the boundaries of that world should extend to the whole school.

Philip Tutin, teacher of Psychology and Social Studies at John Port School, Derbyshire

DEVELOPING POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

We have already identified that many schools advocate school councils and community action projects; there are others which promote general studies and general lectures on aspects of current affairs. Schools also provide careers guidance and information regarding

sexual health, substance abuse and legal responsibilities. These activities tend to be controlled by teachers who either set their own restrictions or follow guidelines laid down by school managers or school governors; as Illich (1973) argued, they are organised to meet the priorities and needs of teachers rather than those of pupils.

Despite the example set by Denbigh School outlined in Case Study #10, it is exceptional for a school to devolve any budget to a school council, although a few do; it is rare for schools to have pupil representation on governing bodies, although there is legislated provision for such representation. It is almost unheard of, in the state sector, for pupils to have any formal say in the structure of their day, their lessons, or their curriculum. What is worth knowing, therefore, in preparation for adulthood and participation in the rights and responsibilities which constitute being a citizen, is almost always dictated according to Bowles and Gintis' (1976) 'Jug and mug' principle – that those in authority believe they know best and they pass on whatever knowledge they deem suitable in whatever format meets their preferences. This hidden curricular message, self-evidently not a universal truth to anyone with any sympathy for a radical approach to any aspect of education, produces a wide-spread attitude of opposition to citizenship education because of the inherent hypocrisy of an approach which says 'we will tell you what is important to you, how to form opinions and what opinions to form'.

Lawton (1975) makes clear that 'different disciplines ask different questions' (p74) and that 'schools have often only succeeded in differentiating between disciplines at the cost of ignoring the relationships between them.' (p74) Over thirty years later, the National Curriculum for England (QCA 2007) finally made it an explicit requirement that the relationship between subjects must be identified and developed in teaching and learning – which surely must include more than just where they consider different aspects of the same thing e.g. when physics and geography both consider volcanoes, or physical education and biology look at health. Understanding how subjects interrelate, and how other aspects of pupils' knowledge matters, must be an objective of citizenship education and one route to

the development of political knowledge in order to establish and nurture the abilities to sift and to synthesise.

The underpinning values of citizenship education include that it enables the development of skills of enquiry, the ability to form and articulate personal opinions, to understand the views of others, and to prepare young people to play an active and effective part in shaping the type of society in which they wish to live. Foisting a passive acceptance of the status quo is an improbable route to achieving these objectives. Rather than placing an emphasis on a body of 'facts', a more appropriate approach is to enable young people to understand society and how to read society. In the words of Postman and Weingartner, 'in order to survive in a world of rapid change there is nothing more worth knowing . . . than the continual process of how to make viable meanings.' (1976, p 85)

This brings our attention to whose meanings are considered to be viable or worthwhile. Postman and Weingartner clearly had their own agenda for viable, appropriate and worthwhile, but it cannot be claimed that there is a universal purpose to teaching nor a uniform perception of meaning. They propose a range of different teacher 'types', each of which I can people from my experiences as a pupil, as a teacher, and as a teacher educator. There are those who want to illuminate, or want to cultivate; those who want to keep minds busy, or strengthen them, or fill them up; those who want to mould, or to feed, or to provide a firm foundation. While this variety may well be preferable to a 'one-type-fits-all' approach to teaching, it is not without its drawbacks.

For pupils, part of the reality of the process of schooling will be to be able to identify which 'type' best describes a particular teacher then to work out and apply whatever strategies will bring most success in appearing to meet that teacher's criteria. This perception follows on from the findings of Hargreaves (1967), Willis (1977), and Corrigan (1979) amongst many others. 'Successful' pupils, therefore, could be those who can most effectively judge and meet the expectations of a teacher type. Those who are equally successful at judging but

either do not have the strategies of apparent or real compliance, or prefer not to employ them, are unlikely to be successful. Those not equipped or unwilling to make effective judgements might find that they hit upon a coping strategy which sees them through the system, or they fail to do so and therefore struggle through the system. If this is what is happening in citizenship education lessons, where they exist, then those lessons become simply another part of the process of negotiating survival rather than part of the process of skills and knowledge development.

If this is the case then, inadvertently, pupils have learned to make viable meanings and act according to them – a valuable citizenship skill. However, they will have learned how to be manipulated and acquiescent rather than how to be discerning and assertive. A systematic and coherent approach to developing similar skills and discernment, but without creating a long-lasting antipathy to education and to authority, would be a more productive and socially effective strategy in the long run.

Postman and Weingartner (1976) argue that much of pupils' involvement in the processes of education has been based on guesswork – they are expected to guess how apparently disparate strands are interconnected, and guess what answer the teacher wants, as well as guessing what might constitute truth, which varies between teachers – but with the valued questions, the values behind the questions, and arbitration on the validity of the invited guesses, being in the sole remit of teachers.

At their time of writing, and still the case today in some highly influential quarters, questioning this dependence on guesswork has been rejected as 'trendy' or 'progressive' as 'most educators . . . are largely interested to know whether it will accomplish the goals that older learning media have tried to achieve' (Postman and Weingartner 1976, p37). The point that they were making was that this is the wrong test; as the truism has it, 'if you do what you have always done you will get what you have always got'. While this approach would fit the philosophy of conservative writers such as Oakeshott (1962), it is far from one which will encourage, enable and facilitate progress towards developing the skills required for survival

by individuals and societies in the twenty first century. New methods of learning and development are necessary for new skills and a change in the nature of society. It is through questioning not acceptance, working things out instead of learning by rote, cooperating rather than competing, that new attitudes will be forged and the needs of a more rewarding society will be met. It is surely healthy that consistent exposure to questioning has developed a desire to question.

It is telling that 'trendy' and 'progressive' are pejorative terms in education. In other environments it would be considered helpful to be up to date with current trends and developments and to be forward looking and forward thinking but not, apparently, when considering the development of young people and the future of society. This might reflect a fear of inquiry or a fear of uncovering inadequacy amongst decision makers and commentators, a preference for their own feelings of security and superiority rather than looking to develop and enhance the prospects of future generations. Bowles' and Gintis' (1976) Correspondence Theory might lead us to conclude that such decision makers and commentators are determined that young people are not encouraged to have questioning, enquiring and critical approaches but, instead, should be acquiescent and accommodating.

Citizenship education must be about being questioning. It has to aim for pupils to being informed enough to know which questions to ask and of whom they should be asked, and being alert to the consequences as well as the content of any answers. Asking directed and informed questions is one of the 'utilitarian skills' derided by highly tradition-bound educators such as Chris Woodhead, a former Chief Inspector of Schools and the first head of Ofsted, whose emphasis on knowledge as a collection of irrefutable facts assumed either that teachers can give pupils all the answers or that teachers and the National Curriculum must have absolute control over what constitutes appropriate knowledge. This approach ignores that teachers do not universally applaud all that is in the National Curriculum, that the National Curriculum in many subjects has emphasised skills as well as knowledge in order to give a context to what might be known, and – perhaps most crucially – young people are asking questions and probably always have done.

CASE STUDY #12

It has been noted that 'Clear ideas are the surest bastion against fraudulence and malicious nonsense' (Baldelli, 1971; p25). Enabling young people to develop clarity of thought, and articulation of such clarity, must therefore be a key objective of citizenship education. One way to achieve this is to encourage and enable pupils' involvement in debates in the classroom and beyond, to support them in the development of skills of research and analysis, of organising ideas and evaluating them, of considering data and selecting from them. There is a wealth of debating clubs and competitions which might appear to develop such skills, but we need to be wary of those which are more concerned with style than substance and to concentrate our attention on those which emphasise clarity of thought and the marshalling of evidence-based argument. One particularly constructive approach is illustrated by Debating Matters.

Many classroom debates are little more than ill-prepared and poorly presented arguments based on opinion, a quick web search and a few points gleaned from the mass media, with perhaps a few questions from equally poorly informed friends. Some schools try to compensate for these sorry episodes by establishing highly formulaic and procedural debating clubs in which pupils learn how to try to be polite to each other while offering slightly better prepared and presented arguments – again based on opinion, a quick web search and a few points gleaned from the mass media – with questions both planted and predictable. Both approaches miss an opportunity for young people to learn how to find information, how to assess what is useful to an argument and what is superfluous, how to organise their data, how to predict and contest opposing positions, how to ask and respond to searching questions, and how to improve on all these skills. In other words, they fail to equip pupils with the skills required for what I have called 'political knowledge'. It is not always straightforward to identify what knowledge will be useful in our lives or how it will

be useful, but we can at least learn how to marshal our knowledge and decide what is relevant and when. One way to do this can be found at <http://www.debatingmatters.com/>.

Debating Matters began in 2002 when David Perks, Head of Physics and convenor of the debate society at Graveney School in South London, suggested a competition to focus pupils' attention on the intellectual content of current debates rather than on rhetoric and sophistry. The key aspects of the format he proposed which can contribute to the development of political knowledge are:– the early provision of debate motions and allocation of positions for or against, which encourages thorough preparation; the central role of a panel of diverse judges in cross examining the speakers about their opening statements, and providing critical feedback; the opportunity for speakers to engage with each others' arguments; and the importance attached to audience contributions, so that everyone is involved. Central to the success of the debates has been the topic guides, freely available on the Debating Matters website, which offer reliable data and summaries of key arguments and therefore demonstrate the value of in-depth research.

It might be tempting to dismiss Debating Matters as simply another public speaking competition for highly academic sixth formers, but this would be a mistake on several levels.

1. There is little simple about it;
2. There is a world of a difference between public speaking and debating; the former emphasises oratory and rhetoric, the second is much more concerned with the ability to argue a point of view;
3. There is also a difference between Debating Matters' format and those of other competitions. Debating Matters places the emphasis on content over procedure, and on substance over style; it encourages young people to engage in the exchange of ideas and exposes their arguments to scrutiny. The stated premise is that debating matters because ideas matter;

4. Why dismiss competition? If we are preparing our pupils to play a part as citizens, we do them no favours by pretending that everyone is a winner in all things, nor need it mean that those who do not win should have a big L branded onto their foreheads;
5. The format can be adapted to develop the skills and meet the needs of virtually any group of pupils, not only the academic and certainly not only older ones.
6. It is a format which takes ideas, argument and young people seriously.

The competition currently involves almost 200 schools throughout the UK, and has twice been awarded an Engaging Science Society Award by the Wellcome Trust. Previous participants have taken up internships, chaired debates, prepared topic guides, briefed judges, and generally demonstrated how much participation in the debates has meant to them and helped them to develop.

The structure is clear and rigorous, but it is neither rigid nor context bound. Debating Matters runs a similar competition in India and has developed regional variations in Northern Ireland and, in conjunction with Peninsula AimHigher, for younger pupils in South West England. Further developments have included working in partnership with the Research Councils UK (RCUK) as part of their 'Global Uncertainties: Security for all in a Changing World' programme, and with Newcastle University's year-long Changing Age programme, looking at the medical, moral and social issues society needs to consider with an aging population. My own involvement began when I ran a three week residential citizenship course for 13-16 year olds on behalf of the National Academy for Gifted and Talented Youth (NAGTY) in the summer of 2003. Some schools – not only those who participate in the competition – have adopted the format for their own debating societies.

The heats, regional finals and national final of the competition are the best illustrations of the benefits to young people of the structure and processes involved in debating in this way, and I recommend teachers and pupils to attend these if possible or, failing that, to watch the video clips or DVD available online. Speakers know well in advance what their topic is

and where to find information on it – and where those speaking for the other side of the motion can find their information. As well as speaking, questioning and responding to audience questions, participants have to deal with questions from an ‘expert’ panel. The panel’s questions are unpredictable, which necessitates speakers understanding their arguments and the bigger picture surrounding the topic, and it is the panel which decides who has won – thereby avoiding victory going to the team with the most friends in the audience. Judges are also required to explain their decision, which results in praise, criticism and advice.

Debating Matters includes in its short term aims, to provide training opportunities and educational support that leads to continuous improvement in the quality of the debates that pupils engage in and assists schools and pupils new to debate to try Debating Matters out, and to encourage greater debate activity within schools and greater interaction between schools outside of the formal framework of the Debating Matters competition. In the longer term it aspires to foster intellectual curiosity and rigour and to create an environment which encourages deeper levels of knowledge and understanding about political, social and cultural issues as a precursor to generating new thinking and ideas about solving problems in new ways. In other words, it is about enhancing the quality of political knowledge and citizenship skills.

There are topic guides on a number of pertinent debates, many of which some teachers – and some pupils – might initially regard as too complex or too demanding. It has been my experience, and the experience of the Debating Matters team, that young people rise to the challenge. Topic guides are available online and are under the following headings:

- [Arts and culture](#)
- [Health and medicine](#)
- [Environment](#)
- [International relations](#)

- [Liberty and law](#)
- [Media](#)
- [Politics](#)
- [Science and experimentation](#)
- [Sport and leisure](#)

There is no reason why this approach cannot be put into action in schools, as at least one of my former students has done and other teachers are doing. Tom Finn-Kelsey at Queen Elizabeth Grammar School, Faversham, has adapted the Debating Matters structure effectively enough for his school to come second in the national competition in 2009/10, for a considerable number of pupils to have become involved in regular school debates, and for pupils to organise and run those debates without Tom's close involvement – serving both to allow the pupils autonomy and avoiding adding to Tom's workload. The number and success of pupils studying politics at A level also reflects the benefits of Tom's approach and his pupils' enthusiasm, commitment and development.

While challenging to achieve this without the involvement of dedicated debate organisers, it is not beyond the skills of most teachers. Judging panels could comprise teachers with areas of interest which relate to the topic e.g. '[In sport, winning is everything](#)' could involve PE staff, '[Clinical trials in developing countries are exploitative](#)' could involve science, geography and RE teachers, but pupils will learn most about the whole process if they also feature on these panels. By involving teachers from departments other than Citizenship or English (wherein debating commonly resides), pupils will learn how everything they do in school is interconnected and staff will learn that they are involved in citizenship education. Having been involved in many such panels, I have found them to be stimulating, hard work, and lots of fun. Once they are they shown what is involved in planning and understand that they really do have the skills and authority to take on the responsibility of planning and running such debates, pupils leap at the opportunity.

Pupils can be paired across year groups, friendship groups or however seems appropriate. As the debates and their distinctive format become familiar, new pupils will learn from the more experienced – and the more experienced will learn from their new colleagues as it is a format which gives everyone a voice. Topic guides will continue to be available, which means that the hardest part for a teacher – enabling pupils to get useful information together in the first place – has already been taken care of, although there is no reason why teachers, and pupils, cannot conduct further research. If a local significant topic is not covered by the guides, the experience and expertise developed from extensive use of those which do exist will make developing new ones so much easier.

By collaborating over research, speeches and questions, pupils develop social awareness and the ability to work with others. The topics themselves demand that pupils learn about a range of matters, and that they understand what they learn. Panel questions show that they are taken seriously and put them under pressure, while panel advice helps them to develop. The debate topics help them to place their everyday learning in practical and applied contexts, demonstrate the value of research and preparation, and enable them to develop a wider understanding of views which they not only might not hold but of which they might not even be aware. My experience has been that young people respond positively to the demands of the Debating Matters structure. Try it and see.

SUMMARY

Bits of information which can be easily looked up in a reference book or on-line wiki site do not constitute powerful knowledge, and the teacher who simply passes on such information is not being much help to anyone and certainly not teaching anyone or anything. Enabling pupils to find and understand such information is much more useful to them as well as much more interesting for the teacher. Most important of all, however, is the development in pupils of discernment and judgement, of articulation and insight, of argument and objective. Knowledge is only power when it includes how and when to use it, and an understanding of what it means.

10. WHAT NEXT?

Either side of briefly recapping the central arguments of chapters one to nine, this final chapter considers how a radical approach to the teaching of Citizenship Education might shape the subject. The question in this chapter title must lead us to further areas for discussion and development within citizenship education. We need to continue to ask questions of ourselves, of the subject, and of each other; questions about radical approaches to assessment which will meet pupil, social, teacher, school and policy needs and aspirations; questions regarding the development of a forum to share ideas and strategies, nationally and internationally, and to remind radical citizenship education teachers that they are not alone; questions about how we can work with like-minded colleagues in other disciplines, and how we can reach and work with colleagues who feel too nervous, uninformed, ill-informed, ill-equipped or ill-advised to understand and make full use of the opportunities provided by citizenship education to enhance the skills and life chances of all our pupils.

DISCUSSION

It would be foolish to pretend that we know what the future holds. Nostradamus had the wit (or perhaps I underestimate his talent and it was foresight) to make his predictions both so vague and so numerous that he could be held equally to have foretold so much or nothing at all that has come to pass. Less obfuscating forecasters have not necessarily been any more successful, finding that predicting the future is a fraught and thankless business. People invent things, or discover things, or develop easier (sometimes more difficult but seemingly easier) ways of doing things. Expected pleasure turns out to be unmitigated disaster, impending doom transpires to be less disastrous than expected. One party in government lays down what it perceives as the framework for communal bliss, only to be replaced by another with a different view, a different blueprint, perhaps even a different perception of bliss. If, however, we do not think about future possibilities and probable developments, we are likely to make a complete mess of things – the evidence of that is all around us; therefore, we need to hazard a guess at what the future holds, and to suggest ways to make it work.

Kynaston (2008) captures the almost tangible excitement and positive outlook prevalent in post-war Britain; the Welfare State was imminent, urban renewal was underway, there was a sense of social opportunity and social equality in the air. He also observes that such euphoria was extremely short-lived. A generation later, social commentators such as Rattray Taylor (1977) were predicting the collapse of telephone services worldwide, gridlocked traffic the length of the country, and acts of international terrorism as a daily occurrence; he ridiculed any possibility that the UK would have had a female prime minister by 2000, and concluded that, basically, the world was going to hell in a handcart. Writing from a politically different standpoint in the USA, Toffler (1973) was more hopeful but still concerned for his equally inaccurate image of what the future held, yet the pictures they drew a generation ago of the dystopian world which would greet the twenty first century are not so very different to predictions being made now for the near future. They got some things right but, as with Postman and Weingartner's (1976) list of problems discussed in chapter one, things might be bad but they haven't become as bad as predicted. There is no reason, therefore, to think that current doomsayers are any more to be trusted or any more likely to be accurate in their forecasts.

Schumacher (1974) held out much greater hope than many of his contemporaries and, I do not believe it to be co-incidental, considered the importance of education in much greater depth than either Toffler or Rattray Taylor; indeed, chapter six of *Small is Beautiful* (Schumacher 1974, p64) is titled 'The Greatest Resource – Education'. Monbiot (2000) warns us of the increasing commodification of education and the use of corporate funded education packs to distort reality and mislead learners but, as Hutton (1995) had already argued, these and other posited dangers will only become irreversible problems if we stand back and allow them to happen; the purpose of a radical approach to citizenship education is to avoid such passivity.

If there is no point in predicting the future, we can at least plan for the future we would like, and work towards its accomplishment. Even better, we can work with our pupils to help them to imagine then create the future they would want to live in. For some this might hint

at social engineering; my intention has not been to hint but to be open and assertive. Wherever we place ourselves in the social structure or social order, it must be clear that 'all educational practices are profoundly political in the sense that they are designed to produce one sort of human being or another' (Postman, 1970; p86) and that 'All debate about education is fundamentally political because it concerns the ultimate questions of what sort of people and societies we are trying to create' (Harber, 2009; p7). We either want to develop a society in which people can participate and in which they wish to do so, or we do not. Those who pay lip-service to notions of participation as both possible and welcome but oppose the development of citizenship education and the changes it can bring about are equally guilty of social engineering – the difference between us is that they are opposed to change, opposed to participation, opposed to informed citizenry, opposed to progress.

We know that the gloomy perception that 'increasing numbers of children are arriving at early schooling showing symptoms of anxiety, emotional insecurity and aggressive behaviour. They seem devoid of many skills and suffer low self-esteem' (Arthur, 2003; p3) is borne out by other studies. It is a waste of talent and of humanity as well as a source of social discord that such a situation exists, but we need to remember that it is not a universal condition, that there are also children who are well-balanced, secure in themselves, amenable in conduct, skilled and confident. Education is not the problem, but it could provide the answer . . . or, more accurately, it is that part of a much greater problem which might just enable people to find an answer which won't rend the social fabric beyond repair. Teachers have a fundamentally important role in addressing and repairing this situation, irrespective of its cause(s); those teachers might ask 'why me?' to which the unavoidable response must be 'why not? Look what happens when we leave it to someone else.'

In Case Study #1 at the conclusion of Chapter Two, the reader was enjoined to consider my reinterpretation of Postman and Weingartner's sixteen principles of practice. Rudduck (1991) offers a much more concise list of the sort of demands the Humanities Curriculum Project (HCP) placed on participating teachers – '1. Discussion rather than instruction; 2. Teacher as a neutral chairperson; 3. Teacher talk reduced to about 15%; 4. Teacher handling

material from different disciplines; 5. New modes of assessment' (Ruddock 1991, p61) and she goes on to identify 'new skills for pupils' to acquire, 'new content for many classrooms' and 'organizational demands on schools'. While the HCP was not the new National Curriculum – in many ways it was more innovative and, by being restricted to one subject and for a fixed periods, less far-reaching – the demands and requirements Ruddock identified in relation to that project remain relevant in the wider picture. In the fifteen years following Postman and Weingartner, some progress had been made to at least identifying have to effect some of the changes they recommended; a further twenty years have passed and there is still some way to go.

Postman and Weingartner (1976) suggest eleven strategies for teachers to understand their pupils and themselves. These strategies involve

- 1) questioning what the teacher has planned for pupils;
- 2) offer classes questions and problems rather than answers;
- 3) do not allow contributions to discussion until the speaker can give a summary of the previous point which satisfies the person who made that point;
- 4) refuse to respond to any contribution which is not a question, offering a reward to the person who asks the most questions (NOT the 'best');
- 5) think about the information you do not have about a student which none the less influences the grade(s) you give her/him;
- 6) test the 'self-fulfilling prophecy' by believing your pupils are the smartest (possibly in their terms if not yours) and treat them accordingly;
- 7) tell everyone on your course that they will have an A grade come what may, then get them to plan the course content according to what they think they need to know;
- 8) teach to the future, not the past – concentrate on 'what if' rather than 'way back when';
- 9) remember that, no matter what you are teaching, media are important;
- 10) follow a series of questions which lead ultimately to – 'why do I teach?'

As with the educational Chartism mentioned in chapter two, some of this might already take place [e.g. 2 and 6 above would be seen as good practice, and not only within a citizenship education classroom] and some of it might still be regarded as utopian and unworkable [e.g. 4 and 7]. That doesn't mean it is not worth a try in order to address the final question. Day (2004) writes of passion for one's subject, for teaching, and for the future of young people as essential emotional characteristics for teachers. It may be that there are people who have drifted into teaching or while teaching who never had or no longer have such passions. Although thirty years passed between Postman and Weingartner's work and that of Day, the message has not changed – if you do not care with a passion about your pupils and about your subject, if you think that you the teacher are the most important element of the educational process, then get out of teaching.

Despite the tone, this is not put forward as a criticism or attack. People get jaded. People's attitudes, interests, talents, preferences, passions can change. If a person is no longer committed to upholding the law, one would expect that they cease to be a police officer. If a person no longer cares about the health of others, one might commonly expect them to cease being a doctor. If a person is no longer committed to the principles of learning and personal development, goes this argument, one could reasonably expect them to recognise their new or previously submerged commitments, and give up teaching. If self-examination and reflection can help someone to that conclusion, it is a good thing. Day's expressed hope is that such reflexivity will reinvigorate teachers' reasons for entering the profession, and he recognises that, for some, those reasons will have been lost forever rather than submerged or neglected. It might be that the caring and beliefs remain, but the will to see them through has been spent; the damage caused to pupils, and to the teacher, is pretty much the same – as is the plea to leave teaching to those who still can. (That there may be police officers and doctors who no longer care or cope does not devalue this line of argument, but suggests the strategy might be equally applicable to those and other occupations.)

What Postman and Weingartner wrote about 'the new education' almost forty years ago could be applied to citizenship education today.

It consists of having students use the concepts most appropriate to the world in which we all must live. All of these concepts constitute the dynamics of the question-questioning, meaning-making process that can be called 'learning how to learn'. . . The purpose is to help all students develop built-in, shockproof crap detectors as basic equipment in their survival kits.

(Postman and Weingartner, 1976; p 204)

An often overlooked aspect of learning how to learn – at least at secondary level – is the continued development of reading. Teachers often value reading because it is so central to what we do, but can be reluctant to encourage or demand that their pupils read. As Draper (2001) observes, '[m]any kids today don't read much, and they don't read well. They learn to read in school, basically, but many times they don't learn to love reading in the process' (p12). We should be aware of the importance of the world which reading opens up, as when Foley (2010) cites research by the USA's National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) which concluded that 'readers are more likely than non-readers to take exercise, become actively involved in sport, go to museums, theatres, concerts, engage in voluntary work and vote in elections' (p141). While this might not be conclusive proof that reading makes one a good and active citizen, it certainly suggests that regular reading helps – particularly when we consider the notion of effective reading as literacy described by Blake et al in their 'Chapter 6 Our most holy duty: Language and literacy' (p88).

If reading is a key to the development of citizens, then the use of language can be understood to be crucial. From the work of Bernstein and Labov teachers have become familiar with the significance and power of school language, teacher language, as opposed to non-standard language. Language constitutes an essential element of cultural capital, it gives access not only to learning but to expression and persuasion. Illich discusses the phenomenon that '[s]chools operate under the slogan "education!" while ordinary language asks what children "learn".' (1973, p104), noting the shift from noun to verb, from a thing to an action, and he makes the rediscovery of language one of the three key elements for social recovery. I would add the rediscovery of other languages to be crucial; we cannot enable young people to become globally aware citizens – or even, increasingly,

communicating citizens of their own locality – if they cannot speak with and understand the cultures and traditions of their neighbours. It is clear that learning languages other than English, and learning about the societies in which those languages are used, is vital to the development of citizenship education.

Not all cases are examples of excellence or merit replication. Unfortunately, some good ideas seem to get lost for bureaucratic reasons or personal preferences, of which Case Study #13 is one example.

CASE STUDY #13

One school which gives outstanding support to some of my PGCE Citizenship student teachers and an excellent citizenship education experience to its pupils had a policy until recently that every lesson in every non-practical subject began with pupils reading for ten minutes. This enabled the teacher to arrive unstressed, set up whatever activities need to be set up, engage with pupils who require individual attention (whether at their own behest or the teacher's), and ensure a clear start. It also enabled pupils to engage with the teacher, have time to reach classes unstressed, leave any hassles from previous lessons behind, spend some time following an interest, and to have a quiet and unpressured ten minutes every hour. It also, of course, developed reading skills – not only the ability to make sense of marks on a page, but to understand the information and arguments and to bring these to classroom based activities when relevant – and the pleasure of reading.

Following a highly unfavourable Ofsted inspection, the school's senior management team decided to stop this practice. I was told that Ofsted did not approve of the practice yet, on scrutinising the inspection report, the only reference I could find to it tells us that '[s]ensible steps are being taken to increase pupils' ability to access the curriculum. For instance, non-practical lessons begin with a short period of reading'. It is difficult to equate 'did not approve' with 'sensible', and one cannot help but conclude that, wilfully or otherwise, the report was either misunderstood or used to introduce a retrograde change while blaming a convenient bogey man. Undoubtedly neither the first nor last time that such a strategy has

been employed, it is a great pity that such an effective approach to learning was jettisoned for no tangible benefit to anyone. More time for structured teaching does not necessarily equate with more effective learning.

DEVELOPING OPPORTUNITIES

Citizenship education is part of a pupil's entitlement; not for a few days a year, nor one hour a fortnight, nor hidden away in another subject, but at all times. Discrete subject provision, no matter how well presented, organised and delivered, cannot ensure this entitlement on its own, any more than numeracy or literacy or ethics can be the exclusive domain of specific subjects. There can be no doubt that

[t]o sequester the responsibility for citizenship within a single discipline . . . or even a single class . . . is a grave mistake . . . students need multiple opportunities to develop skills and aptitudes that facilitate effective citizenship

(Smith et al, 2010; p9)

and that schools have a responsibility to avoid that grave mistake. We need to plan for collaboration between teachers, not for them to look at ways in which they can pinch bits of the citizenship education curriculum for 'their' subject or claim that they are already providing citizenship education through what they do.

Teachers need to regard citizenship education as an opportunity rather than a threat. Not as an opportunity to enhance their subject, but one through which to enhance their pupils. If pupils care about their society and their futures, if they care about themselves and are empowered to initiate changes and face consequences, they are much more likely to engage with their peers and with their teachers. They will have reasons to learn rather than to be as anxious, insecure, and unskilled as Arthur (2003) found many of them to be. There are challenges to teaching citizenship just as there are in all subjects. A generation ago ICT was perceived by many teachers as a threat – it probably still is by some – as a new subject with a new language and with applications (in a traditional, non-ICT sense) beyond our

understanding. Nobody would doubt the importance of young people being technologically literate, even if we would not all agree that the National Curriculum identifies the best way to achieve this. ICT is commonly an integral part of the teaching and learning which takes place in other subjects; it has not been annexed or subsumed, but harnessed with at least the intention of supporting learning. The same has to become true of citizenship education.

As well as working with other subjects, we can see the development of working across phases of education. Case Study #5 in Chapter Four stems from work relating to early years teaching; Case Study #2 in Chapter Two is of a primary school; other school-related case studies relate to secondary education. One of the texts I have regularly cited is Smith et al (2010), a collection of essays discussing citizenship education in further and higher education in the USA. Citizenship barely starts at 16 in England in terms of opportunities for independent involvement, but compulsory citizenship education stops at that age. As Case Study #14 indicates, building on citizenship education in schools by making it a compulsory and intrinsic element of further and higher education could serve to enable young people to continue their development and therefore both shape and meet the needs of society.

CASE STUDY #14

Kola Adesina, of the *Crescent University Abeokuta*, and Durotimi Adeboye, of *Lagos Schools Online Project*, aspire to introduce a coherent citizenship education curriculum throughout all stages of education in Nigeria – primary, secondary and tertiary. Kola's proposal for this to his university identifies a litany of alarms with which many readers will be familiar. They desire to challenge intolerance, exploitation and inequality, to disseminate the principles of democracy for Africa and show why corrupt practices should never be accepted. The examples they intend to use and the key problems they wish to address might be specifically Nigerian and more generally African, but there is a great deal that teachers, students and pupils in other countries and other continents can learn from their approach.

Arthur (2005, p4) suggests that, for a variety of reasons 'one would expect universities to demonstrate a clear commitment to a culture of citizenship. This would include encouraging students to understand the importance of an active citizenry'. For those of us who hold such expectations, Adesina and Adeboye show one way forward.

A PROPOSAL FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP INTO THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM OF NIGERIA

KOLA ADESINA Head of Department of Mass communication and co-ordinator of Global Citizenship Studies, *Crescent University Abeokuta*. His research interests include the mass media and Citizenship Studies.

BACKGROUND

The intention is to contribute to the Nigerian educational system through the introduction of citizenship in schools. The need to promote citizenship in Nigeria's schools is of paramount importance to the survival of good governance, democracy, peace and unity in the country. The recent level of moral decadence in schools, juvenile delinquency, the spread of social miscreants, corruption, vandalism and terrorism are clear warnings of the dangers ahead if adequate measures are not taken to curb the situation.

Incessant religious riots, wanton destruction of public properties, disrespect for law and order, total disregard and disrespect of parents by their growing children and lack of commitment to public service coupled with the get-rich-quick syndrome are common features of Nigerian society. This ugly situation is exacerbated by increasing level of poverty among the populace.

This proposal is a call to action for developing responsible citizens of this great Nation through education and empowerment with emphasis on youth development. It is an exercise meant to examine, in all its ramifications, the possibility of introducing citizenship studies into school curriculum in Nigeria from the Primary – Secondary – Tertiary level during the formative years of the youth with the ultimate aim of producing responsible citizens as a hope for future generations.

By incorporating and inculcating the principles of citizenship into education, it will enable young people to develop concerns for peaceful co-existence among one another, challenge poverty and injustice, and take real effective and decisive actions for change. Nigeria needs a change. Developing the potentials of youth is a great challenge.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:

The main aim of the proposed project is to design a course to be taught as citizenship in Nigeria's primary, secondary and tertiary schools curricula. It is meant to bridge the gaps that exist between communities and groups in Nigeria as a result of practice, prejudice, myths, a combination of these and other factors.

THE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES ARE:

- i. To teach citizenship as a subject at all levels from primary- secondary – tertiary education in Nigerian schools.
- ii. To create awareness in Nigeria of the multi ethnic, multicultural and multi-faith nature of most communities and the acceptance of these as a reality of the modern world we live in, as an antidote for ethnic and religious intolerance.
- iii. To reduce or eliminate the chances of young people being exploited or used for destructive exercises because of their ignorance.
- iv. To teach the principles of democracy as the best method of governance, how it is practiced and abused in Africa.
- v. To show corruption, in their various forms, as the bane of many African societies and why corrupt practices should never be accepted as normal.
- vi. To teach and emphasize the removal of barriers between communities in Africa, emphasizing the damaging effects of violence and conflicts and their role in perpetuating poverty in Africa, using graphic illustrations of genocides in places like Rwanda and Sierra Leone.
- vii. Highlighting the deprivation and exploitation of women with emphasis on how such contribute to promoting perpetual poverty in Africa.
- viii. To adapt aspects of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) including the effect of HIV/AIDS and other health issues.

- ix. To teach peace and conflict resolution at both secondary and tertiary education in Nigerian schools in order to develop mediation skills in young people.
- x. To create awareness of the unacceptable growing levels of poverty in Nigeria and how at individual level preventive and reversal actions can be taken.

METHODOLOGY:

The strategy is to reorient minds by targeting the youth through education and empowerment.

To achieve the set objectives, the working committee initiated will design a course that will be a part of a wider subject – Citizenship.

This will be set at various key stages and will be a compulsory subject in the primary and secondary school curriculum most especially. Its contents will be developed in consultation with organizations responsible for curriculum development in Nigeria.

Global Citizenship studies will assist government in finding ways of developing the potential of the Nigerian Youth in order for them to be better able to face the leadership challenges of the future. As children mature citizenship education will contribute positively to their mental and physical development. This contribution will ensure a solid foundation for the country's future.

The following synopsis is premised on the Nigerian situation with special focus on cultural values and attendant crises arising from finding a positive place for the country in the global village. It has been structured with view to adapting it across the developing world.

1. MORALS, VALUES AND ATTITUDE DEVELOPMENT

Concepts of time and punctuality; Respect for elders and constitutes authority; Concern for the environment; Empathy and commitment to common good; Self-esteem and sense of identity; Charitable and humanitarian services.

2.KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

Social justice and equity; Global interdependence; Sustainable development; Heritage studies.

SKILLS DEVELOPMENT

Critical thinking and analysis; Arguing effectively; Challenging injustice and inequalities; Showing respect for people and things; Cooperation and conflict prevention; Legal enterprise and legitimate wealth creation.

ENDNOTE

This would appear to be a significant challenge for a country where most education is provided by private concerns rather than state authorities, with the world's eighth largest population (almost 150 million), 250 ethnic groups, 68% literacy and 70% of the workforce engaged in agriculture. Kola Adesina and Durotimi Adeboye argue that these are reasons why this project is imperative, and I have to wonder why many wealthier and more literate countries are not following Nigeria's example in striving to develop a coherent citizenship programme throughout all stages of education.

SUMMARY

There are further topics to be discussed which this book has not explicitly addressed. While matters of school ethos and the development of teacher skills and confidence must be addressed if citizenship education is to continue to be more than just another subject, the other aspects of citizenship education considered here do not constitute an exhaustive list. Awareness and celebration of identity and diversity, the development of personal voice and the ability to have it heard, the will and ability to become politically engaged, understanding how to be an effective and active citizen, the ability to assess and influence social order – all of these are attributes essential to citizens and for society. But they are not all that is required; we need, for example, citizens who can conduct themselves rationally and autonomously. There may be other categories, other skills, other attributes which underpin being a citizen in and of the 21st Century. These will only be established through discussion and achieved through insight, engagement and application, and I look forward to the

insights, arguments and recommendations of others which will support the development of a radical approach to all of citizenship education.

Not only does more have to happen in schools – not so much more content as more opportunity, more learning rather than more teaching – but we have to look beyond compulsory education.

The final words, for the moment, must go to someone who has done more to shape many young people's worlds than any educator of the last fifteen years. For all the pressure on children to read more (or at all) which came from carers, teachers, politicians, librarians and others, it was a series of books set in a world of everyday magic which achieved what so many of those of us who might deem ourselves experts tried so hard and for so long to achieve. If we want young people to be able to grasp our damaged society and make it something worth celebrating, we need to give them the opportunity to do so. We should not be in any doubt that there are as many capable, interested, articulate, creative and imaginative young people now as in the days of our own youth, just as there are probably as many disenchanted, disinclined and despondent youngsters now as then. If young people are to make the most of who they are and what they offer, they have to be properly informed and equipped to make the decisions that matter. To paraphrase Albus Dumbledore, the headmaster of Hogwarts, our strengths lie not in our talents but in our choices. (Rowling 1998)

GLOSSARY

Most of the language in this book should be accessible to the majority of readers. I am aware that some terms used are nationally or even regionally specific, and that many are contentious. What follows is not necessarily an exhaustive list of such terms, nor do I claim absolute accord with any reputable dictionary; they are the terms I think need to be clarified, and the clarifications relate to my use of them. By the time this book is published it is likely that some of the terms will have become obsolete, particularly those which relate to governmental administration, policy and bureaucracy – this is one of the perennial challenges of the world of education and not unique to the United Kingdom.

ASBO – Anti-Social Behaviour Order

A penalty imposed by courts in England to limit where and with whom a person can meet, issued in response to behaviour considered to be threatening or damaging to a public sense of comfort or safety. These are popularly perceived to be aimed at young people, although they are not always the recipients of such orders, and there is a further popular perception that the young upon whom such orders are imposed regard them as badges of honour rather than penalties or punishments.

BEGINNING TEACHER

Sometimes offered as a synonym for student teacher and one which, like trainee teacher, indicates a philosophical position relating to the development of teachers. Some student teachers are far from beginners, having worked as unqualified teachers or instructors, teaching assistants, as teachers of English as a foreign or second language; this term implies to me a disregard for any previously developed skills or experience. (*see Student, Trainee*)

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

The preferred term in this book, used to make clear the difference between the National Curriculum subject of Citizenship, the condition of being a citizen, and the processes and tests through which people go in order to be granted that condition.

CPD – Continuing Professional Development

A collective term for the training provided for teachers to enable them to keep up to date with developments in their subjects and in education more generally. This usually takes place in school on days when pupils are not attending, or in ‘twilight sessions’ after school, or at weekends.

DCFS – Department for Children, Families and Schools, renamed after the 2010 General Election as the Department for Education (DfE).

The government department responsible for most aspects of education in England.

ENGLAND

The most populous region of the United Kingdom, often misused as a synonym for the UK or for Britain – particularly in the mass media and, for reasons I cannot fathom, by reputable and otherwise scrupulously careful historians. The four component parts of the United Kingdom (Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and England) have separate education systems; the National Curriculum is not national at all as it applies only to England.

GSCE – The General Certificate in Secondary Education

A series of examinations and other forms of assessment undertaken by pupils, usually but not always at the end of Year 11 – at or approaching 16 years of age.

ICT – Information and communications technology

One of the compulsory subjects within the National Curriculum for England and one which, like Citizenship Education and Religious Education, is often taught by non-specialists and not always in accordance with either statutory requirements or advisory guidelines.

ITE – Initial teacher education

Sometimes seen as a synonym for ITT, but there is a philosophical difference (see ITT, beginning teacher, student, trainee).

ITT – Initial teacher training

Sometimes seen as a synonym for ITE, but there is a philosophical difference (see ITE, beginning teacher, student, trainee).

KS - Key Stage

Education in England is divided into age bands, known as key stages (KS); KS 1 (5-8 year olds) and KS2 (8-11) mark the primary phase, KS 3 (11-14), KS 4 (14-16) are secondary. The 16-18 age band is often referred to as KS 5, but it is not as it is not an element of compulsory education and therefore not a Key Stage. Secondary schools are increasingly truncating KS3 to allow more time for a variety of activities, including early preparation for public examinations, so that there is a move away from the original age categories.

MASTERS' LEVEL

Student and other teachers have opportunities to submit work which can contribute towards the award of higher level academic credits, 180 of which can result in the achievement of a Masters degree – increasingly in Teaching and Learning (MTL).

NATIONAL CURRICULUM

Established in 1988, updated and restructured several times, this indicates/dictates the teaching and learning required to take place in state schools. Citizenship Education was originally a cross-curricular theme but, since 2002, it has been a compulsory subject in Key Stage 3 and 4. Strictly speaking [see England above, and Bailey (1996)] it is not national at all.

NQT – Newly Qualified Teacher. Having gained a PGCE, teachers who embark upon their first year in a teaching post continue to be given structured support and development (CPD). The NQT year must be successfully completed in order for a teacher to be regarded as fully qualified.

OFSTED – the Office for Standards in Education

A qango with responsibility for monitoring and reporting upon standards of teaching and learning in schools and in initial teacher education and training. Such has been the

improvement in its relationship with schools that an impending Ofsted inspection is now only regarded with dismay rather than, as formerly, outright terror.

PGCE – Post Graduate Certificate in Education/Professional Graduate Certificate in Education

One of the teaching qualifications available for those with degrees and who wish to teach. The initials stand for either Post Graduate Certificate in Education or Professional Graduate Certificate in Education, dependent on the level of credits achieved.

PUPIL – Young learner.

This term is preferred here to differentiate such learners from those who are studying how to teach them and is used throughout unless cited authors use the term ‘student’. In such cases the context of the quotation should make the meaning clear.

QCA – Qualifications and Curriculum Agency

A qango which was renamed Qualifications and Curriculum Development Agency and which ceased to exist shortly after the Conservative/Liberal Democrat government took office in May 2010.

RADICAL

To promote, embrace and reflect ideas and actions which are significantly different from current and past practice.

STUDENT – Someone who is studying to become a teacher.

As well as separating such people from the younger learners referred to here as pupils, the term also reflects a philosophical position regarding the development of teachers. It is a principle of radical education that teaching is not about applying set processes to specific circumstances and understanding the mechanics of instruction, but that it involves study, reflexivity, development and questioning. (See Beginning Teacher, Trainee)

SUBNATIONAL

Possibly a neologism used to try to differentiate between those regions of the United Kingdom which have some historical claims to be separate nations but which are now constituent parts of a whole. These parts are not politically equal as Scotland has a parliament while Wales has an assembly and Northern Ireland has a different type of assembly and England has none of these, although some would claim that the parliament which sits in Westminster is largely English in make-up and focus. The status of The Isle of Man, Cornwall, The Kingdom of Fife or other regions with some sense of separate identity is not implied or considered in my usage.

SUBVERSIVE

As used by Postman and Weingartner (1976), facing up to and attempting to resolve social problems while consciously undermining the attitudes and processes which produce them.

TRAINEE

A term used by those who consider teaching to be about applying set processes to specific circumstances and understanding the mechanics of instruction, rather than involving study, reflexivity, development and questioning. The term often used by governmental and teacher qualifying bodies and adopted by others without necessarily considering the implications of the term. (See Beginning Teacher, Student)

VOLUNTEER

When used as a noun this should indicate someone who has freely chosen to participate in an activity, usually unpaid. If used as a verb it is the action of choosing to so participate. This term is often used in relation to citizenship education as a wholly inaccurate euphemism for persuaded, coerced, or compelled, as when pupils are given no choice but to participate in an activity; if pressure is brought to bear, the pressured person is not a volunteer and the activity is therefore not voluntary.

WELTANSCHUANG

A Weberian term approximating to 'world view' but perhaps a little closer to 'the sense we make of the world around us as demonstrated by our actions and priorities'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Advisory Group on Citizenship (1998) Education for Citizenship and the teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship London: QCA

Ajegbo, K., Kiwan, D. and Sharma, S. (2007) Curriculum Review – Diversity and Citizenship Nottingham: DfES

Alderson, P. (2004) 'Democracy in Schools: Myths, Mirages and Making it Happen' in B. Linsley and E. Rayment (eds) Beyond the classroom: Exploring active citizenship in 11 – 16 education London: New Politics Network pp 31-38

Apple, M. W. (1990) Ideology and Curriculum London: Routledge

Aronowitz, S. and Goroux, H.A. (1985) Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate Over Schooling London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Arthur, J. (2003) Education with Character: The Moral Economy of Schooling London: RoutledgeFalmer

Arthur, J. (2005) 'Introduction' in J. Arthur with K. E. Bohlin (eds) Citizenship and Higher Education: The Role of Universities in Communities and Society Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer P4 pp 1-7

Arthur, J. and Wright, D. (2001) Teaching Citizenship in the Secondary School London: David Fulton

Bailey, R. (1996) 'The Irony of The National Curriculum' in D. Hayes, (ed) Debating Education : Issues for the new millennium? Canterbury: Canterbury Christ Church College, pp 14-18

Baldelli, G. (1971) Social Anarchism Middlesex: Penguin

Bell, D. (2005a) 'Speech to the Hansard Society' <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/>

Bell, D. (2005b) 'Education for Democratic Citizenship – The Roscoe Lecture at Liverpool John Moores University' <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/>

Berg, L. (1972) Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive Harmondsworth: Penguin

Bernstein, B., (1973) Class, Codes and Control Vol 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language London: Paladin

Bernstein, J. L. (2010) 'Citizenship-Oriented Approaches to the American Government Course' in M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek and J. L. Bernstein (eds) Citizenship Across the Curriculum Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp 13-35

Best, G. and Scott, L (1994) The Best of Times London: Simon and Schuster

- Blake, N., Smeyers, P., Smith, R. And Standish, P. (2000) Education In An Age Of Nihilism London: RoutledgeFalmer
- Bowles S & Gintis H (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Breslin, T (2005) 'Delivering National Curriculum Citizenship: Comparing and Applying Curriculum Models' in T. Breslin and B Dufour. (eds) Developing Citizens London: Hodder Murray, pp 309-319
- Brett, P (2007) 'Identity and Diversity: Citizenship Education and looking forward from the Ajebo Report' available at: http://www.citized.info/?strand=0&r_menu=res
- Brett, P. (2004) "More than a subject" : Fair Play for Citizenship' http://www.citized.info/index.php?strand=2&r_menu=res
- Brown, N. and Fairbrass, S. (2009) The Citizenship Teacher's Handbook London: Continuum
- CCCS Mugging Group (1975) 'Some notes on the relationship between the societal control culture and the news media' in S. Hall and T. Jefferson (eds) Resistance through Rituals London: Hutchinson pp 75-79
- Centre for Studies on Inclusion in Education (CSIE) (2000) Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools, Bristol: CSIE with CEN and CER
- Clay, J., and George R. (2002) 'Equality and Inclusion' in V. Ellis (ed) Achieving QTS: Learning and Teaching in Secondary Schools, Second Edition. Learning Matters: Exeter, pp138-151
- Cleaver, E., Ireland, E., and Kerr, D., (2003) 'The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study' Teaching Citizenship Issue 7, 15-19
- Clemitshaw, G. (2008) 'A response to Ralph Leighton's article – "Revisiting Postman and Weingartner's 'New Education' – is teaching citizenship a subversive activity?"' Citizenship Teaching and Learning 4 (1) 82-95
- Cohen, S (ed) 1971 Images of Deviance Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Cohen, S. (1994) Folk Devils and Moral Panics: the creation of the Mods and Rockers Oxford: Blackwell
- Cole, M. (ed) (2000) Education, Equality and Human Rights Routledge Falmer, London
- Corrigan, P. (1979) Schooling the Smash Street Kids London: Macmillan
- Crick, B, (2004) 'Why Citizenship At All?' in B. Linsley and E. Rayment (eds) Beyond the classroom: Exploring active citizenship in 11 – 16 education London: New Politics Network pp 5-10

- Davison, J. and Arthur, J. (2003) 'Active citizenship and the development of social literacy: a case for experiential learning' www.citized.info/pdf/commarticles/Arthur_Davison.pdf
- Day, C. (2004) A Passion for Teaching London: RoutledgeFalmer
- Dixon, B. (1979) Catching Them Young 1 Pluto Press, London
- Draper, S.M. (2001) Not Quite Burned Out But Crispy Around the Edges Portsmouth NH: Heinemann
- English Secondary Students Association (2009) <http://www.studentvoice.co.uk/>
- Faulks, K. (2006a) 'Education for citizenship in England's secondary schools: a critique of current principle and practice' Journal of Education Policy 21 (1) 59-74
- Faulks, K. (2006b) 'Rethinking Citizenship Education in England' Education, Citizenship and Social Justice 1(2) 123-140
- Florio-Ruane, S. (2001) Teacher Education and the Cultural Imagination: Autobiography, Conversation, and Narrative. London: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Foley, M. (2010) The Age of Absurdity: Why Modern Life Makes it Hard to be Happy London: Simon and Schuster
- Freeman, M. (1995) 'Children's rights in a land of rites' in B. Franklin (ed) The Handbook of Children's Rights Routledge Falmer, London
- Geelan, D. (2010) 'Science, Technology and Understanding: Teaching the Teachers of the Citizens of the Future' in M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek, J. L. Bernstein (eds) Citizenship Across the Curriculum Bloomington: Indiana University Press pp147-164
- Gilborn, D (2006) 'Citizenship education as placebo: "Standards", institutional racism and education policy' Education, Citizenship and Social Justice 1 (1) 83-104
- Gillborn, D. and Mirza H.S. (2000) Educational Inequality: Mapping Race, Class and Gender, Ofsted: London
- Gipps, C. and Murphy, P. (1994) A Fair Test? Assessment, Achievement and Equity, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.
- Giroux, H., (2000) 'Postmodern education and Disposable Youth' in P. P. Trifonas (ed) Revolutionary Pedagogies: Cultural Politics, Instituting Education, and the Discourse of Theory London: RoutledgeFarmer pp174 -190
- Godwin, W. (1797) 'Education through Desire' in G. Woodcock, (ed) (1980) The Anarchist Reader Glasgow: Fontana/Collins pp. 270-273
- Goffman (1961) Asylums Harmondsworth: Penguin

- Goodman, P., (1975) Compulsory Miseducation London: Penguin
- Griffiths, M. (1998) Educational Research for Social Justice: Getting off The Fence Buckingham: Open University Press
- Halualani, R. T. (2010) 'De-Stabilizing Culture and Citizenship: Crafting a Critical Intercultural Engagement for University Students on a Diversity Course' in M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowecek and J. L. Bernstein (eds) Citizenship Across the Curriculum Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp 36-53
- Harber, C. (2009) Toxic Schooling: How Schools Became Worse Nottingham: Educational Heretics Press
- Hargreaves, D.H. (1967) Social Relations in a Secondary School London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Hargreaves, D.H. (2004) Learning for Life: The Foundations Of Lifelong Learning Bristol: Polity Press
- Hayes, B., McAllister, A. and Dowds, L. (2006) 'In Search of the Middle Ground: Integrated Education and Northern Ireland' Politics Research Update (no 42) Access Research Knowledge: Northern Ireland <http://www.ark.ac.uk/publications/updates/update42.pdf>
- Henn, M., Weinstein, M. and Forrest, S. (2005) 'Uninterested youth? Young People's Attitudes towards Party Politics in Britain' Political studies vol 53 (3)
- Hutton, W. (1995) The State We're In London: Jonathan Cape
- Illich I (1973) Deschooling Society Middlesex: Penguin
- Jackson, B., and Marsden, D., (1970) Education and the working class London: Penguin
- Kerr, D., Lopes, J., Nelson, J., White, K., Cleaver, E., Benton, T. (2007) VISION versus PRAGMATISM: Citizenship in the Secondary School Curriculum in England. The Citizenship education Longitudinal Study: Fifth Annual Report London: NFER
- Kimberlee, R.H. (2002) 'Why don't British young people vote?' Journal of Youth Studies 5 (1)
- Knott, S. (2007) 'Britishness' <http://citized.info/>
- Kolb, D. (1984) Experiential Learning New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Kynaston, D. (2008) Austerity Britain 1945-51 London: Bloomsbury
- Labov, W. (1969) 'The Logic of Non-Standard English' in N. Keddie (ed) Tinker, Tailor . . . The Myth of Cultural Deprivation Penguin: Harmondsworth pp 21-66
- Lawton, D. (1975) Class, culture and the curriculum London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lehman, S. (1999) The Tibetans: a struggle to survive London: Virgin

- Leighton, R. (2002) 'Who are you? A discussion on citizenship provision' Paper presented at the British Sociological Association conference, Leicester University, March 2002
- Leighton, R. (2004a) 'What you give is what you get: a preliminary examination of the influence of teacher perceptions of the role of Citizenship Education' <http://www.citized.info/>
- Leighton, R. (2004b) 'Fair conflict resolution starts here.' Teaching Citizenship Issue 11, Summer 2004 26 – 31
- Leighton, R. (2004c) 'The nature of Citizenship Education provision: an initial study.' The Curriculum Journal 15 (2) 167-184
- Leighton, R. (2006) '[Revisiting Postman and Weingartner's 'New Education' – is Teaching Citizenship a Subversive Activity?](#)' Citizenship and Teacher Education 2 (1), 97-89
- Leighton, R. (2010a) 'Active Citizenship' in L. Gearon (ed) Learning to Teach Citizenship in the Secondary School, 2nd Edition London: Routledge pp 135-143
- Leighton, R. (2010b) 'The (F)utility of Focus Days in Developing Citizenship Education' Paper presented at the International Citizenship Education Conference, St Andrew's University, July 2010
- Lockyer (2003) 'Introduction and Review' in Locker, A., Crick, B. and Annette, J. (eds.) Education for Democratic Citizenship: issues of theory and practice. Aldershot: Ashgate. Pp 1-14
- Lorimer, D. (ed) (2008) Learning For Life: From Inspiration to Aspiration Dundee: Learning for life
- Lukes, S. (1974) Power: A Radical View London: McMillan
- Mahony, P. and Hextall, I. (2000) Reconstructing Teaching London: Routledge/Farmer
- Manzoor, S. (2010) 'My month of being Jewish' Guardian (G2) 8 April 2010
- McEwen, A. (1999) Public policy in a divided Society – Schooling, Culture and identity in Northern Ireland Aldershot: Ashgate
- McGlynn, C (2004) 'Education for Peace in Integrated Schools: A Priority for Northern Ireland?' Child Care in Practice 10 (2) , pp. 85–94)
- Merton, R.K. (1968) Social Theory and Social Structure New York: Free Press
- Michels, R. (1949) Political Parties Glencoe: The Free Press
- Mills, C.W. (1980) The Sociological Imagination London: Penguin
- Monbiot, G. (2000) Captive State London:Pan

- Morgan, C. and Morris, G. (1999) Good Teaching and Learning: Pupils and Teachers Speak Buckingham: Open University Press
- Morrall, C. (2010) The Man Who Disappeared London: Sceptre
- O'Connor, S. (2010) 'Why am I allowed to work and marry but not vote?' Folkestone and Hythe Kentish Gazette, 30 August 2010, p3.
- Oakeshott, M. (1962) Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays London: Methuen
- Office for Standards in Education (2003) Inspecting Citizenship 11-16 London: HMSO
- Office for Standards in Education (2006) Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools London: HMSO
- Office for Standards in Education (2010) Citizenship Established? Manchester: Ofsted
- Ofsted (2009) Denbigh School Inspection Report
[http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/display/\(id\)/109116](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/display/(id)/109116)
- Park, R. (1950) Race and Culture New York: Free Press .
- Peters, M.A. and Bulut, E. (2010) 'Education and Culture' in Arthur, J. and Davies, I. (eds) The Routledge Educational Studies Textbook London: Routledge
- Peterson, A. and Knowles, C. (2007) 'PGCE citizenship student teacher understandings of active citizenship' www.citized.info/pdf/commarticles/ActiveProjectReport.pdf
- Postman, N. and Weingartner, C. (1976) Teaching as a subversive activity London: Penguin
- Postman, V. (1970) 'The politics of reading' in N. Keddie (ed) Tinker, Tailor . . . the myth of cultural deprivation London: Penguin
- Powell, M. and Solity, J. (1990) Teachers in Control: Cracking the Code London: Routledge
- Preston, J. and Chakrabarty, N. (2010) 'Do schools contribute to social and community cohesion?' in J. Arthur and I. Davies (eds) The Routledge Educational Studies Textbook London: Routledge pp 187-194
- Price, G. A. (2002) 'Inclusion: Special Educational Needs', in V. Ellis (ed) Achieving QTS: Learning and Teaching in Secondary Schools, Learning Matters: Exeter
- Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2007) The National Curriculum for England Nottingham; QCA
- Ratray Taylor, G. (1974) Rethink Middlesex: Penguin
- Ratray Taylor, G. (1977) How to avoid the future London: NEL

- Reid, A., Gill, J., and Sears, A. (2010) 'The Forming of Citizens in a Globalized World' in A. Reid, J. Gill and A. Sears (eds) Globalization, The Nation State and the Citizen: Dilemmas and Directions for Civics and Citizenship Education London: Routledge pp3016
- Riley, K. (2010) http://www.leru.org.uk/london_lives
- Ross, A. and Dooly, M. (2010) 'Young People's intentions about their political activity' Citizenship Teaching and Learning 6 (2) 43-60
- Rowling, J.K. (1998) Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets London: Bloomsbury
- Rudduck, J. (1991) Innovation and Change Buckingham: Open University Press
- Schumacher, E.F. (1974) Small is Beautiful; a study of economics as if people mattered London: Abacus
- Sellar, W.C. and Yeatman R.J. (1976) And Now All This London: Magnum
- Smith, J. A. and Osborn, M. (2003) 'Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis' in J. A. Smith (ed) Qualitative Psychology London: Sage pp53-80
- Smith, M. B., Nowacek, R. S. and Bernstein, J. L. (2010) 'Introduction: Ending the Solitude of Citizenship Education' in M.B. Smith, R.S. Nowacek and J. L. Bernstein (eds) Citizenship Across the Curriculum Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp 1-12
- Thomas, W. I. and Thomas, D. (1928) The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs. New York: Knopf.
- Toffler, A. (1973) Future Shock London: Pan
- Weber, M. (2009) From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology London: Routledge
- Werder, C (2010) 'Fostering Self-Authorship for Citizenship: Telling Metaphors in Dialogue' in M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek and J. L. Bernstein (eds) Citizenship Across the Curriculum Bloomington: Indiana University Press pp 54-72
- White, R. with Brockington, D (1983) Tales Out of School: Consumers' views of British Education London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Wilde, O. (1891) 'Disobedience: Man's Original Virtue' in Woodcock, G. (ed) (1980) The Anarchist Reader Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, pp 72-74
- Williams R (2010) 'Union says pupils on interview panels are humiliating to teachers'. Guardian Newspaper 3/4/2010
- Willis, P. (1977) Learning to Labour Farnborough: Saxon Press
- Young, J. (1971) The Drugtakers: the Social Meaning of Drug-taking London: Paladin

WEBSITES

<http://www.ark.ac.uk>

<http://www.citized.info/>

<http://www.debatingmatters.com/>

<http://www.denbigh.net/>

<http://www.environment.gov.au/education/aussi/>

<http://www.leru.org.uk/>

<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/>

<http://www.persona-doll-training.org/ukhome.html>

<http://www.rumad.org.au/>

<http://www.studentvoice.co.uk/>

<http://www.wedg.org.uk>

Leighton, R. (2013a). 'Citizenship teachers—Different types, different needs'.

Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 9[1], pp.85-98.

Abstract

This paper outlines the diverse nature of citizenship education provision in England and raises some of the problems this creates in relation to the initial and continued professional development of pre-service and in-service teachers, a situation exacerbated by the reduction in state authorised citizenship teacher education programmes. It goes on to identify some of the variety of citizenship teacher academic backgrounds and some of the challenges which arise for both specialist and non-specialist citizenship teachers in addressing divergent, complex – and sometimes invisible – modes of subject provision. It is argued that differences in school provision, teacher background and attitude(s) to the subject require sensitivity in the construction and delivery of programmes intended to enhance teacher confidence and competence in citizenship education. A typology of the '8 Cs' of citizenship teachers is identified – Co-existence Colonisation Commitment Compliance Conflict Convenience Conversion Cynicism – and discussed, outlining the range of needs and attitudes among specialist and non-specialist teachers of citizenship education, and some recommendations are offered regarding how these can be approached.

Keywords: Different needs; Non/specialists; Professional development; Teacher typology

Introduction

This paper outlines the diverse nature of citizenship education provision in England and addresses some of the problems this raises for pre-service and in-service teacher development, a situation shown to be exacerbated by the reduction in state authorised citizenship teacher education programmes. It goes on to identify some of the variety of citizenship teachers' academic backgrounds and some of the challenges which arise for both specialist and non-specialist citizenship teachers in addressing divergent, complex – and sometimes invisible – modes of subject provision. It then identifies an eight-element typology of citizenship teachers and addresses the varied and very distinct professional needs which such teachers face, and recommends different approaches for different needs.

Background

A number of reports in England (Ofsted 2006, 2010, Ajegbo et al 2007, Kerr et al 2007, Keating et al 2010) have identified qualitative and quantitative differences in the effectiveness of the teaching of Citizenship Education by those who have qualified as specialists compared to teaching by those whose professional backgrounds are in other subjects. Ofsted, the schools inspectorate for England, recommended that the Department for Children, Families and Schools (since supplanted by the Department for Education) and the Teacher Development Agency should 'maintain the numbers of trainee places for initial teacher education and the level of provision for continuing professional development in citizenship' and 'promote the take-up of courses for continuing professional development in this area' (Ofsted 2010, p7). It further stated that schools should 'develop the quality of citizenship teaching by taking advantage of existing expertise in the school, capitalising on training opportunities and recruiting specialist teachers when the opportunity arises' (Ofsted 2010, p8).

The Department for Education has ended the undersubscribed part-time professional development course which gave non-specialists thirty-eight hours of support, spread across several months, in order to develop the insights and skills which pre-service specialists take a year of full-time study and practise to address. That programme was a response to a perceived need for more specialist teachers of citizenship but did not recognise the significant differences between those who choose to follow a particular path and those who are required or compelled to do so. With the demise of that programme, professional development programmes will be limited to those offered by a variety of institutions and organisations, many of which are likely to similarly fail to recognise and respond to such variance. Furthermore, it has cut the number of places on pre-service programmes for Citizenship teachers by 30% which has led to the closure of some courses and a serious threat to the viability of others when there are still not enough qualified specialists to ensure that every secondary school in England has at least one such teacher.

Teachers do not comprise a homogenous group of same thinking, like minded and similarly experienced individuals. The designation 'teachers' represents a diverse group for which 'community' implies greater uniformity than is appropriate. To generalise about citizenship teachers, while possibly a syntactical convenience, is to allow an inaccuracy which can lead to errors of analysis and interpretation of data and, subsequently, to errors of understanding, judgement and

policy. It also leads to training, development and support which does not meet the needs of the intended targets nor of the children in their care. It is important that we not only understand the diverse nature of citizenship teaching and provision in order to agree on what we are talking about, it would also be helpful – when discussing how the subject is taught and by whom – to know who we are talking about.

There is an extensive body of evidence (Cleaver et al 2003, Leighton 2004a, Ofsted 2006, 2010, Ajegbo et al 2007, Kerr et al 2007, Keating 2010) that, unlike any other secondary school subject, there is not a large number of specialist trained professionals in place to interpret and deliver England's National Curriculum for Citizenship (QCA 2007). Indeed, the NFER longitudinal study into the teaching of citizenship in England found that "four years on from the introduction of statutory citizenship over half of teachers teaching citizenship have still not received any citizenship-related training." (Kerr et al 2007, p vi)

There are, at most, 2500 current teachers with a citizenship Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE). To this number we can add those teachers who have been trained through work-based routes such as Teach First and the Graduate Training Programme, as well as those who have completed the Certificate in the Teaching of Citizenship. There are also some Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs) in Citizenship from a variety of subject backgrounds. We can subtract from this total those who have left the teaching profession or who are not teaching citizenship and, bearing in mind that some schools have more than one specialist, conclude that approximately half of England's secondary schools do not have any subject specialists teaching Citizenship.

It has been shown previously (Cleaver et al 2003, Leighton 2004a, 2012a, 2012b, Clemitshaw and Calvert 2006, Ofsted 2006, 2010, Faulks 2006) that schools approach the delivery of citizenship in a number of disparate ways, the varying degrees of effectiveness of which are not here under consideration – although it should be noted that Ofsted (2006) estimated that 25% of the Citizenship lessons seen in its 2005/06 inspections were inadequate and, by 2010, this was 11% (Ofsted 2010, p4). Some schools integrate citizenship within the teaching of other subjects; often within one or more of the humanities, with RE featuring prominently in such provision, but also through English or across the whole curriculum. While the cross-curricular approach is required by the National Curriculum as complementary to single-subject delivery, there are schools where it is seen as an

alternative. It is conflated with Personal Social and Health Education (PSHE) in over two thirds of the schools in the NFER study (Kerr et al 2007, Keating 2010); sometimes it subsumed into an existing programme, while in other cases a hybrid such as Personal and Citizenship Education (PACE) has emerged. There are many – a growing number – where Citizenship Education exists as a separate timetabled subject, others where it is presented through a series of collapsed time-table days or events, and some where there is no formal recognition or provision.

In those schools where there is distinct timetable provision of the subject, delivery is neither uniform nor consistent (Leighton 2004a). There are schools, or teachers within schools, who follow the schemes of work and lesson plans available on-line from the Department for Education – some following these to the letter and others using them to guide rather than dictate lessons. There are schools, or teachers within schools, who recognise the spirit of the National Curriculum for Citizenship and who have developed and present their own interpretation of it – and others who have developed and present their own version without necessarily paying close, or even scant, attention to that spirit.

The delivery of Citizenship Education in schools in England can therefore be at best described as “erratic”. This is not due to a lack of information about the subject, given the plethora of sites, texts, documents, articles, handbooks, and involved NGOs which proliferate, although the inconsistencies between these might be a contributory factor. At least as important as those possible inconsistencies is the demonstrable disparity of types of teacher of citizenship.

Most secondary school teachers in England have a degree in their subject as well as a post-graduate qualification in that subject. However, according to Ofsted, ‘[m]ost teachers of citizenship are “non-specialists”; many work far from their normal comfort zone both in subject knowledge and teaching approaches, especially with regard to controversial and topical issues’ (Ofsted 2006, p1). Four years on, the inspectorate again raised concerns about the subject being ‘taught by large teams, including form tutors, who lacked the knowledge, skills and understanding to teach it effectively.’ (Ofsted 2010, p20)

An earlier study (Leighton 2004b) identified one institution's training cohort of 23 PGCE(s) Citizenship students as including graduates in nine subjects, none of which was Citizenship, who had worked with 27 school based mentors who had been trained to teach nine subjects – only in one case was that subject Citizenship. In the academic year 2006/07, that institution recruited 38 PGCE students to work with 29 school-based mentors, eight of whom were trained citizenship teachers and with a further eleven subject specialists in their schools. This might be taken to imply that 50% of these trainees would have first teaching placement contact with a practicing subject specialist but, due to the unequal distribution of such specialists, only 30% had such contact. While a significant improvement on the findings of the earlier study, this clearly indicates that there is an expertise deficit in the training of Citizenship teachers in schools.

That research, based on interviews with pre-service teachers of citizenship and their subject mentors, initially led to the conclusion that there were six distinct “types” of teacher of citizenship. Further interviews, with a greater number of trainee and practising teachers and with the greater depth of analysis which arises from Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), have revealed two more categories.

While the classifications outlined and discussed below are significant, they cannot be assumed to represent an exhaustive list; the point to be emphasised is that the typical citizenship teacher, like the typical “anyone”, does not exist. The diversity of type of citizenship teacher should therefore be reflected in sampling and analysis when researching citizenship education in order to ensure that generalisations about the nature of the experience of teaching or being taught citizenship in England – if they must be made – are secure, valid and reliable. Similarly, and crucially, awareness of that diversity must also inform any in-service or professional development provision if it is to meet the needs of teachers and of pupils.

Typology – the 8 Cs

1. Commitment: For most citizenship specialist student teachers, the decision to teach citizenship has been a conscious career choice based on their understanding of and commitment to the underlying principles of citizenship as identified, for example, in the Crick Report (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998), and to the content of the Citizenship National Curriculum. Citizenship-qualified

teachers who were acting as mentors had very similar reasons for teaching the subject to those offered by specialist student teachers; unsurprisingly, as they were recently qualified and had made the same conscious choices. In both groups, academic backgrounds represent a wide range of subjects and most had demonstrated their own commitment to active citizenship in working for NGOs, voluntary activities with faith groups or support networks both prior to and subsequent to qualification. There is a strong identification with a sense of mission, a desire to 'make a difference'.

2. Conversion: There are experienced teachers who feel that the separate and explicit teaching of Citizenship is crucial to the benefit of young people and the welfare of society; for some such teachers this is to the extent that they are more interested in how to teach Citizenship and thereby enable their pupils to develop related skills than in developing the subjects in which they originally qualified to teach. There are others who feel that they do not have the necessary skills and depth of knowledge to develop the subject and actively seek recruitment of teachers who have an appropriate background. Many of the teachers who choose to enrol on the Certificate of the Teaching of Citizenship were converts, but not all.

3. Convenience: Amongst those who have trained or who are on pre-service programmes for specialist teachers of citizenship there are those who see these as a route into teaching their degree subjects. With few initial teacher education courses in the social sciences, some graduates in related subjects appear to consider their chances of successful recruitment and subsequent employment to be greater on Citizenship training courses. In January 2011, the Graduate Teacher Training Registry website identified three courses for intended teachers of Economics; four Social Science training courses, including one with an option in sociology or psychology and one with a Citizenship option; and lists no courses for the specific training of teachers of Law, Politics, Psychology, or Sociology – all subjects which featured significantly in this sample. In comparison, there are fifteen institutions of higher education offering Citizenship places, giving a significantly greater likelihood of finding a training place and a greater likelihood of Key Stage 3 (11-14) teaching experience, carrying with it a perceived improvement in employment prospects.

4. Co-existence: A number of teachers qualified in other subjects believe that there is a need for citizenship teaching. Not at the expense of their main subject but possibly complementary to their schools' Personal Social and Health Education programmes, as well as preparing young people for

life after school in ways which other subjects were not equipped to address. They have tended to share what this author has described elsewhere (Leighton 2004a) as a 'Not before time' perspective. These teachers, and student teachers in other subjects, are keen to deliver discrete lessons in Citizenship and to ensure the explicit inclusion and identification of the Citizenship curriculum in their own subject specialist teaching.

5. Colonisation: There are teachers who regard Citizenship as a way of ensuring the continuance of their own subject which they perceive as otherwise under threat. Amongst teachers in this category there is a belief that they can deliver 'their version' of citizenship, apparently in line with Crick's (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998) notion that what pupils experience in citizenship should be tailored to the requirements of their school and the local community – '[i]f taught well and tailored to local needs, [citizenship] skills and values will enhance democratic life for us all, both rights and responsibilities, beginning in school and radiating out.' (QCA, 2001, p 3) This carries with it the assumption that such requirements are identifiable and identified; such identification appears to be confined to the perceptions of those charged with delivering the subject and, in the case of 'colonising' teachers, this is heavily influenced by their desire to protect and develop their own, often PSHE-related, areas of responsibility. Programmes of study which emphasise personal relationships, sex education, first aid and road safety, laudable as they may or may not be, do not reflect the National Curriculum for Citizenship (QCA 2007).

6. Compliance: There would appear to be teachers of Citizenship who find themselves in that position due to a lack of an adequate number of classes timetabled in their 'own' subject, and where Citizenship is therefore seen by both the teacher and the school as a timetable filler; there is also some indication that pupils taught in this context share this perception of the subject.

It is common to find an air of resignation amongst such teachers. Frequently younger and less experience teachers, their approach tends to be that the subject is there and they do not want to upset anyone who might be called upon to write a reference, so they might as well do what they can. That they were compliant rather than dedicated does not necessarily result in poorer teaching but in greater anxiety. Some of the more senior teachers who do not want to teach the subject were in a position to ensure they were not called upon to do so, while others seem to have been timetabled to teach Citizenship but find that such lessons often coincide with 'unavoidable' meetings and leave the lesson to be taught by a free and compliant or coerced more junior colleague.

7. Conflict: Direct opposition to the provision of Citizenship education was identified less often and was less vehement than had been expected at the outset of this research. This might be a reflection of an overestimation or initial oversensitivity on the part of the researcher, or of respondents' awareness of the researcher's commitment to citizenship education. None the less, it is clear that some teachers are actively opposed to the teaching of citizenship – whether by themselves or by anyone else. In some cases this opposition is based upon dissatisfaction with the programme which such teachers are expected to deliver and which does not closely match the National Curriculum guidelines; for these teachers the opposition is not necessarily to Citizenship Education per se but to a perceived inadequacy or inappropriateness of their school's provision. For others it is derived from an insecurity with subject knowledge and subject skills; again this might not be opposition to the subject itself, but a response to the professional dissonance created by the professional and pupil expectation that teachers are in command of what they are doing coming into conflict with a very different reality. While citizenship tends not to be a didactically delivered subject as, at its best, it encourages active participation and the airing and sharing of views, it might be that didactic teaching and acquiescent pupils are some teachers' preferred experience. There are also those teachers who are aware of National Curriculum requirements for citizenship but do not think that these have a place in school.

As well as three variants of the 'conflict' teacher, there are variations in the response to this conflict. Many of them are as anxious as their compliant colleagues, with their anxieties centred upon spending time away from what they believed they should be doing – usually preparing or delivering 'their' subject – or that colleagues or line managers will perceive them as poor teachers because they do not perform as well outside their specialism as they do within it.

There are also some conflict teachers who openly express their rejection of the subject and who do not adhere to school or national guidelines and who belittle the subject to pupils. In the most extreme case in the conduct of this research, one such teacher adopted strategies which included being disruptive when observing the lessons of student teachers of citizenship, making disparaging comments about their competence and the relevance of the subject to their university tutor, and removing resources prepared by and relied upon by trainees. He continues, however, to be perceived as a very good teacher of his specialist subject – albeit now in another school, where he has no involvement in the support and development of student teachers of citizenship.

8. Cynicism: One specialist teacher of citizenship was aware that there were signs of her “becoming cynical about whether we can make any difference to anyone”. In her own school, she could identify more teachers who could be placed in typology categories 3 – 7 than who might be in 1 or 2. Many of her colleagues openly described the subject as a time-table filler for themselves and for the pupils. While she believed that her head-teacher was aware of and committed to the principles underpinning the National Curriculum for Citizenship, the lack of provision equivalent to that enjoyed by other subjects – time-table time, homework, examination entry, space and time for co-ordinated extra-curricular citizenship activities, pupil engagement and encouragement – meant that, in her view, there was little which citizenship could tangibly achieve.

Originally committed, some specialist teachers of citizenship are finding it difficult to maintain this commitment in the face of what they perceive as intransigence or unequal treatment. Time tables where Citizenship is a ‘floating subject’ (e.g. Monday period 1 one week, period 2 the next, period 3 the next) are cited as disabling, as have ignoring or openly denigrating pupils’ examination successes in Citizenship, and, in a school which streams by perceptions of ability based on SAT scores, providing citizenship for lower streams while the more able learn a second language.

While it has so far been possible to identify eight types of citizenship teacher, it has not been possible to organise them by any social categories other than the descriptors given and it should not be imputed that there are only these eight types. It may well prove to be the case that there are other further attitudinal categories or sub-categories of citizenship teachers – for example those with preferences for community involvement over curriculum knowledge, or vice versa, or those who would emphasise a communitarian approach over a commitment to self-improvement. In a more general context not considered here but worth further investigation, See (2004) identifies that family background and perceptions of teaching are key determinants of an individual’s attitudes to teaching, and that those who are committed to teaching are likely to be motivated by associated perceived intrinsic rewards.

There is no indication in this research that age, length of service, gender, ethnicity, subject specialism, occupational background, seniority or any combination of these determines into which ‘type’ a teacher could be placed. This is in part a research artefact – the methodology is interpretative, the sample was not intended to be representative of any of those social categories,

and data which might inform such interpretations were not gathered in a systematic way – but it is also an important point in itself.

Discussion

Gillborn (2006) cites numerous studies which indicate that ‘many White teachers hold systematically lower expectations of Black and other minority ethnic students’ (p 89) and demonstrates the growing gap in inequality of attainment between ethnic groups as part of his substantial body of evidence of institutionalised racism in the UK. While not blaming citizenship education for a racist society, Gillborn places it in the – for him – counter-productive context of multiculturalism rather than a more radical anti-racist agenda. He describes it as ‘a *placebo*: a fake treatment, meant to placate concern, but making no actual attempt to address the central problem’ (p 97) going on to caution that, while ‘Citizenship education has the potential to open up new and controversial areas of debate and, within a critical whole-school approach, can advance anti-racist developments’ (pp 98/9) it is unlikely to do so.

If Gillborn is correct – and the strength of his arguments and the wealth of data he presents from his own work and the research of many others presents a very powerful case – the ethnicity of teachers of citizenship, and the commitment of all teachers to the potential for social change which citizenship education can foster, might be a key factor which influences the attitudes they display and therefore their classification within the typology.

While this author’s perspective on such potential for social change is discussed elsewhere (Leighton 2006, 2012b), the ethnic distribution of pre-service citizenship teaching students may be informative. The institution whose citizenship PGCE students formed the sample for this study consistently achieves Black and other Minority Ethnic Group recruitment just below 20% on its secondary post-graduate initial teacher education programmes, and the PGCE Citizenship course has recruited at over 30% since its inception. The national representation of black and other minority ethnic group members of the teaching profession in England is 10% (WLE, 2010) although that varies considerably by national region.

These past course members have taken either a committed or convenience approach to their development as teachers of citizenship, and some might have become cynical. As a cohort they cross the age, ethnic, academic background, physical disability and social class diversity of teachers in general, without necessarily coinciding with the mean/norm of any of these divisions either within Initial Teacher Education or within the wider teaching workforce. This highlights the difficulty in predicating typology classification according to social or biological categories.

Kerr et al (2007) clearly indicate that discrete provision of citizenship on a school timetable does not in itself guarantee adequate provision, appropriate learning or subject development. Rather, their findings lead them to conclude that any model of delivery of citizenship is most “likely to be effective if citizenship: is taught by small, dedicated teams; has strong and clear leadership and direction; is well supported through up-to-date, accessible lesson plans and resources” (Kerr et al 2007; p vii), a perception previously identified by Breslin (2005) and subsequently confirmed by Ofsted (2010). Such dedication, clarity of thought and direction, and currency of lessons and resources are much more likely to come from individuals – or teams which include individuals – who have a commitment to the provision, development and delivery of the subject.

When supporting teachers of citizenship education – whether curriculum design, lesson planning and delivery, attitudes to and conduct of assessment, classroom activities and outcomes – an understanding of the role of the teacher, and how an individual teacher performs that role, is vital. The execution of that role is likely to be determined by the attitude(s) to citizenship education held by that teacher, so that understanding the teacher’s place within this typology might clarify our understanding of the range of needs such teachers might have. When talking about such about citizenship teachers, about their training and development needs and how such needs can be best met, it might ensure some understanding of their diversity.

Conclusions

It is clear that there are both qualitative and quantitative differences in the provision and effectiveness of the teaching of Citizenship Education in England, with most teachers of citizenship not being specialists and working outside their comfort zones in regard to both subject knowledge and teaching strategies. While there is an identified need to continue to develop pre- and in-service

programmes for teachers of Citizenship Education, there is no indication that this need will be reflected in government policy; if schools are to develop and exploit expertise and promote take-up of CPD courses, those courses will have to meet a wide range of diverse and sometimes conflicting needs. A range of attitudes towards and expertise in citizenship education has been identified amongst those who currently teach the subject. Just as these differences exist, so do their learning, development and training needs.

Those teachers who are committed to the teaching of Citizenship Education will have a variety of subject perceptions and subject-related strengths which can be shared and developed. Such sharing and development must take into account the nature of subject provision in their schools as the needs and opportunities prevalent in an environment where the subject is taught discretely by a team of experts will be very different to those where there is one committed teacher and an array of cynics and compliant colleagues.

Converts to Citizenship Education are likely to have a particular need for greater subject and resource awareness, ensuring that evangelism does not obscure the opportunities and range of activities which citizenship education presents. Those who followed pre-service Citizenship Education programmes as a matter of convenience might find they are none the less still required to teach it. Their needs might overlap with those of their committed colleagues in that their subject knowledge could be further strengthened, as well as there being a need to ensure that they do not become colonials, compliant, conflicted or cynical.

There were few teachers of Citizenship Education who displayed an attitude of co-existence. As the current national curriculum requires that all subjects explicitly identify their relationship with all other subjects, these teachers may well be in a position to lead their less enthusiastic colleagues in understanding how such links can be effectively made and sustained.

The colonising teachers and schools need first and foremost to be made aware of the content, opportunities and requirements of the National Curriculum for Citizenship. This has to be done in such a way as to avoid compliance, conflict or cynicism. There are likely to be gaps in subject knowledge and teaching and assessment strategies which are much more fundamental and deep-

rooted than those of the types discussed so far, so that developing confidence as well as understanding is paramount.

By no means unique to citizenship education, the needs of the compliant teacher are considerable. They have effectively subjected to bullying and need to understand how this can be challenged professionally and securely. Pragmatically, they also need to understand the nature and demands of teaching citizenship education, to have their confidence and expertise developed, to have a sense of their own value. Although on the surface very different, they have much in common with those in conflict with or cynical about citizenship education.

Nobody should have to teach a subject with which they find themselves in conflict; it does them no good and it does their pupils great harm. If both conflicted and compliant – willing to teach citizenship education but not seeing the point of it – they need subject and teaching skills as well as an understanding of how their preferred subject relates to citizenship education. Both they and the converts might benefit from collaboration and shared time. If they have lost their passion for teaching, it is incumbent upon their school – and their own sense of worth – that steps are taken to rekindle that passion. Putting them out to pasture in a subject possibly perceived to be of little value is a betrayal of them and of their pupils.

There can be some value to staffroom cynics, if only to alert other teachers to the dangers which lie in wait, but to be cynical about the subject one teaches is no good for the teacher or the pupils. School ethos matters in the teaching of citizenship education, not only to encourage pupils to understand and apply the principles of good citizenship, but to reinforce for all members of the school community that who they are and what they do is valued. Perhaps the most supportive and enhancing in-service support for cynical teachers would not be for their participation but for their senior colleagues'.

All the above types of citizenship teachers, indeed all teachers, need the opportunity to network. They also need their senior colleagues – perhaps where the depths of conflict and cynicism are at their most profound – to develop understanding of the subject. To counter the negativity of some senior and head teachers, there should perhaps be a ninth category – Citizenship Champions. There

are many classroom-based teachers of citizenship who could lead and support citizenship education CPD, and who do, but are concerned not to raise participants' hopes too high in the light of senior teacher lip-service. However, there are also many head teachers and other senior staff with a commitment to and passion for citizenship education who could demonstrate to their colleagues how to harness the potential of the subject for the good of their schools.

There can be no doubt that citizenship education is most effective when it is taught by dedicated teams of committed professionals who enjoy clear leadership and direction to provide engaging, up-to-date, and accessible activities. This has to be the common objective, but it is folly to assume that everyone should tread the same path to arrive at that destination: diversity is not a term exclusively applicable to pupils.

References

- Advisory Group On Citizenship (1998) *Education For Citizenship And The Teaching Of Democracy In Schools: Final Report*. London: QCA
- Ajegbo, K., Kiwan D, Sharma, S (2007) *Curriculum Report: Citizenship And Diversity*. London: DfES
- Breslin, T. (2005) Delivering National Curriculum Citizenship: Comparing and Applying Curriculum Models, in Breslin T and Dufour B (eds) *Developing Citizens* London: Hodder Murray
- Cleaver, E., Ireland, E., Kerr, D. (2003) The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study. *Teaching Citizenship*, 7, Autumn, pp15-19.
- Clemitchaw, G., Calvert, M (2005) Implementing Citizenship In The English Secondary School Curriculum: A Follow-Up Study *Pastoral Care In Education* 23, 3, pp.31-36
- Davies, I., (2003) Initial Teacher Education And The Citizenship Agenda *Teaching Citizenship* Issue 7, Autumn 2003, pp30-35
- Faulks, K., (2006) 'Education for citizenship in England's secondary schools: a critique of current principle and practice *Journal of Education Policy* 21, 1, pp.59-74
- Gillborn, D. (2006) Citizenship Education As Placebo: 'Standards', Institutional Racism And Education *Education, Citizenship And Social Justice*.2 1,1, pp. 83-104
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E. and Lopes, J. (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) *Research Report DFE-RR059*
London: DfE

Kerr D, Lopes J, Nelson J, White K, Cleaver E, Benton T (2007) *VISION versus PRAGMATISM: Citizenship in the Secondary School Curriculum in England: Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Fifth Annual Report* London: DfES. Available from <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR845.pdf> [accessed 5 May 2011]

Leighton, R. (2004a) The Nature Of Citizenship Education Provision: An Initial Study *The Curriculum Journal* 15, 2, pp. 167 – 181

Leighton, R. (2004b) Trainees, Mentors And Citizenship: Fair Conflict Resolution Begins Here *Teaching Citizenship* Issue 9, Summer 2004, pp. 26-31

Leighton, R. (2012a) Introducing pre-service citizenship teachers to the design and implementation of focus days to enhance their professional learning *Citizenship Teaching and Learning* 7,1, pp. 89-102

Leighton, R. (2012b) *Teaching Citizenship Education: A Radical Approach* London: Continuum

Ofsted (2006) *Towards Consensus? Citizenship In Secondary Schools* London: Ofsted

Ofsted (2010) *Citizenship Established? Citizenship in Schools 2006-2009* Manchester: Ofsted

QCA (2007) *Citizenship: The National Curriculum For England* London: DfES/QCA Publications

See, B. H. (2004) Determinants of Teaching As A Career In The UK *Evaluation And Research In Education* 18, 4, pp. 213–242

WLE (2010) OP9: Becoming a head teacher: Perceptions of black and minority ethnic (BME) aspirants
Available from http://www.wlecentre.ac.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=359&Itemid=50 [accessed 11 March 2011]

RIEJS - 2013 Vol2, Núm 1

OVERCOMING THE NOCEBO EFFECT - A RADICAL APPROACH TO CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Ralph Leighton

INTRODUCTION

This paper begins with a discussion of recent evidence regarding the state of Citizenship Education in England, proposing that there are indications of a nocebo effect – where an intervention has detrimental effects which outweigh any potential benefits. It is then argued that a more radical approach to Citizenship Education than is currently generally apparent is required in order to alleviate and reverse the trend towards a nocebo effect, going on to briefly outline a number of strategies through which such an objective might be achieved and identifying one school example of such practices. Finally some observations are offered regarding the consequences of ignoring the current situation.

1. DISCUSSION

It is clear from the detailed findings of the final Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) (Keating et al., 2010) that Citizenship Education in schools in England has been unevenly introduced and that its effects have been unevenly experienced. Not all schools have introduced the subject, despite it being a statutory component of the National Curriculum for England (QCA, 2007), and many of the strategies for introduction and 'delivery' have failed to engage either teachers or pupils. OFSTED (The Office for Standards in Education – England's school inspectorate, 2010), a smaller study than CELS in terms of both size and duration as well as being the outcome of school inspections rather than systematic research, none the less found provision to be inadequate in over 11% of schools and only satisfactory in a further 35%. In other words, just under half of the schools inspected provided no better than satisfactory teaching of Citizenship Education. The question mark in the title of that report – 'Citizenship Established?' – emphasises the prevailing uncertainty whether the subject has a secure and valued place in the school curriculum in England despite (at the time of writing) being a statutory requirement for all state school pupils aged between 11 and 16 years of age.

As many have attested, Citizenship Education must be relevant to the lives of pupils and of those around them if it is to become both established and effective (Advisory Group on

Citizenship, 1998; Ajegbo et al., 2007; Leighton, 2006, 2012; OFSTED, 2010; Reid et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2010). It requires pupils to question social institutions, the mass media and other sources of information, established conventions, new ideas, assumed truths, parents, teachers and themselves. It is a subject which, at its best, can enable pupils to unlock doors and their own potential; at its worst, however, it is a subject which can deter pupils from inquisitiveness and from participation in the political process. Where the subject is not seen as relevant or where it contradicts pupils' understanding of their own experiences it does not work, but instead becomes 'innovation without change' (Rudduck, 1991, p. 26).

In this sense it can be worse than having no provision at all in that the failure of Citizenship Education to effect positive change becomes seen as evidence of the inevitability of inequality rather than a consequence of the organisation and priorities of the state. As Gramsci (1985) and others have demonstrated, the 'common sense' of hegemony leads to reinforcement of the status quo, rather than to change, under the guise of failed experimentation. This is the circumstance for Citizenship Education which Gillborn (2006) describes as a placebo, 'a fake treatment, meant to placate concern, but making no actual attempt to address the central problem' (p. 97) but which might more accurately, and of greater concern, be described as a nocebo. Gillborn's position was taken largely in respect of Citizenship Education's capacity to address racism and other issues relating to ethnicity and diversity; while in full agreement that these must be addressed, the position taken in this article is that there are more issues of inequality and social injustice than these alone.

It is of value to consider research in medicine to both contextualise and question Gillborn's argument offering, as he does, a medical analogy. While Hrobjartsson and Gotzsche (2003) show there is no evidence of placebos having clinically important effects – neither help nor hindrance – (Barsky et al., 2002) discuss the phenomenon of the nocebo, where a placebo has a significant negative effect. Therefore a placebo is of no significance, which is not the point Gillborn appears to intend to make, while a nocebo causes harm. If Gillborn's medical analogy is sustainable, it could be the case that Citizenship Education as it exists in England will exacerbate and create new social problems rather than resolve those perceived problems which informed its introduction into the National Curriculum. In other words, there is a significant likelihood that the ineffective teaching of Citizenship Education in schools, and as experienced by pupils, might serve to further disengage and alienate young people rather than engage their interests and civic commitment. Current approaches to Citizenship Education will

not lead to a society where difference is accepted but inequality is not, where citizens are skilled at enquiry, advocacy, opposition and scrutiny, one where people understand who they and their neighbours are without rancour.

Despite the accusation of failure levelled by Gillborn (2006), the claim was never made that Citizenship Education would right all wrongs and cure all social ills in England. Indeed, the Advisory Group on Citizenship report which resulted in the introduction of compulsory Citizenship Education in England's secondary schools clearly states that Schools can only do so much... Pupils' attitudes to active citizenship are influenced quite as much by values and attitudes in schools as by many factors other than schooling: by family, the immediate environment, the media and the example of those in public life. Sometimes these are positive factors, sometimes not (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998, p. 9).

However, there is a significant danger, should the nocebo phenomenon apply, that the failure of Citizenship Education to bring about an end to inequality and all other social ills will be interpreted or offered as evidence that these things are inherent and inevitable in human society. Not only will the lofty ambitions of Citizenship Education fail to be realised, but that failure will become viewed as unavoidable if not inevitable. Although Citizenship Education was introduced into the National Curriculum for England with cross-party parliamentary support, there was considerable suspicion and opposition from many quarters, as summarised by Frazer (2003) where she identifies a conscious and concerted adherence to 'the illusion of the non-necessity of politics' (p. 75) in England – not only, but particularly, in educational theory and discourse. Frazer characterizes the English emphasis on values over structures, theories and action as essentially and explicitly depoliticizing, comparing it to the position in most US states where it is a given that schools are responsible for civic and political education. She challenges the largely irrelevant yet dominant debate on partisan teaching, fuelled as it is by 'deep seated antipathies' (p. 72) rather than being informed by the reality of the daily experience of educators to maintain positions of informed neutrality across a range of controversial, discomfiting or contested areas of study. Bearing in mind that 'the media reception for Citizenship Education in England remains distinctly hostile' (Andrews & Mycock, 2007, p. 81), it is clear that there are many who would be happy to see the demise of the subject.

In order to avoid this irreversible outcome, Citizenship Education has to become more than the civic republican model (with its emphasis on learning and accepting pre-determined civics and

citizen responsibilities), the liberal approach which emphasises citizens' autonomy of choice without apparently questioning how the state shapes or dictates such choices, or the communitarian model which offers as a focus the common good which is situated in society and social roles but does not seriously interrogate the power inequalities which determine that 'good'. To build on any or all of these perspectives, Citizenship Education has to adopt a radical approach through which the young can become involved and empowered to contribute to the development of their society in ways which they consider essential. After all, as one 15 year old asked some time ago, 'if you give me the same indoctrination as a child, how can you expect me to be any different from you?' (Blishen, 1969, p. 7). One such radical approach is provided by the principles outlined in the latter part of this article, with primary consideration being given to why the subject is important rather than simply thinking about what to teach and how to teach it.

1.1. The need for radical Citizenship Education

The notion of a radical approach to education is not new, even if what constitutes radical varies according to time and place. Godwin (1977), for example, described study in order to pass examinations, without any desire to learn and to develop, as a mockery. Several references in this article are therefore made to texts which might otherwise be regarded as dated and which are certainly older –longer established than might be expected in relation to what is a comparatively new subject in England. The perspectives on education offered by Blishen (1969), Godwin (1977), Goodman (1975), Illich (1973), Morgan & Morris (1999), Payne & Spender (1980), Postman & Weingartner (1976), Rudduck (1991), Spender & Sarah (1980), Wilson et al., (1969), share a commitment to challenging taken for granted assumptions about the nature of education and share a belief in questioning the status quo. They illustrate young people's insights into their experiences of schooling and identify with clarity and certainty the need to change the old ways if young people are to be prepared for a new society. While they all write about education in general, some time ago and in contexts by no means identical to the current social and educational climate of England, their comments and insights remain pertinent to education in general and to Citizenship Education in particular.

That 'educators need to be able to inculcate a favourable attitude to learning new things' (Wilson et al., 1969, p. 364) is particularly true with regard to Citizenship Education, and the final CELS report (Keating et al., 2010) shows that the success of teachers of citizenship in England in this regard has been sporadic. That report's unequivocal finding was that Citizenship

Education is most successful when taught by dedicated specialists in explicitly timetabled lessons –not, perhaps, a surprising finding to anyone who has either taught outside their specialism or been taught by a non-specialist, but one of which little awareness has been shown by those school leaders and others who expect Citizenship Education to be taught by people with neither the skills nor enthusiasm the subject requires. As noted in regard to schooling in general by Ruth [15] ‘there is nothing worse than sitting in a lesson knowing full well that the teacher is dying to get rid of you and rush back to the staff-room to have her cup of tea’ (Blisshen, 1969, p. 141). The same issues appear thirty years later where pupils complain of poor experiences when a teacher ‘just reads out of a book’, where ‘there was not a proper teacher’, occasions when pupils ‘felt you couldn’t ask because you would feel stupid’ (Morgan & Morris, 1999, p. 59) and observe that ‘if a teacher not doing their own specialist subject, not so good’ (Morgan & Morris, 1999, p. 52), whereas one of the significant factors in pupils’ perceptions of good teaching is where ‘they like doing the subject and had the right training’ (Morgan & Morris, 1999, p.52). It is therefore not unique to Citizenship Education that engaged and engaging teachers have a positive effect on pupils but, bearing in mind that ‘the introduction of a new subject, even one that is statutory, has proved to be far from easy’ (OFSTED, 2010, p.4) it is particularly apposite.

Preparation for citizenship is more important than other, more instrumental aims which often enjoy curricular priority. The INCA study (O’Donnell et al., 2010) identifies that all 21 nations surveyed have democracy/civics/ citizenship in their educational aims, reinforcing Gutmann’s (1987) imperative that such aims should take moral priority over any other aims of education. Today’s pupils will complete their schooling and, in most cases, can be expected to be in some form of employment for about 30% of the day for about 85% of the year for less than 75% of their remaining lifespan – therefore, in the region of 20% of their post-school existence – but they will exist as citizens throughout their lives, whether working, relaxing, socialising or sleeping; education, if it is to prepare the young for their future lives, has an obligation to allow them the opportunity to develop more than skills for work. They will undoubtedly live what Wilson et al. (1969) term segmented lives, but it is their status and actions as citizens which will hold those segments together.

If pupils are to learn about themselves and those around them, about their entitlements and their duties, they have to engage with the political system. For pupils to understand how they can take informed and responsible action in order to hold to account those in government and

others in power requires much more than familiarity with rights and responsibilities, and depends upon a great deal more than what, if anything, happens during lessons designated as Citizenship Education. Given the findings of OFSTED (2010) and CELS (2010) referred to above, this is perhaps just as well.

The radical approach to Citizenship Education proposed requires engagement with risk-taking, questioning, school ethos, issues of identity, diversity, the range and potential of pupil voices, political engagement, active citizenship, the nature of social order, and with political knowledge. This list does not represent a hierarchy of principles nor can it be described as either exhaustive or exclusive. There will be other issues to consider, such as modes and purposes of assessment and the development of skills of critical thinking, and each is addressed in outline only, but they lie at the heart of the subject and therefore at the heart of its potential for change.

1.2. Some Potential Components of Radical Citizenship Education

1.2.1. Risk

Radical Citizenship Education requires risk on the part of the state, the school, the teacher and the pupil. The state –whether politicians or bureaucrats– needs to be confident that the system to be scrutinized is robust enough to withstand sustained inquiry, investigation and dissection; not because it is perfect, but because the imperfections can be understood and potentially addressed. It must therefore also be open to the possibility of change. Bryant (2012) cautions that ‘global citizenship, as it is currently conceived in state-sanctioned curriculum resources, is unlikely to foster the kinds of individual and collective action necessary for a substantively more equitable relationship between the First and Third Worlds’ (p. 262). While not as despairing as Gilborn’s placebo, Bryant’s analysis clearly demands a significant change of direction in approaches to global citizenship – one which moves away from predictability and playing safe.

The school which provides a radical approach to Citizenship Education risks parental pressure in favour of examinations and away from pupil development, as well as moving away from a comfort zone marked by boundaries of tradition and convention. Teachers of Citizenship Education take risks daily–often simply in teaching a subject for which they have had little or no professional development and for which they have limited time and other resources. They also risk pupil unrest and colleague disquiet by presenting work and working relationships in ways

very different to those established routines which provide a sense of security to staff and pupils. If we agree –as the author of this article agrees– that ‘education is not the determination of who the student should be, but of how she might become’ (Blake et al., 2000, p. 195), then we must ensure an emphasis on risk and inquiry over safe lessons, safe questions and safer answers.

If they are to become or continue to be active citizens, pupils cannot be passive recipients of Citizenship Education, so they must also take risks – by adopting a different approach to learning, by expressing views they will be expected to explain and justify, by facing up to some potentially uncomfortable truths, by taking responsibility for themselves and for others, by taking part rather than being allowed or encouraged to be passengers. These are explicit requirements, although phrased differently, of England’s National Curriculum for Citizenship (QCA, 2007) but there is compelling evidence that such activities and opportunities are only sporadically present in schools in England (Keating et al., 2010; OFSTED, 2010). It must be remembered that ‘curiosity is one of the most general features of young children –until it is crushed out of them by parents and teachers because it is so very inconvenient’ (Wilson et al., 1969, p. 364), and teachers must not allow their own need for security to outweigh the potential for learning and personal development inherent in young people’s curiosity.

Many of the principles of radical Citizenship Education are principles of effective teaching and learning, and risk taking is something which should be a basic feature of all teaching. Most teachers understand and can deploy the technical skills of their calling, just as, for example, most professional footballers can deploy the technical skills of theirs – but the characteristics which have marked Pele, Cruyff, Ronaldo and Messi from their contemporaries have been the ability to judge when to employ one skill over another, when to be creative, when to hold back, when to take risks.

Jamous & Peliolle (1970) separate the skills of medical practice into the technical and the indeterminate; while the technical skills of diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment are essential, it is the indeterminate skills of professional judgement, patient rapport and lifestyle contexts which separate the outstanding practitioner from the mediocre. To nullify curiosity would render Citizenship education a nocebo in that, in the words of M, a 17 year old male pupil, it is essential that we ‘replace constipated ways of teaching’ (Blishen, 1969, p. 63) and strive to go beyond the mediocre; playing safe in Citizenship Education is, paradoxically, to take too big a risk with the future.

1.2.2. Questioning

There may be goblets of information which some would advocate as essential –an understanding of the prevailing electoral system, perhaps, or established civil, legal and human rights– but these things can be found in books or internet searches with a minimum of effort by most interested people in ‘western’ and westernizing societies. If these ‘facts’ are given to pupils they might then know them, but it does not follow that they are or will ever be interested in them. It must be much more important for the development of an effective and empowering approach that questioning becomes integral to Citizenship Education.

This is not the asking of questions to which teachers already know the answer, a practice derided by Postman & Weingartner (1976), although Clemintshaw (2008) is correct to point out that questioning is an important skill for any teacher when those questions ‘are formulated in a spirit of enquiry [which] supports students to offer speculation and posit tentative exploration of their implications’ (p. 86). Citizenship Education must equip young people with the tools through which social institutions, processes and structures can be questioned and scrutinised; yet again, although the National Curriculum (QCA, 2007) requires this to happen, there appears to be more evidence of omission than of compliance (Keating et al., 2010; OFSTED, 2010). This could variously be a consequence of the lack of an adequate number of specialist teachers, a reluctance on the part of teachers and/or their schools to encourage a reflective criticality which, once established, might become difficult to stem, or hesitancy among young people themselves to adopt a stance which previous experience tells them is more likely to lead to criticism than acclaim; after all, ‘confused, people inevitably try to ward off anxiety by rigidifying the old methods’ (Goodman, 1975, p. 13).

The purpose and practice of Citizenship Education cannot be to produce an unthinking electorate which fills its unemployed hours in volunteering and thereby depriving others of employment, but to question a system which accommodates or even expects and accepts inequality, discrimination and exploitation. Its focus must be to fulfil the ambitions of those pupils, like Judith [13] who hoped that schools would become places where people ‘learn to live together and love one another, where people learn to reason, learn to understand and above all learn to think for themselves’ (Blishen, 1969, p. 30).

The collection edited by Spender and Sarah (1989) clearly demonstrates the invidious power and depth of the patriarchal domination of society. If we extrapolate their arguments against

sex and gender domination to address institutionalised social inequality in all its forms, we can determine that school plays a key role in promoting social justice by constantly questioning the way teachers and students make sense of the world. When there are such enormous prejudices in our society a fundamental task of education is to look at those prejudices and the selection of evidence we make in the light of them (Payne & Spender, 1980, p. 174).

Not only must pupils be allowed –enabled, encouraged– to question, teachers should also ask questions and seek answers. By establishing an ethos in which it is understood to be acceptable not to know things but not acceptable not to care about not knowing, everything is held up to scrutiny and everyone – pupils and teachers, parents and governors – can test the validity and reliability of the answers to questions. To do otherwise, to enforce either of the dual fallacies that the teacher, and only the teacher, is correct or the corollary that all views are of equal worth irrespective of evidence and implications is to produce the nocebo effect in a society wholly subservient or (for those who see through the fallacies) wracked in disequilibrium.

1.2.3. School Ethos

If those involved in running a school are not committed to the development of its pupils as citizens, the subject will be less than any other in interest, effectiveness and impact. School leaders, governors, administrative and other support staff, teachers, parents, pupils, visitors, the wider community – everyone has to be involved. Once they are fully involved and fully committed, the opportunities for progress are limited only by the imaginations of all concerned.

It remains the case that ‘teachers and others have constructed a complex set of rules and unstated expectations for [pupils] to conform to, with rewards and punishments of very limited kinds to back them up’ (Wilson et al., 1969, p. 333) and it can be of little use to anyone that such complexities and limitations continue. If Wilson et al were correct in noting that ‘these schools only work really successfully to the extent that their pupils are committed to their role as pupil; to the extent that they care about doing well and being well thought of by their teachers’ (Wilson et al., 1969, p. 333), then pupils caring about and being committed to themselves, their teachers and their schools must be central to any school’s endeavours.

Reid et al. (2010) observe that Citizenship Education ‘must involve the whole school and there must be a clear and reiterated rationale for the ideas of shared governance and distributed

responsibility if participatory democracy is to prosper in the classroom and in the institution' (p. 14). This does not mean mission statements and school policies, but daily and systematic commitment to all aspects of Citizenship Education. The school must practice rather than preach, and everything associated with the school must be imbued with the spirit of inclusion, understanding, inquiry and equality. This is, of course, predicated on an assumption that those responsible for the governance of a school are truly committed to participation and democracy.

This requires planned movement away from traditional classroom activities, away from teacher-led learning, and away from the passive reception of assumed truths, into areas of creativity and risk. Teachers and pupils need to know that the school not only supports and encourages creativity, inquiry, scrutiny and risk, but that it insists upon them and provides an environment within which they take place as a matter of routine. Pupils and teachers need to know that they are trusted and that they are safe, otherwise risks will not be taken and passivity will continue. It is from an inclusive, secure and understanding ethos that other principles of radical Citizenship Education can develop. It would also, as observed by Ian [15] 'be beneficial to establish some definite correlation between school and enjoyment' (Blishen, 1969, p. 105) for those who believe that benefit accrues to society when its members enjoy learning and enjoy their lives.

1.2.4. Identity

Central to such an ethos has to be awareness of the complexity of identities. All members of a school bring with them a range of cultural perceptions and a multiplicity of identities; some of these will overlap with each other as well as with the overt culture of the school, and there will be times and places where the differences are as significant as the similarities. A school which ignores such diversity ignores the human potential that it constitutes, and fails to respect all members of the school community. Florio-Ruane (2001) clearly demonstrates the fallacy and the costs of the assumption that issues of ethnicity, language and identity are irrelevant to teaching and learning. Schools are not value free institutions; they either recognize and incorporate the cultures of their community to synthesise a new, dynamic and inclusive culture, or they operate under a rigid and non-negotiable culture. As Florio-Ruane makes clear, schools which tend to the latter model do so to the detriment of everyone involved.

Despite mass media caricatures of migrant cultures, Peters & Bulut (2010) remind us that adherence to parental subcultures can be systemic but can also represent the exercise of

choice by young people; while Preston & Chakrabarty (2010) demonstrate that some children will aim to assimilate while others become more 'traditional'. There continues to be a popular and political focus on inequalities of achievement, voicing concern about boys' relatively poor academic records compared with those of girls – a concern I cannot recollect when 'measured achievement' was greater for boys than girls – with attention rarely given to the evidence which indicates that of the three best-known dimensions of inequality . . . gender, and in particular boys' underperformance, represents the narrowest disparity. In contrast to the disproportionate media attention, [our] data shows gender to be a less problematic issue than the significant disadvantage of 'race' and the even greater inequality of class (Gillborn & Mirza, 2000, p. 23).

Identity, diversity and ethnicity are intrinsically linked but are not synonymous – there are many categories of 'other', skills, health status, music, art, eating, dress, sexuality and the interplay between all of these and gender, age, ethnicity and social class create a highly complex and dynamic set of identities.

Social and cultural tensions continue to blight the experiences of many young people, from 'casual' bullying through systematic discrimination to violence and murder. Illich warned of the dangers to society when it 'isolates people from each other... when it undermines the texture of community by promoting extreme polarization' (Illich, 1973, p. 11). Schools can address real and manufactured differences by addressing the ignorance which distorts them. Openly addressing racism and other forms of discrimination – not simply through reprimand or retribution, but by setting an example and by ensuring that all members of the school community are fully informed about who they and other members of the school community are. Difference can be a cause for celebration and exchange of information and ideas.

A radical approach to Citizenship Education must go beyond facilitating 'respect, understanding and tolerance' (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998, p. 46) to be inclusive, celebratory and empowering. Identity is not a matter exclusively related to ethnicity, nor is ethnicity an uncontested or straightforward concept, and identity has to include all those aspects of existence which combine to make us who we are. Unless schools are to be viewed wholly and exclusively as academic production lines, skills other than the academic must be valued; health status matters; personal as well as community preferences in music, art, eating, dress all matter; sexuality is part of who we are. These and other aspects of people's humanity cannot

be ignored or made less of if identity is to be respected. To ignore the multiple aspects of human identities is to devalue difference and to promote parochialism and hostility – if Citizenship Education does not explicitly and with determination address such attitudes it becomes a nocebo by allowing them to fester and continue to be entrenched.

1.2.5. Pupil voice(s)

It takes very little time for pupils to realise that the quickest way to an easy school life is to ask few questions and to give the answers their teachers expect. Lukes (1974) explains how those with authority can manipulate their minions to express only those opinions which have been or will be approved, elaborating on the process identified by Michels (1949) as ‘The Iron Law of Oligarchy’. In order to enable pupils to air their own opinions, concerns, beliefs and preferences, they must unlearn the hidden processes whereby they express only approved views.

Pupils do not speak with one voice; no age-groups and few entities comprising more than one person do. Not everyone my age, in my place of work – or in my household – agrees with everything I say. Why should it be thought that all young people, or everyone on a particular school class, have only one opinion between them? Some disagreement is essential in a democracy, and can produce either consensus or, through the process of synthesis, produce an entirely new idea. If disagreement remains, there might have been at least an understanding of another view. An ability to contribute to discussion must be part of radical Citizenship Education in order, as Rudduck (1991) notes, to foster scepticism and independence of mind.

Some of Blishen’s (1969) respondents observed that young people deserved the opportunity to be heard. ‘Pupils should be given more chance to speak and the teachers should be given a chance to listen’ (Blishen, 1969, p. 133); a chance to listen being, even in those halcyon days, inhibited by pressure to cover topics and address questions determined in an age without a proscriptive national curriculum. If teachers have the chance to listen they might find common ground with their pupils or at least be able to investigate why such common ground is hard to find. There was also a perceived need for ‘self-government by the pupils. I suggest a sort of committee made up of pupils of each age group and elected by that age group’ (Blishen, 1969, pp. 161-162) clearly seeking the establishment of school councils, although with greater optimism than time has shown to be warranted.

School councils, regularly identified by schools as evidence of a commitment to pupil voice, do not compensate for restrictive classroom practice; at best they only involve a few pupils for a limited amount of time. Morgan & Morris recommend that teachers 'confront [pupils] about their own learning and . . . challenge them to take appropriate actions' (1999, p. 135) in order to enable their pupils to understand process as well as detail, and to become involved in making decisions about things which matter to them.

That contrasting voices might cancel each other out, arguing as vehemently and coherently for as against particular issues or actions is not the point. The purpose of enabling pupil voices to be heard must be the development of those voices –articulation, construction of argument, collation and exposition of evidence, countering or adjusting in the face of opposing arguments– not so that schools become a representation of teenage idealism, but so that as citizens the young develop the ability to voice opinions and argue for change. Whether voices wish to argue for or against the status quo, they need to be developed to avoid being ineffectual.

1.2.6. Political awareness and engagement

There is a truism that 'knowledge is power' and, as politics is the organisation and exercise of power –and, with good fortune, of responsible authority– political knowledge is knowing what knowledge matters, when it matters, how to find it and how to use it. Lumps of information such as why seats in the House of Commons are green and those in the House of Lords are red, or why the Speaker's Chair used to be a commode, might win points in pub quizzes, prizes on television quiz games or marks in classroom tests and public examinations, but they don't really matter.

To enable engagement and to avoid perceived disempowerment, Citizenship Education must go beyond the simple transference of facts about civics from the forefront of one person's brain or lesson plan into the recesses of another's brain or rarely read notepad. The relative places and merits of 'content' and 'skills', much discussed in teacher education, require scrutiny as we bear in mind that it is impossible to generate worthwhile discussions among and between pupils unless those discussions are properly informed and about something, that 'good discussion cannot take place in a vacuum' (OFSTED, 2010, p. 14).

Rudduck identifies a crucial and complex issues regarding political knowledge when she writes

that teachers and pupils often conspire in perpetuating a false security that manifests itself in a reliance on right answers and on a view of the expert as one who knows rather than one who uses knowledge to refocus doubt. Teachers, prompted by a kindly concern for those they teach, often over-simplify the complexities of living and learning; they seek to protect their pupils from uncertainty (Rudduck, 1991).

Such protection is short-term and exceedingly harmful as it inhibits intellectual curiosity, subscribes to the myth of omnipotent expertise, and deceives pupils into believing that there exist right answers to all things. For Geelan (2010), the awareness of ambiguity and the ability to face up to and deal with it is crucial. Such engagement and awareness can combine to equip pupils with the tools necessary for the acquisition of political knowledge and understanding, and the skills to act upon it.

There has been a regular media portrayal, repeated by various grate and good talking heads, that young people are politically disinterested, apathetic, inept or inert which goes against evidence and depends largely upon one's perception of what constitutes political engagement and what criteria are employed to identify and measure it. By most rational measures, it is an assumption clearly unsupported by evidence in the UK or elsewhere (Bernstein, 2010; Henn et al., 2005; Kimberlee, 2002). The large sample, cross-national study conducted by Ross & Dooly enables them to report that 'children and young people do implicate themselves in political behaviour... in contrast to frequent narratives suggesting that indifference to political issues is commonplace among youth' (Ross & Dooly, 2010, p. 43).

Even in those schools where the teaching and learning of politics is taken seriously, operating wholly on a micro scale does not meet pupils' needs; indeed, we should be concerned that those schools adjudged to enable pupils to develop a good knowledge of Citizenship Education are schools where 'good knowledge sometimes omitted the central areas of parliamentary government and politics' (OFSTED, 2010, p. 9). It does not follow from this that teaching about parliamentary politics necessarily results in a knowledgeable and competent body of pupils, as 'where standards were low, students' knowledge was based on completing factual exercises about topics such as parliamentary procedures rather than exploring and discussing current issues' (OFSTED, 2010:9). There may be a place for such exercises, and we must remain open to persuasion that there are educationally valid justifications for their regular use, but they do not develop understanding or independence of thought.

Many pupils –and not only older ones– will already be politically active through, for example, green activism and ethical consumerism. Their peers who reject such activities are, in their rejection, also being political. The commonly touted perception that the young are significantly less politically aware than previous generations is not supported by evidence – and not only because previous generations were much less politicised than some commentators might think, as demonstrated by Kynaston’s (2008) analysis of Mass Observation data. Without greater and more diverse political engagement throughout society the political establishment will continue to conduct itself as at present, a circumstance which would be neither appealing nor democratic.

1.2.7. Active citizenship

Taking informed and responsible action is a significant step towards political engagement. Active citizenship cannot and must not be exclusively about young people becoming a conscripted army of involved community members –not that there is anything inherently wrong with involvement in the community– as taking social and moral responsibility and developing political literacy both require action on the part of citizens; it is not simply, or even necessarily, about doing things for other people.

The English National Curriculum for Citizenship Education states that ‘active participation provides opportunities to learn about the important role of negotiation and persuasion in a democracy’ (QCA, 2007, p. 28). One of the three key processes demanded of the teaching of Citizenship Education by the National Curriculum, along with ‘critical thinking and enquiry’ and ‘advocacy and representation’ –both of which offer many opportunities for active learning– is again ‘taking informed and responsible action’. This does not include Big Society volunteerism, school-conscripted and organised events or pupil work experience as these tend not involve pupils making informed decisions and rarely involve them taking - or being allowed to take on – responsibilities.

When pupils work in groups to make decisions, to collaborate on activities, to evaluate their own and others’ contributions to an activity, they are involved in active citizenship. Therefore, classroom group work on any topic is an example of active citizenship and both teachers and pupils should be aware of this in developing and celebrating pertinent skills.

1.2.8. Social order

Comte's analogy of society as an organism proposes that survival depends on adaptability; a society which stagnates is one which is dying. We must also recognise that one generation's order and stability is likely to be another generation's moribund strangulation; social order and social control are not synonymous as the former relates to both the nature of society and the relative stability of it, while the latter is concerned with who controls, manages, and benefits from the nature and degree of social change.

While there could be a perception that 'social order' and 'radical' are mutually exclusive concepts, this is far from the case. Challenge and change are at the centre of the radical approach to Citizenship Education, enhanced by an understanding of what is and what might be and, in the wonderful definition attributed to Raymond Williams, the recognition that 'to be truly radical is to make hope possible rather than despair convincing. This has to include an understanding of the current social order and what maintains social order, how to question these and – if and where they are found wanting – what alternatives might be considered, for social order means both the maintenance of an orderly and regulated society, and an established social hierarchy. If the regulations of society are open to question, development and change, as they must be in a democratic society so must the social structures upon which they depend.

2. HOWEVER

While Citizenship Education is, in many cases, in a parlous state, what is generally true is not an absolute truth. There are many schools and other agencies which have adopted the strategies outlined above to significant effect. For example, in Merrylee Primary School in Scotland – where there is no compulsory curriculum – almost everything is about good citizenship education and active learning as the result of careful and integrated planning and of the essence of citizenship education being the essence of the school.

Pupils, staff, parents, the school's environment committee (how many schools have one of these?) and a local energy company worked with architects on the design of a new school building to meet the self-identified needs and aspirations of the school community. Some of the walls have been partially glassed so that everyone can see the construction methods and materials and the insulation – a daily reminder of energy conservation. There is also a dedicated eco-classroom which looks out over the school's own wind turbine. Further

consultations brought in the local authority and the Forestry Commission so that the school grounds now house the first natural play site on any UK school campus.

As well as having a pupil-elected school council which meets regularly with the head teacher, there are further opportunities for the expression of pupil voices. Older pupils are consulted on some matters of curriculum development, while peer mediation and a buddy system allow a range of pupils to become involved in working with and supporting each other and to make representation to the school management team. Pupils also have the opportunity to be appointed to posts of responsibility. When a pupil's behaviour is deemed unacceptable – these are, after all, children aged 5-12, not angels or automata – the practise is to try to engender a sense of responsibility for one's actions and the pupil makes amends by helping within the school community.

This is not a perfect school, nor is it the only school which can lay claim to active and empowering citizenship learning and development, but it is clearly one with a strong citizenship focus. It involves all members of the school and with the wider community in a variety of ways (described in more detail in Leighton, 2012, pp. 41-44), ensuring that pupils get practical experience of making representation, negotiation, the exercise of rights and responsibilities. They are encouraged and enabled to ask the questions which matter to them and to see that their opinions can (but don't always) make a difference. The ethos of the school enables risk, engagement, active citizenship and active learning, security of identity and an understanding of others' identities – it is not a placebo, but a force for social change.

A few similar schools have been identified in England, for example by Keating et al. (2010) and, less convincingly, by OFSTED (2010), but these are clearly considered to be the exception rather than the norm. As such, few pupils will experience the opportunities to participate and to enable change which are the essence of a radical approach to citizenship. A society in which only a few young people are enabled to be active and involved is not one which provides effective radical citizenship education.

3. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In 2010 there was heated and protracted debate in the UK, although neither clear nor well-informed debate, regarding whether the British electorate would be capable of understanding (and possibly using) an alternative voting system to the First Past The Post (FPTP) system which

is used in most, but by no means all, UK elections. Contemporaneously, the people of Iceland elected an assembly comprising members of the public other than political representatives whose role was to consider changes to the Icelandic constitution and make recommendations to the Althingi (the Iceland Parliament). These two examples illustrate a considerable understanding and involvement chasm – the people of Iceland were considered capable of understanding political complexities and trusted to come up with recommendations regarding presidential power, the role and function of plebiscites, economic guidelines and principles of probity; the people of the UK considered themselves incapable of dealing with the complexity of writing the numbers 1, 2, 3 – the system used by the three leading political parties in the UK to choose their own leaders, similar to that used in UK elections to the European Parliament, and in recent elections in England and Wales for Police and Crime Commissioners, and more straightforward than that used in elections to the Scottish Parliament.

Irrespective of the outcome of the May 2011 referendum on voting in the UK which rejected a change to AV (alternative voting), there is a clear and worrying perception of political illiteracy. This will not be resolved by continuing to educate people about citizenship as has been done previously – far too often piecemeal, preferring the tried and trusted (if ineffective) ways of the past, or not at all. If established methods continue to not to be effective, there must come a time when different methods are used. There are notable examples of excellence in citizenship teaching, but pupils deserve these to be the norm rather than the exception. If political involvement is to change and, along with it, the general conduct and involvement of citizens, a radical approach to educating the citizens of England is long overdue. If not, there is a real danger that Citizenship Education will prove to have been a placebo in rendering discussion and strategic planning for political and civic education beyond consideration for generations to come.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr Patricia Driscoll, Dr Andrew Peterson and Prof Trevor Cooling for their comments and advice in response to an early draft of this article.

REFERENCES

Advisory Group on Citizenship (1998). *Education for Citizenship and the teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship*. London: QCA.
Ajegbo K., Kiwan, D., & Sharma, S. (2007). *Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review*. London:

DCFS.

Andrews, R., & Mycock, A. (2007). Citizenship Education in the UK: Divergence within a Multi-National State. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 73-88.

Barsky, A. J., Saintford, R., Rogers, M. P., & Borus, J. F. (2002). Nonspecific Medication Side Effects and the Nocebo Phenomenon. *Journal Of The American Medical Association*, 6(287), 622-627.

Bernstein, J. L. (2010). Citizenship-Oriented Approaches to the American Government Course. In M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek & J. L. Bernstein (Eds.), *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp.13-35). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Blake, N., Smeyers, P., Smith, R., & Standish, P. (2000). *Education in an age of nihilism*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Blishen, E. (Ed.). (1969). *The school that I'd like*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bryan, A. (2012). Band-Aid Pedagogy, Celebrity Humanitarianism, and Cosmopolitan Provincialism: A Critical Analysis of Global Citizenship Education. In C. Wankel & S. Malleck (Eds.), *Ethical Models and Applications of Globalization: Cultural, Socio-Political and Economic Perspectives* (pp. 262-286). Hershey, PA: Business Science Reference.

Clemintshaw, G. (2008). A response to Ralph Leighton's article –Revisiting Postman and Weingartner's 'New Education' – is teaching citizenship a subversive activity? *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 4(1), 82-95.

Florio-Ruane, S. (2001). *Teacher education and the cultural imagination: autobiography, conversation, and narrative*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Frazer, E. (2003). Citizenship Education: Anti-political Culture and Political Education in England. In A. Lockyer, B. Crick, & J. Annette (Eds.), *Education for Democratic Citizenship* (pp. 64-77). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Geelan, D. (2010). Science, Technology and Understanding: Teaching the Teachers of the Citizens of the Future. In M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek & J. L. Bernstein (Eds.), *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 147-164). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gilborn, D. (2006). Citizenship Education as placebo: "Standards", institutional racism and education policy Education. *Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1(1), 83-104.

Gillborn, D., & Mirza, H. S. (2000). *Educational Inequality: Mapping Race, Class and Gender*.

London: OFSTED.

Godwin, W. (1977). Education through Desire. In G. Woodcock (Ed.), *The Anarchist Reader* (pp. 270-273). Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.

Goodman, P. (1975). *Compulsory Miseducation*. Middlesex: Penguin.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from Cultural Writings*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Henn, M., Weinstein, M., & Forrest, S. (2005). Uninterested youth? Young People's Attitudes towards Party Politics in Britain. *Political Studies*, 53(3), 556-578.

Hrobjartsson, A., & Gotzsche, P. (2003). *Placebo treatment versus no treatment*. Cochrane Database Systematic Review 2003(1): CD003974. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>

Illich, I. (1973). *Deschooling Society*. Middlesex: Penguin.

Jamous, H., & Peliolle, B. (1970). Changes in the French university hospital system. In J. A. Jackson (Ed.), *Professions and professionalization* (pp. 109-152). London: Cambridge University Press.

Keating, A., Kerr, D., Bento, T., Mundy E., & Lope, J. (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)*. Research Report DFE-RR059. London: DfE.

Kimberlee, R. H. (2002). Why don't British young people vote? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 5(1), 85-98.

Kynaston, D. (2008). *Austerity Britain 1945-51*. London: Bloomsbury.

Leighton, R. (2006). Revisiting Postman and Weingartner's "New Education" – is Teaching Citizenship a Subversive Activity? *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 2(1), 79-88.

Leighton, R. (2012). *Teaching Citizenship Education: A Radical Approach*. London: Continuum.

Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. London: McMillan.

Michels, R. (1949). *Political Parties*. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Morgan, C., & Morris, G. (1999). *Good Teaching and Learning: Pupils and Teachers Speak*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

O'Donnell, S., Sargent, C., Byrne, A., White, E., & Gray, J. (2010). *INCA Comparative Tables*.

London: QCDA.

OFSTED. (2010). *Citizenship Established?* Manchester: Office for Standards in Education.

Payne, I., & Spender, D. (1989). Feminist practices in the classroom. In D. Spender & E. Sarah (Eds.), *Learning to Lose: sexism and education* (pp. 174-179). London: Women's Press.

Peters, M. A., & Bulut, E. (2010). Education and Culture. In J. Arthur & I. Davies (Eds.), *The Routledge Educational Studies Textbook* (pp. 19-29). London: Routledge.

Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1976). *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*. London: Penguin.

Preston, J., & Chakrabarty, N. (2010). Do schools contribute to social and community cohesion? In J. Arthur & I. Davies (Eds.), *The Routledge Educational Studies Textbook* (pp. 187-194). London: Routledge.

QCA. (2007). *The National Curriculum for England*. Nottingham: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Reid, A., Gill, J., & Sears, A. (2010). The Forming of Citizens in a Globalized World. In A. Reid, J. Gill & A. Sears (Eds.), *Globalization, The Nation-State and the Citizen* (pp. 3-16). London: Routledge.

Ross, A., & Dooly, M. (2010). Young People's intentions about their political activity. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 6(2), 43-60.

Rudduck, J. (1991). *Innovation and Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Smith, M. B., Nowacek, R. S., & Bernstein, J. L. (2010). Introduction: Ending the Solitude of Citizenship Education. In M. B. Smith, R. S. Nowacek & J. L. Bernstein (Eds.), *Citizenship Across the Curriculum* (pp. 1-12). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Spender, D., & Sarah, E. (Eds.). (1989). *Learning to Lose: sexism and education*. London: Women's Press.

Wilson, J., Williams, N., & Sugarman, B. (1969). *Introduction to Moral Education*. Middlesex: Penguin

Goal-Driven, Girl-Driven: citizenship education in an English independent school

RALPH LEIGHTON

Faculty of Education,

Canterbury Christ Church University, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Numerous studies have identified the nature and effect of the various versions of the national curriculum for citizenship education in state schools in England. However, considerably less attention has been given to independent schools in England, even though they do not have to follow the national curriculum and their pupils will go on to play significant roles in society. Interviews were conducted with staff and pupils at one school, and relevant school documentation was scrutinised, in order to map and understand the place of citizenship education in one of England's independent schools. The main purpose of the study was to gain some understanding of how independent school pupils perceive and are prepared for their roles as citizens of influence.

Introduction

This article represents initial observations regarding the state and status of citizenship education in an independent school in England. The main purpose of the article is to gain some understanding of how pupils in that sector are prepared by schools for their roles as citizens, and how they perceive that preparation. It is based on a single case study and, therefore, while nothing specific can be extrapolated from the findings to be applied to any other schools – whether independent or state-funded – this study is valuable in that it constitutes the first attempt to map and understand the place of citizenship education in one of England's independent schools, notwithstanding Trafford's (2006) insight into innovation and practice in the independent sector, and might act as a template for further such studies.

The context and significance of independent schools in England is outlined, followed by a more detailed description of the school at which the research took place. The research methods and sample are then explained and discussed, with a subsequent literature review, which is relatively brief, given the dearth of research in this area. Data are then presented, discussed and interpreted, followed by conclusions which relate to the research-focus school, and similarities and differences between the findings of this research and those of the much larger Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (Kerr et al, 2007; Keating et al, 2009, 2010). Since the completion of this research, the national curriculum for citizenship has been revised and, once further research questions are identified, and the content of the new curriculum has been approved and is in place in the state sector, a larger study will be conducted.

Context

In England, there are 3907 secondary schools, of which 790 (20.2%) are in the independent sector schools which are not under the control of the Department for Education or local education authorities, which are not required to teach the national curriculum, and which charge parents/carers for pupils' education. That sector educates 7% of the total number of schoolchildren in England and more than 18% of pupils over the age of 16. There have been numerous studies (Leighton, 2004, 2012a; Breslin, 2005; Office for Standards in Education, 2006, 2010; Kerr et al, 2007; Keating et al, 2010) into the nature and effect of citizenship education in state schools, but none regarding citizenship education in the independent sector – a situation which this article endeavors to address.

Independent schools are one of several categories of school that are not required to adhere to the national curriculum for England. Given the uneven treatment of citizenship education by those schools which are required by law to teach it (Leighton, 2004, 2012a; Faulks, 2006; Office for Standards in Education, 2006, 2010), it was considered to be of interest to investigate if – and how – the subject was approached where there was no statutory compulsion. This was considered to be particularly important for two reasons: (1) the growth of 'academies' and 'free schools' will produce many more schools in England that are not constrained by the national curriculum and (2) by the general nature of their intake and the level of fees charged by independent schools, their pupils are more likely to be members of advantaged families and to have realistic ambitions to replicate that status for themselves as adults.

In the United Kingdom, the economic and political influence of people educated in the independent education sector is clear. Table I summarises several reports by the Sutton Trust, an educational charity whose main objectives are ‘to improve educational opportunities for young people from non-privileged backgrounds and increase social mobility’. [1]

Percentage who attended an independent school
Members of the Cabinet 60
Chief executive officers 54
Journalists 54
Medical practitioners 51
Oxford University undergraduates 47
Members of Parliament 38

Table I. Independent school and social position.[2]

In a speech at Brighton College in May 2012, Secretary of State for Education Michael Gove identified people in the arts, sciences, politics and other fields who had been to independent schools, concluding that:

the sheer scale, the breadth and the depth, of private school dominance of our society points to a deep problem in our country ... Those who are born poor are more likely to stay poor and those who inherit privilege are more likely to pass on privilege in England than in any comparable country. (Gove, 2012)

While educational background is not the only variable factor amongst the power elite (Mills, 1980), it is clearly one of considerable significance in its contribution to social, as well as cultural, capital. Mills’ discussion of a power elite comprising leaders of the economy, the military and the polity illustrates the common and often overlapping backgrounds of their children – who are shown to also largely be their successors – through family ties, educational institutions, recreational activities and

myriad other circumstances. As Bourdieu (1983) and others have shown, the advantages accrued from such forms of capital are profound and exclusive.

Notwithstanding that the constituent members of the United Kingdom operate distinct education systems, and that it is rarely helpful to consider one system while using the concepts of another (Bailey, 1996; Leighton, 2012a), 'independent school' is one term that is consistent throughout the United Kingdom – that is, a school which is not under the control or direction of a local authority or central government. The category includes 'public schools', which, in the context of the United Kingdom, are neither financed by nor answerable to the general public or its elected representatives. The term was first used by Eton College (established in 1440) to indicate that it differed from schools for adherents of a particular church and from the system of private tuition favoured by particularly wealthy families, being open to the paying public. As well as 'extras' – such as the cost of the school uniform, sports kit, lunches, music lessons, school trips, weekend wear and additional items for boarders – for families based overseas there are further costs, such as guardianship, travel and pocket money. Many independent schools offer scholarships – usually up to the value of 50% of the fees – for children who are considered to show the potential for high achievement in academic studies, music or art, and discretionary means-tested bursaries are sometimes made available by individual schools to cover part of the fees for pupils whose parents cannot afford the full cost. There are also schools – such as that where the study was conducted – which offer reduced fees for siblings and for the children of military personnel, lending further credibility to Mills' notion of a three-part power elite.

The School

This independent girls' school was established in the seventeenth century and has been on its present site for over 100 years. It was selected by opportunity, having been identified as 'outstanding' by both the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted, the state schools' inspectorate) and the independent schools' inspectorate, and following a positive response from the head teacher to a request to conduct the research.

There were 148 boarders, within a total of 400 pupils on the roll, across a range of abilities and ethnic, cultural and faith backgrounds. Twenty per cent of the pupils came from outside the United

Kingdom, with 16 different countries represented and 57 of those pupils having been identified as having English as an additional language. Ten per cent of the pupils had some degree of learning difficulties. Boarding fees were just under £27,000 and day fees over £18,000 per annum. The average boarding fee for independent secondary schools is almost £21,000 and the average day fee £13,000 per annum; the average income in the United Kingdom in 2012 was approximately £24,000 net (£26,500 gross) per annum (Office for National Statistics, 2012).

The stated aim of the school is to support the development of happy, successful and independent young women who thrive on new experiences and who are able to confidently pursue their goals. In 2011, over half the A level (the public examination taken at 18 and the main criterion for university entrance) grades achieved were A* or A, with over 30% of examination candidates gaining at least three A*/A grades. At GCSE (General Certificate of Secondary Education, the public examination taken at 16), more than half the candidates achieved seven or more A*/A grades, with two-thirds of all grades being A*/A. These examination results have led to all final-year pupils gaining entry to higher education.

Although an increasing number of state schools are extending Key Stage 4 to give pupils longer to study GCSE specifications, the school's outstanding public examination results at that level are achieved in the two years for which the specifications are designed. The English Baccalaureate – an arbitrary group of subjects which the Secretary of State for Education has decided will be used as the ranking criteria for secondary schools' success at GCSE, to the exclusion of all other subjects – is not compulsory at the school, but English language, English literature, mathematics, science and a modern foreign language are (which is the English Baccalaureate without a humanities subject). Each class for Years 7-11 (pupils aged 11-16) averages fewer than 20 pupils, enabling smaller teacher–pupil ratios than in most state schools. The number and range of subjects available suggests that most A level groups are also comparatively small.

As well as year groups, pupils are organised into seven houses, three of which are for boarders. The teaching day is from 8 a.m. until 4.30 p.m., with customary breaks for meals, etc. Supervised homework time (prep), subject clinics, clubs and other activities take place between 4.30 and 6.30 p.m. There are no formal lessons at weekends, but an extensive array of almost 70 activities is provided.

Method

Hargreaves (1967), Willis (1977), White with Brockington (1983), Morgan and Morris (1999) and others have shown that speaking with people in schools – asking them about the meanings they make of their school experiences – can take the researcher beyond surface interpretations and preconceptions to gain insight into how those subjects make sense of things. While statistical information is included in this study, it is necessary to bear in mind, as Nielsen (2012) does, that identity formation and development is a dynamic process that is constantly in flux. It was, therefore, only by speaking with pupils from different year groups, and with their teachers, that the processes pupils experience and their resultant self-perception as citizens could be discerned.

Ten pupils were interviewed in two groups of five – one group of Year 9 students (aged 13-14) and one group of Year 12 students (aged 16-17) – as were eight members of staff individually, regarding their personal perceptions of citizenship in general and possible notions of national identity in particular. Each staff interview lasted approximately 30 minutes and each group interview with pupils lasted 45 minutes.

Peer-mentoring, personal, social and health education (PSHE), and community involvement are identified by school documentation as having a significant presence and were therefore the initial focus of discussions until directed differently by the interviewees. The research intention was to gain some insight into the interviewees' perceptions of citizenship as (a) a taught subject, (b) an element of the school's ethos and (c) an aspect of the pupils' identities. The interviewees were self-selected, and confidentiality and their anonymity guaranteed as far as possible. School documentation was scrutinised in advance of the interviews in order to understand the school's official position and to inform the interview questions. The documentation was again examined in light of the interviewees' responses.

There were issues of subject vulnerability in that women were being interviewed by an adult male and the pupils and staff might wish to express views contrary to those which the school advocated or claimed. It was also recognised that this could influence interview responses, although little other than reaffirming anonymity and confidentiality could be done to avoid this. The pupils were self-selected in response to a request from the head teacher and chaperoned by non-teaching staff

throughout the interviews; only those present knew who was there and no record of names was retained by the interviewer. All of the pupils and adults present were advised of the need for anonymity and confidentiality, and no names or other specific indicators have been used in reporting the findings.

The staff interviewees were known to the head teacher, as specific post-holders were identified by the researcher as preferred prospective interviewees; this made their anonymity and confidentiality more difficult to ensure. As far as is possible, steps have been taken in regard to this in writing up the research findings. The head teacher understood and acknowledged the need for confidentiality and the anonymity of all the participants.

The documents scrutinised included the school prospectus, option choices booklets, the school curriculum, an unused copy of the term planner given to each pupil, a history of the school written by a member of staff, and the school website. Such documents are not value-free, but project a particular image as desired by the school leadership. In some cases, this might be considered to limit their usefulness as data; in this study, their veracity is scrutinised, but that particular image and its construction present an important body of data. In order to protect the school's and individual anonymity, these documentary sources are not identified in the bibliography for this article and permission to refer to them is hereby acknowledged.

Literature Review

Teachers of Citizenship Education

According to Pring:

Teaching is the conscious effort to bridge the gap between the state of mind of the learner and the subject matter (the public forms of knowledge and understanding) which is to be learnt, and as such the teacher's expertise lies in understanding both. (Pring, 2001, p. 23)

In accepting this definition in the context of formal education, one accepts that teaching requires competence in both subject pedagogy and pupil motivation. It might therefore be assumed that teachers of citizenship education possess and can demonstrate the expertise to which Pring refers; this is not always the case (Leighton, 2012b).

Those who are qualified to teach citizenship education might have had 36 weeks of specialist training on a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) course, or six weeks on a work-based route such as Teach First, or a few sessions on a graduate training programme, or a maximum of 40 hours on the part-time Certificate for Teaching Citizenship course for serving teachers. It is more likely that teachers of citizenship education have had no specialist training at all, given the number of schools in England and the number of people who have completed any of the courses identified (Leighton, 2012a). For those who have appropriate training, the questions regarding training for professional competence posed by Freidson (1973, quoted in Larson, 1977, p. xi) – ‘how long, how theoretical, how specialized?’ – are particularly apposite.

Whatever the resources available to teachers and pupils, Demaine (2004) points out that having a wide range of teaching materials is not the same as a subject being well taught, and that effective citizenship education teaching is heavily dependent on the capacity of teachers. As Pring puts it in a more general context:

A teacher ... although very good in the classroom, could not be said to be teaching (as opposed to child minding) when supervising the children at swimming when he or she does not know anything about swimming. A teacher cannot be teaching physics when he does not understand the basic concepts. He may be teaching lots of things, but these do not include physics. (Pring, 2001, pp. 23-24)

In this school, with 16 members of staff teaching citizenship education, none had had any formal or accredited training in the subject or its pedagogy, and so the answers to Freidson’s questions above must be ‘not long, not theoretical, not specialised’, which leads to the possibility that – to paraphrase Pring, and no matter how competent and skilled the teachers at the case-study school were in their ‘own’ subjects – in their citizenship education lessons, they might have been teaching a lot of things, but these did not necessarily include citizenship.

The Nature of Citizenship Education in England

As Barbalet (1988, p. 2) puts it: ‘in the modern democratic state [citizenship] is the capacity to participate in the exercise of political power through the electoral process’. The Advisory Group on Citizenship (1998) contended that citizenship education is ‘more than just a subject’. In doing so, it

was argued that the development of social responsibility and moral character requires new methods, new content, new activities and new approaches to learning. Citizenship education must be relevant to the lives of pupils and to the lives of those around them if it is to have any long-lasting effect. It is not a subject to be taught by avowed experts to a receptive and passive audience—indeed, it is difficult to perceive good practice in any subject taught in this way – but one which requires pupils to question themselves and those around them, to learn as much about their own potential as about their rights and responsibilities, and to understand, participate and contribute. As found by the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (Kerr et al, 2007; Keating et al, 2010), where the subject, its content and its presentation are not seen as relevant, the subject simply does not work.

What constitutes citizenship education was vague in the 2002 national curriculum, allowing schools to adapt general principles in light of local circumstances. It stated that: ‘it is up to schools to choose how they organise their school curriculum to include the programmes of study for citizenship’ (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 1999, p. 6). The emphasis of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority and the Advisory Group on Citizenship (1998) was on an ‘output-only’ model, where aims and objectives are identified but strategies for their achievement are advised or recommended, rather than imposed. These quickly became a justification for reinterpreting the observation that citizenship education could be delivered as a separate subject and through existing curriculum arrangements as offering alternative rather than complementary strategies. This resulted in a lack of consistency in the structure and content of subject delivery, to the extent that some schools have citizenship education as a timetabled subject, while others do not appear to include it in any part of their programmes of study. The identified models are: (1) as a discrete subject; (2) as part of PSHE; (3) integrated into existing curricular subjects; (4) collapsed timetable days; (5) a combination of (1) or (2) with (3) and/or (4); and (6) ignoring statutory requirements (adapted from Leighton, 2004, 2012b).

The case-study school fits Model 5, despite there being no statutory requirement. Citizenship education is clearly present in both the formal and informal curricula of this school. There is discrete timetabled provision for the subject, and elements of citizenship education appear within the school’s PSHE provision, as well as there being an explicit expectation on the part of the head

teacher that other subjects address elements of citizenship as appropriate. It was the intention of the subject head to introduce focus days in the following academic year.

Findings

School Literature

For Years 7-11, PSHE and citizenship is a discrete and compulsory subject in the school – conforming to the requirements in the state sector – taught with the stated intention to ‘improve [pupils’] awareness, self-discipline, judgement and responsibility, both to themselves and to the community in which they find themselves’ (curriculum document, p. 28). Of eight aims identified in the school’s policy document, five – respect for others; independent and responsible membership of the school community; positive and active membership of a democratic society; making informed choices regarding social issues; and the development of good relationships within the school and the wider community – can be considered to come within the remit of citizenship education.

As well as this discrete delivery, religious education is also identified as a subject within which explicit reference is made to citizenship education issues, such as moral and ethical decision making, and secular and faith values. Examination of the lower school subject guides found references to citizenship education skills or knowledge in art, biology, drama, English, geography, history, and information and communications technology, indicating that these subjects at least are conforming to the head teacher and subject head’s perceptions and expectations.

For middle school pupils, as well as compulsory PSHE and citizenship lessons, there are other subjects which can be identified from the school’s stated approach and outlined content as addressing aspects of citizenship education. All pupils follow a core course of six subjects at GCSE and can choose a further three or four from a menu of 14. These include history (social change; crime and punishment; the impact of war on women, propaganda and social class; and government and protest in the USA), geography (globalisation – industry or tourism) and religious education (ethics, in/equalities, media, justice and peace). In all cases, these are perhaps more indicative of the (limited) opportunities presented by examination board specifications than by any inherent school bias, although it is the case for all schools – state or independent – that they can choose which specifications to follow and, often, which options to teach within those specifications. The

compulsory, non-examination PSHE and citizenship provision is heavily directed towards PSHE and careers education, with citizenship and politics listed as topics to be covered along with, for example, sexually transmitted diseases, smoking and bullying. Some of the other topics – such as prejudice and discrimination – are integral to the national curriculum for citizenship (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007), but not identified as such by the school, as there is a perception that its multicultural and multi-ethnic composition renders it unnecessary.

The sixth form curriculum, in common with most schools in England, offers no explicit provision for citizenship. An extended studies programme is compulsory, which is intended to complement the PSHE experiences of pupils and to enhance the spiritual, moral, social and cultural experiences provided by the school, and there is a compulsory independent study project to be completed during the summer recess. Twenty-two subjects are available, some of which – critical thinking, drama, economics, geography, history and religious studies – relate closely to citizenship education. Academically gifted students also have the opportunity to enrol in the Open University's Young Applicants in School Scheme.

There are elements of a school's hidden curriculum (Bowles & Gintis, 1976) which indicate the extent to which the ethos of that school reflects the notion that citizenship is more than just a subject (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998; Arthur & Wright, 2001) – an aspect of citizenship education emphasised by Leighton (2012a). An elected school council meets regularly with the head teacher, and committees are also elected in each of the pastoral houses. There are posts of responsibility to which pupils can be appointed, and those appointments were valued by the pupils interviewed, who perceived that the appointees listened to pupils and were, in turn, listened to by staff. Mock elections, charity activities and sessions on taxation and personal expenditure also contribute to the school's approach to citizenship education.

There is an expectation that older pupils help their younger peers to settle into the school through a buddy system, while boarders from countries other than the United Kingdom experience a one-term enculturation programme prior to their academic involvement in the school. Among the 69 extra-curricular activities that are provided by the school and available for day pupils, as well as to boarders, are Young Enterprise (a nationwide active-learning business education programme), the Duke of Edinburgh's Award scheme and public speaking. Musicians and other performers provide

concerts with and for the local community, and there is a significant amount of charitable fundraising. Shortly prior to the research visit, for example, pupils had calculated the distance from the school to a drought-stricken area in Africa and – with the agreement of the senior management team following a pupil presentation to them – established a sponsored walk/jog/run/swim/cycle (on stationary exercise bikes) involving staff and students covering that distance (in total, not each).

There is both overt and covert emphasis on respect and tolerance. The school's behaviour policy is explicitly based on stated rights and responsibilities for all members of the school community; the sanctions policy reflects this and, in response to pupil requests, there is also a complaints procedure which is, again, based on the principles of rights, responsibilities and respect.

Inspections by statutory bodies have identified the school as 'outstanding'. The healthy eating policy was perceived to be effective, as pupils understood and supported it rather than simply accepting it. One inspection singled out for praise the pupils' excellent moral and cultural awareness, while another, with a wider remit, described the school's leadership as 'exemplary'.

Staff Interviews

Several common themes arose in the discussions with the staff members, not all of which were expected or the intended focus. One of the principles underpinning interviewing is to give subjects a voice, therefore the researcher considered it more important to follow these themes than to impose predetermined questions. Unless providing a direct quotation or where a member of staff's role is significant to the response, comments and insights have been grouped together.

The highly contested notion of national identity – in particular, the concept of Britishness – was perceived to be simultaneously ephemeral and complex. Some staff were aware that elements of the nature of British society are addressed in the Year 7 curriculum, although – other than the subject coordinator – not what those elements are. There was a general consensus that English pupils see themselves as English rather than British. Discussions around what it is that defines Britishness were fruitful only in the breadth of definitions provided – from the making of the union through celebration of the royal wedding to collecting blackberries.

Internationalism and the understanding of other cultures were aspects of citizenship with which the staff were much more comfortable. The taught curriculum refers to the Commonwealth, the European Union and the United Nations, and has included a mini United Nations General Assembly role-playing activity. All of the staff were aware that 20% of the school's pupil population are not United Kingdom nationals, and emphasised their significant contribution to school life. International films are shown in the school, which are selected by pupils who form an international committee, and they are often followed by presentations by pupils from that country on aspects of its traditions – such as a recent demonstration, with participation, of Russian cookery. A further example was offered of discussions arising informally amongst pupils who realised that Mother's Day is celebrated on different days in the United Kingdom and Australia, and went on to compare and investigate other differences and the reasons behind them. That the school also sponsors a girls' school in India, including the provision of a university bursary, was only mentioned by the head teacher.

There was agreement that 'community' – both the school as a community and its relationship with the people and institutions of the local community – is central to the life and purpose of the school. The school chaplain was able to give a detailed account of involvement with the local community through concerts and charitable engagement, citing the Old Testament prophet Jeremiah's injunction to 'seek the welfare of any city to which I have exiled you ... on its welfare your welfare will depend' (Jeremiah 20.7) as evidence that such involvement is mutually beneficial. Other staff identified some of the activities the chaplain listed, particularly the support given to local homeless people. The school also invites local people to use some of its facilities, particularly for sports, and is currently investigating ways to ensure Criminal Records Bureau clearance (known as a CRB check, which is a legal requirement in England for all people working or having regular contact with vulnerable people, including the young). The grounds and other facilities are also available for hire for weddings and conferences.

The staff identified a number of elements of citizenship education within the informal and hidden curricula, again emphasising the nature of the school as a community. Pupils give tours to prospective pupils and their parents/carers, developing and demonstrating confidence and the ability to communicate clearly. Some are involved in the selection process for new staff, forming an interview panel which advises the school authorities on their preferences and the reasons for them.

There are mock elections and elections to several committees run by pupils, which again make representations to the school. Each house also has regular meetings, at which opinions are aired and justified, and decisions taken. School rules and regulations, including the behaviour policy and its rewards and sanctions, were also said to be directly influenced by pupil representation. For boarding pupils, there are the added elements of having to get on with people whatever their foibles, and therefore understanding and living within diversity, and the need to look after oneself and help others by, for example, taking turns at washing up. Such activities were perceived by the staff to enable pupils to develop the skills of management, tolerance, compromise, collaboration and the responsible exercise of rights and responsibilities, which were considered to be integral to the school as a community and for successful engagement with wider communities once the pupils leave the school, in accordance with the school's stated aims. It was also considered evidence of pupils' awareness, and the trust which was placed in them, that they planned and took part in the World Wildlife Fund's 'switch off' campaign and planned their own fund-raising events for their own chosen charities.

The content of the formal citizenship education curriculum was less familiar to most staff, even though some taught it. Few were able to articulate what is involved in this, apart from the citizenship and PSHE coordinator. Even then, the programme she described suggested the truth of the observation of the former Chief Inspector of Schools, David Bell (2005), when he stated that: 'PSHE is about the private, individual dimension of pupils' development, whereas citizenship concerns the public dimension ... Often, schools claim the content of lessons is citizenship when it is in fact PSHE'. Political structures and language are addressed, much as was the case in former civics curricula, as are national and international economic and political organisations. These are presented in a programme which also includes economic awareness and matters of personal health, and a number of speakers on various topics – for example, a recent visit by a Holocaust survivor. There is an intention to change the programme from fortnightly taught sessions to suspended curriculum days, despite the coordinator's awareness of the potential weaknesses of this approach, as identified by Ofsted (2010) and Leighton (2011).

Although the school is part of a Christian foundation, most of the staff agreed that the influence of faith on the school is subtle, while the chaplain considered it to be strong without being overpowering. There are regular hymn practices and collective acts of worship of a broadly Christian

nature, with opportunities for pupils with faith commitments to follow the requirements of their beliefs. The pupil population is not exclusively Christian, which the staff felt is both respected by the school and to its benefit. One additional feature of the assemblies identified by the staff is the positive role models for women which the head teacher makes a particular point of identifying and discussing.

The peer-mentoring programme, in which volunteer pupils are trained to give support to others, was seen as integral to the school as a community. Although some of the staff were not willing (or able?) to offer much insight into the programme, there was recognition that pupils will not want to discuss everything with teachers, and a general consensus that the scheme also serves to develop responsibility and respect for others.

Although vague on the number of participants, the school's Duke of Edinburgh's Award Scheme coordinator was clear on its benefits to pupils and on its citizenship function. Both the Bronze and Silver awards (there were currently no Gold participants) require prolonged commitment to community service, which is organised by the pupils and which the coordinator considered to be the most important aspect. On expeditions, participants also have to be aware of risks, conduct, rights and responsibilities (for example, access to land, trespass, the Countryside Code). It was her perception that these activities, along with the expectations of skills development and physical recreation, are both life-enriching and character-forming, and that the whole experience 'gets them out of the bubble' of their privileged educational environment.

For the citizenship education coordinator – a geographer who had previously worked in the state sector – what was 'most important is that citizenship education is done, not that it is explicit'. In this and other observations, her position reflects the 2006 Ofsted report, although she was clearly aware of the more recent inspection report (Office for Standards in Education, 2010). One very important point in which she concurred with this more recent report, and with Keating et al (2009), regards the challenge of engaging pupils in the subject when many of those teaching it are not themselves engaged. Her state school experience involved coordinating a small and committed team, whereas she now has 16 non-specialists with varying degrees of interest who are particularly challenged in addressing controversial issues. She felt that this makes the subject more difficult to teach well and therefore it is more difficult to engage pupils in it. The overall structure of the programme is

underpinned by the principle of 'local > national > global', starting with homelessness in Year 7 and moving through to counterterrorism in Year 10. Neither of these topics is identified in the citizenship national curriculum.

The school chaplain observed that citizenship education is an obligation for a school such as this, with pupils largely from privileged and favoured backgrounds. She proposed that 'those to whom much is given, of them is much required' (Luke 12.48) underpins the ethos of the school, so that pupils are expected to make contributions to the well-being of the rest of society, and that this is evidence of the strong, but not overpowering, influence of Anglicanism on the school. She said that pupils make their contributions in various ways – for example, by speaking at local schools, involvement in Young Enterprise, and charitable work locally and internationally. She cited pupil enthusiasm for recycling, the Global Student Forum and other environmental campaigns as evidence that they are concerned for others' and their own futures, and that there is full engagement with the ethical as well as institutional and process aspects of citizenship education.

Pupil Group Interviews

Year 9. None of the Year 9 (13-14-year-old) pupils had previously given any thought to 'being a citizen' and were initially not clear about what it meant to them. They all considered themselves to be English, which they were and which was perceived as a synonym for British. Among the aspects of being English/ British of which they declared themselves proud were the variety of regional accents, the international acceptance and recognition of the English language, the length (compared to, for example, the USA) and variety of its history, the excellence of the military and the royal wedding. They considered themselves lucky to be British, but felt strongly that nationality does not determine who we are, as they found the international dimension of the school to be very valuable.

Opportunities to volunteer for or take part in elections to committees were seen as significant both in terms of being able to make a contribution to the school community and as preparation for social and political engagement beyond their school years. This was identified as not only involvement in electoral political processes, but also the likelihood of involvement in teams at work and in the communities in which they would eventually live. They commented on a mock election that had taken place the previous year, in which pupils represented different political parties and campaigned

for votes in parallel with the national general election; this was perceived as a useful way to understand the electoral process. While aware of the role of the school council and positive regarding its performance on their behalf, the pupils were particularly fulsome in regard to the school's ecological committee (expressing pride and enthusiasm for their vegetable patches) and the food committee.

Pupils are aware of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award scheme within the school and, while there is no pressure to participate, some were taking part and all saw benefits to it, particularly the community involvement aspect. However, they did not consider that the scheme was the only opportunity for such involvement, citing parental tours and visits to the elderly as two activities in which they participated. There was a consensus that they were not involved enough with the community, despite putting on events and the opportunities to volunteer for other activities; there was uncertainty about the extent to which the school's presence is viewed positively amongst the local populace.

It was clear that the pupils considered the school to have a positive influence on their development as young women and members of society. They were resolute that gender stereotypes are challenged in a variety of ways – through sporting endeavour, celebrations such as the recent International Women's Day, and the head teacher's regular references to inspirational women. Although they struggled to recollect particular names, it was proposed by them that it is the general air of determination and success which matters, rather than who did what.

A further example they offered was that careers advice, talks from visiting speakers and the range of subjects open to them emphasise their future roles as women who can contribute to society. They felt well supported and well informed, with one pupil commenting that a recent talk on chemical engineering had opened her eyes to a future career and she had been encouraged to make further enquiries about it. Their employment ambitions were wide-ranging – doctor, lawyer, nuclear engineer, design/marketing, 'something to do with music' – and they felt no academic pressure. The message they perceived from the school was that in order to achieve what they want, they need to work hard, and they felt encouraged to do so.

The overriding principle which the pupils consistently emphasised was that they felt trusted, which motivated them to behave responsibly for themselves and for the community of the school. The credits/rewards/sanctions policy of the school was developed directly from suggestions from pupils, which they felt gives them ownership of, as well as a sense of responsibility towards, that policy. They said that pupils are generally allowed to 'do their own thing' and are made aware of the repercussions of their actions, and that, as they get older, the school allows them more responsibility. Boarders stated that their responsibility for their own welfare – sorting out laundry, washing up, an appropriate diet – helps them to develop quickly; they have to take their own actions to avoid the undesirable alternatives of 'going hungry and being smelly'.

Year 12. Year 12 (16-17-year-old) pupils were more aware of aspects of being a citizen, identifying statutory rights such as passport eligibility, protection under the law and political participation. There was agreement that it is a status to be valued and that citizens should contribute to the society in which they find themselves. Examples of the contributions offered were not to break the law, to pay taxes, not to litter and to generally be helpful to others. Particular characteristics of Britishness which were identified included patriotism, the richness of the language, British culture and British history. One pupil from the United Kingdom who had sat an online citizenship nationality test out of interest observed that she could not answer the questions and she considered the test to be 'silly'. Although others had not encountered such a test, there was discussion concerning what the questions should consider, and they thought these should be about 'useful, everyday things', such as the requirements and processes involved in registering births, marriages and deaths, examples of social conventions and courtesy, and the potential sanctions for law- breaking.

As with their younger colleagues, English and British were used synonymously. When questioned further on this, the pupils showed some confusion over the differences between England, Britain, Great Britain and the British Isles. Only one student – who was not originally from or educated in the United Kingdom – was able to explain the differences correctly. This led to another asking the questions: 'What about the Falklands? Which one are they part of?'; the rest of the group were able to explain the location of the Falkland Islands, but were not clear about its relationship with the United Kingdom.

Several members of the group were involved in Young Enterprise and were clear that the focus is on maximising profits and 'looking for the best deal'. They had not considered the place of ethics in business, considering this to be something which is raised in science and religious education. It was their perception that several activities are driven much more by staff than by pupils. Little was said regarding the school council and involvement with the local community, as these pupils considered that they tended to learn about political and social issues from their parents (whether or not they were day pupils or boarders), television and their own experiences in other countries. It was unanimously perceived that Britons abroad are generally quite rude, and that the pupils learned a great deal formally and informally from their international peers.

There was no suggestion that a faith dimension is intrusive or imposed. Few of the pupils considered themselves to be religious, but nonetheless considered the values of faiths to be useful moral positions. It was pointed out that, as there are adherents of several faiths and some of no religious belief, the school is possibly a truer reflection of society than others might think. There was a clear rejection of any notion that faith – either specific or in general – makes anyone an inherently better (or worse) citizen.

They were very positive about the quality of talks they have as part of the general sixth form citizenship awareness programme, singling out for particular praise those which were delivered by recovered alcoholics, drug addicts and people with HIV. They appreciated the insights offered to them by these presentations and considered them to be more instructive as they were presented 'by people who have been there', rather than from textbooks, by teachers or by filmed presentations. It was generally agreed that a presentation by ex-offenders was the best of all, as no punches were pulled, they were given graphic insights into what prison is really like, and found the whole thing to be 'very off-putting'. There was recognition by the pupils that they are being shown respect in being treated as adults in this programme, and their respect for those who delivered it was made clear.

There was a strong feeling that the school is concerned for its reputation and public image, which they considered to be an appropriate concern. They felt an obligation to uphold the school's good name and to be seen in public as ambassadors for the school. They considered this to be a way of repaying the trust shown in them. The overall perception of the school was that it challenges gender stereotyping regarding expectations and both academic and personal choices, supporting them and

expecting them to make the most of their opportunities, as the school is 'goal-driven and girl-driven'.

Summary

Table II identifies 19 citizenship-related issues which arose during the research and might lead to a conclusion that these are the essence of the school's approach to citizenship education; such a conclusion would imply a consistency of perceptions and opinions which is not to be found in the data. Instead, the data suggests variations amongst the staff, between the age bands of the pupils interviewed, and between the staff and pupils. That understanding of democratic processes was a little vague for the Year 9 pupils could be either indicative of their own insights or a weakness of the school programme.

The pupils tended to the view that fund-raising is an end in itself – an attitude that has been identified as reducing citizenship to a series of 'worthy acts' (Leighton, 2010) – whereas most of the staff were clear that the skills which are developed in planning and conducting fund-raising activities are at least as important. This was the only area in which skills associated with citizenship education were explicitly identified by the staff. Pupils evinced only some interest in moral conduct; although notions of 'right' and 'wrong' were identified, the sixth-formers involved in Young Enterprise were clear that – for them – ethics were secondary to 'the best deal' in business.

The documentation explicitly identifies that pupils are encouraged and enabled to make choices, recognising this as an essential skill for effective participation in a democratic society. Other citizenship-related skills are implicitly connected to a range of subjects and activities. Both sets of pupils were able to identify these and articulate their development and benefits, often linking them to subjects. The staff members did not identify either of these elements of the informal or formal school curriculum, suggesting either ignorance of what they and their colleagues do or ignorance of skills inherent to citizenship education. While the documentation makes no mention of the bonds of trust which develop between pupils and between pupils and staff, all of the respondents emphasised these bonds and clearly valued them – indicative, perhaps, of an essential component in the relationship between authorities and populations which is in decline, at the same time as participation in democratic processes is thought by some to be at a low ebb.

Aspect	Documents	Yr 9 pupils	Yr 12 pupils	Staff
Britishness/national identity	No mention	✓ when prompted	✓ when prompted	✓ when prompted
Charity involvement	✓	✓ fund raising	✓ fund raising	✓ Skill development
Community – beyond school	✓	✓	✓	✓
Community - school	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cross-curricular provision	✓	No mention	✓ in passing	No mention
Cultural awareness	✓	✓	✓	✓
Democratic processes	✓	✓ a bit vague	✓	✓
Eco-school	✓	✓	✓ staff focus	✓
Elections	✓	✓	P	✓
Faith	✓	✓	P	✓
Mentoring	✓	✓	No mention	✓
Moral awareness	✓	Limited	Limited	✓
Non-specialist teaching	No mention	No mention	No mention	✓
Principles & development of Behaviour policy	✓	✓	✓	✓
Respect – for self and others	✓	✓	✓	✓
Skills linked to subjects	✓	✓	✓	No mention
Supportive management team	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tolerance	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trust	No mention	✓	✓	✓

Table II. Aspects of citizenship education identified.

Conclusions

The study indicates that several of the findings of Keating et al's (2010) study, which was conducted in the state sector and on a much greater scale, apply to varying extents to at least one independent girls' school. The nature of the research conducted in relation to this article precludes any useful discussion of changes over time – this is a snapshot, whereas Keating et al's study involved the collection and analysis of 'data from 43,410 young people, 3,212 teachers, and 690 schools' (p. i) over a nine-year period. It should also be noted that, as well as matters of scale and time, the research purpose and questions are not identical between the studies. However, several points of comparison arise.

Keating et al found 'indications that these young people will continue to participate as adult citizens' (p. iii) – indications that were also found in the current study. Similarly, age and life stage appear to be significant factors in determining levels of political and social engagement. Both studies also identify a tendency to associate being a good citizen with being law-abiding and taking part in the community. However, where Keating et al found a greater likelihood of pupils being 'motivated by the prospect of personal benefits than by a sense of duty' (p. vi), the pupils in the current study made no reference at all to personal benefit other than a sense of well-being at doing what they perceived as the right thing.

There is no doubt, in regard to both studies, that high levels of citizenship education have a direct influence on civic attitudes and a sense of efficacy. Keating et al indicate that this was directly related to pupils' perceptions that their citizenship education was at a high level, and the pupils at the independent girls' school, although not particularly aware of citizenship education, considered that the informal education they received from family, friends and the media was of a high level and they were clearly sensitive to political participation; they had a sense of being listened to and having influence, which motivated them to continue to be involved.

Both studies found the participants to be supportive of human rights in general and women's rights in particular, but there is a greater disparity in relation to 'a hardening of attitudes toward equality and society ... [and] a weakening of attachment to communities' (p. iii), as there did not appear to be a 'hard' attitude in this regard in the independent school. Despite the mock election outcome of a

Conservative victory, the pupils did not demonstrate the critical stance not only 'towards refugees and immigrants, but also in their attitudes towards jail sentences, benefit payments, and some environmental restriction policies' (p. vi) found by Keating et al. Where opinions on these matters were expressed, they were consistently done so with balance and understanding in a fairly liberal tone. Far from links with communities weakening as pupils get older, as Keating et al found, the pupils at the independent school desired greater local links than currently existed, and all expressed enthusiasm for international understanding.

This independent school research also confirms Keating et al's (p. 10) finding that citizenship learning takes place in many sites and contexts other than the school; this appears to be as true for a boarding school as it is for day pupils in the state sector. Older pupils in particular identified their family and the mass media as sources of information and outlook with greater influence, in their view, than the school. It may be that social class is another variable factor, but Keating et al do not identify this possibility, and a one-school study such as the present research does not allow this possibility to be effectively investigated.

According to Keating et al: 'The format, timing and duration of the citizenship learning experience are crucial variables' (p. vi). They identify four key aspects for schools which aim to develop high levels of citizenship outcomes in pupils (i.e. skills, attitudes and behaviour that can be interpreted as positive regarding current and future participation). These are that citizenship education should be: (1) delivered in a discrete slot in the timetable for over 45 minutes per week; (2) developed by the teachers who are delivering the citizenship curriculum rather than the school's PSHE coordinator; (3) formally examined (for example, as part of the GCSE in citizenship); and (4) delivered regularly and consistently throughout the cohort's educational experience (p. vi).

At this independent girls' school, the first and last conditions are met; the third is not; while the second is almost in direct opposition to Keating et al's recommendation. The school's PSHE coordinator is also the citizenship education coordinator, and it appears – by implication in the staff interviews – that those who teach it have no great desire to be involved in the planning. The school's intention to change delivery from discretely timetabled slots to a series of focus days, despite going against the recommendations of Ofsted (2010), could give the staff involved more ownership and therefore give the programme greater effectiveness; only time will tell.

The executive summary of Keating et al (2010, p. vii) clearly indicates success for citizenship education in supporting the development and empowerment of young people, fostering 'positive attitudes and intentions towards civic and political participation (both in the present and in the future). It can also have a positive impact on the young people's sense of personal efficacy'. This positive conclusion comes with 'two key caveats' (p. vii), however. The first is that there are many factors other than the classroom which affect young people's citizenship development; this is borne out by the present study. The second is that the format, timing and duration of school input are all crucial – a conclusion that is less obviously supported in this study, which must lead to consideration of why this is the case.

One tentative hypothesis – as yet untested, only partly formed and therefore only partially articulated here – is that there is something about the essence of independent schooling which contributes to the development of effective citizenship education. That 'something' is unlikely to be the residential aspect of boarding, as there is no indication in this study that boarders are more socially committed and aware than their day-pupil peers. The 'something' is likely to be complex and possibly an amalgam of one or more of the following: (a) the social-class background of most pupils at the school; (b) the values of the parents/carers who send girls to this school as opposed to another; (c) the ethos of the school and its staff; (d) this school is unique in its pupils' attitudes and conduct; (e) independent schools' attitude of what and how pupils will achieve, rather than whether or why; (f) independent pupils see role models for success, whereas many state-educated pupils see role models for failure; and (g) there is a network which supports former pupils of independent schools at the expense of those from state schools.

There does not seem to be any greater awareness of social and political circumstances among the pupils in this independent school than there exists generally among their state-educated peers. It remains the case, however, that these pupils are much more likely to be in positions of elected and/or social influence than those peers. It is only through further research in the independent sector that reasons for this disparity might be uncovered.

Notes

[1] <http://www.suttontrust.com/who-we-are/>

[2]<http://www.suttontrust.com/research/the-educational-backgrounds-of-government-ministersin-2010/>
<http://www.suttontrust.com/research/the-educational-backgrounds-of-mps/>
<http://www.suttontrust.com/news/news/the-educational-backgrounds-of-500-leadingfigures/>

References

Advisory Group on Citizenship (1998) *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Arthur, J. & Wright, D. (2001) *Teaching Citizenship in the Secondary School*. London: David Fulton.

Bailey, R. (1996) The Irony of the National Curriculum, in D. Hayes (Ed.) *Debating Education: issues for the new millennium?*, pp 14-18. Canterbury: Canterbury Christ Church College.

Barbalet, J.M. (1988) *Citizenship: rights, struggle and class inequality*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Bell, D. (2005) Speech to the Hansard Society, London, 17 January.

<http://www.theguardian.com/education/2005/jan/17/faithschools.schools>

Bourdieu, P. (1983) Economic Capital, Cultural Capital, and Social Capital, *Soziale-Welt Supplement*, 2, 183-198.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America: educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Breslin, T. (2005) Delivering National Curriculum Citizenship: comparing and applying curriculum models, in T. Breslin & B. Dufour (Eds) *Developing Citizens: a comprehensive introduction to effective citizenship education in the secondary school*. London: Hodder Murray.

Demaine, J. (Ed.) (2004) *Citizenship and Political Education Today*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230522879>

Faulks, K. (2006) Education for Citizenship in England's Secondary Schools: a critique of current principle and practice, *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(1), pp. 59-74.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680930500391546>

Gove, M. (2012) Education Secretary Michael Gove's Speech to Brighton College, 10 May.

<http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/speeches/a00208822/brighton-college>

Hargreaves, D.H. (1967) *Social Relations in a Secondary School*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203001837>

Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E. & Lopes, J. (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)*. London: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Keating, A., Kerr, D. & Lopes, J. (2009) *Embedding Citizenship Education in Secondary Schools in England (2002-2008): Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study seventh annual report*. London: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Kerr, D., Lopes, J., Nelson, J., White, K., Cleaver, E. & Benton, T. (2007) *VISION versus PRAGMATISM: citizenship in the secondary school curriculum in England. Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: fifth annual report*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

Larson, M.S. (1977) *The Rise of Professionalism: a sociological analysis*. London: University of California Press.

Leighton, R. (2004) The Nature of Citizenship Education Provision: an initial study, *Curriculum Journal*, 15(2), pp167-184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0958517042000226829>

Leighton, R. (2010) Active Citizenship, in L. Gearon (Ed.) *Learning to Teach Citizenship in the Secondary School*, 2nd edn, pp. 135-143. London: Routledge.

Leighton, R. (2011) Introducing Pre-service Citizenship Teachers to the Design and Implementation of Focus Days to Enhance Their Professional Learning, *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 7(1), 89-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1386/ctl.7.1.89_1

Leighton, R. (2012a) *Teaching Citizenship Education: a radical approach*. London: Continuum.

Leighton, R. (2012b) Citizenship Teachers: different typology, different needs. Paper presented at the CiCe/CitizEd conference, University of York, June 2012.

Mills, C.W. (1980) *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Penguin.

Morgan, C. & Morris, G. (1999) *Good Teaching and Learning: pupils and teachers speak*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Nielsen, L. (2012) History Teachers Work with Students' Identity in Multicultural Classrooms. Paper presented at Fourteenth Annual Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe Network, Eighth CitizEd and First Creating Citizenship Communities Joint Conference, University of York, 24-26 May.

Office for National Statistics (2012) Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, 2012 Provisional Results.

http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_286243.pdf

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2006) *Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools*. London: Ofsted.

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2010) *Citizenship Established? Citizenship in Schools 2006/9*. Manchester: Ofsted.

Pring, P. (2001) *Philosophy of Educational Research*. London: Continuum.

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) (2007) *Citizenship: the national curriculum for England* London: London: Department for Education and Skills & QCA.

Trafford, B. (Ed.) (2006) *i2 = Independent + Innovative: examples of innovation in independent schools*. Saxmundham: John Catt.

White, R. with Brockington, D. (1983) *Tales Out of School: consumers' views of British education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour: how working class kids get working class jobs*. Farnborough: Saxon House.

RALPH LEIGHTON is a Principal Lecturer in Education and course leader for the PGCE Citizenship (11-18) at Canterbury Christ Church University, United Kingdom. As well as teaching and supporting the development of prospective teachers of citizenship, he teaches on the university's generic professional studies programme and on the undergraduate Education Studies degree course. His current research interests concentrate on citizenship education both as a potential instrument of social change and in independent school settings.

Correspondence: ralph.leighton@canterbury.ac.uk

Leighton, R. (2014) 'England's self-image as portrayed in public examination Citizenship Education textbooks.' In P. Cunningham and N Fretwell (eds) *Innovative Practice and Research Trends in Identity, Citizenship and Education* London: CiCEa pp140-155

Abstract

This paper is based on an analysis of the images in five textbooks aimed at young people (14-16 year olds) taking public examination courses in Citizenship Education in England. While the subject is a statutory part of England's National Curriculum (Department for Education, 2013a), examination is not compulsory and it is often the case that schools do not observe the minimum statutory requirements (Ofsted, 2010).

With reference to Fang (1996) and others showing the role of images in motivating pupils and scaffolding their learning, as well as Freire's (2006) notion of the thick wrappers of multiple 'whys' which attach to any educational entity, it is considered that images are at least as important as text. The focus is primarily on the images which relate to gender, class and ethnicity – what those images indicate regarding the 'official' perception and presentation of these socially constructed and defined categories, and the extent to which that perception can be said to be verified or sustained through other data. A fourth category, the 'English citizenship' perception of the foreign – the European Union and the world beyond Europe – is also considered. While the images presented in the textbooks are analysed to demonstrate the 'English persona' which they imply, that persona is also shown to be emphasised by what is absent from the images. The presence of specific images represents choices made, so that the absence of others can be considered similarly to represent choices. These choices are shown to speak volumes about the gap between England's state directed self-image and the reality of citizenship in England.

Keywords: *democratic development, ignored inequalities, images, text books, the 'other'*

Introduction

The data presented here are derived from analysis of the illustrations in five textbooks aimed at those young people taking any one of the three public examination courses for 16 year olds in Citizenship Education. While the subject is a statutory part of England's National Curriculum (Department for Education, 2013), examination is not compulsory and it is frequently the case that

schools to not observe the minimum statutory requirements (CELSI; Leighton, 2012, 2013; Ofsted, 2006, 2010). It must also be noted that the National Curriculum for Citizenship has gone through various forms (QCA 2002, 2007, 2010; Department for Education, 2013a) since the books were published, and there have been new editions of some of them. However, when teachers in school were asked which books and which editions they use, these were the books they identified.

It was decided to use the 2002 editions for a variety of reasons:

- a) they share a common year of publication and therefore a common reference point;
- b) they are aimed at the same (14-16) age group;
- c) 2002 was the year Citizenship Education became a compulsory subject within the National Curriculum for England;
- d) they reflect the National Curriculum, but are not constrained by it;
- e) they are the editions currently in use in schools;
- f) they are approved by examination boards as supporting their subject specifications which are, in turn, approved by the Department for Education.

These books have therefore been chosen as representing a collective image designated by the Department for Children, Families and Schools (as it was then known), delineated by the examination boards, and projected by schools, to pupils in the 14-16 age range, of what it means to be English.

Caveats

Not all teachers of citizenship rely on textbooks. It has been argued that best practice militates against such use (Ofsted, 2010, Leighton, 2012) as many of the 'facts' and personalities central to the subject change over time at a pace which outstrips publication. Specialist teachers of Citizenship Education are often encouraged, during their pre-service education, to ensure that learning is

tailored to their pupils' interests and experiences (Leighton, 2012) – something which any one text book cannot achieve.

There are also vast amounts of useful – and a good deal not so useful – images, data and activities available through the internet which teachers use and manipulate to determine the images and ideas they wish to develop as part of citizenship education. Freire's observation that 'a deed, a gesture, a poem, a painting, a song, a book are always wrapped in thick wrappers. They have been touched by manifold *whys*' (2006, p. 10) reminds us that the images deployed by teachers of citizenship – whether specialist, volunteer or coerced – are loaded with reasons and messages not always immediately obvious but none the less powerful and influential.

Only 9,279 young people sat the GCSE in Citizenship in 2012, out of a potential 649,553 (1.4%), but Ofsted, the schools inspectorate for England, reports that a significant majority of that age cohort experience Citizenship Education to an extent which satisfies official guidelines. According to Ofsted, in those schools where provision was deemed inadequate (11%),

citizenship had been misunderstood or ignored, or its development had been so constrained by other priorities that its effectiveness was severely limited. As a result, the students had little knowledge or understanding of citizenship (Ofsted, 2010,p. 10)

We do not know whether that misunderstanding is of the official image of being a citizen and that a more comprehensive or universalistic perspective is offered as an alternative in those schools, but it would appear that Ofsted inspectors were satisfied that 89% of schools in England were developing citizenship in line with the requirements which the textbooks discussed here meet. If the images used in each classroom do not wholly coincide with those in the textbooks considered here, the majority are clearly held to tell the same story.

Historical/Political context

England's imperial, political and democratic history is not as clear-cut as might sometimes be assumed; in 1603 England ceased to be an independent sovereign power, and after 1707 it was no longer a politically independent nation but one part of the United Kingdom. While its development

as an international force predate the early sixteenth century – according to Andrews (1991) these began to bear fruit by 1480 and, as McLeod (2009) shows, they were firmly established one hundred years later, contrary to some interpretations of laissez faire – Gallagher provides compelling evidence of ‘a fundamental continuity in British expansion throughout the nineteenth century’ (2004, p.6)

Britain’s empire covered a third of the planet; it was the pink bits on the maps I saw as a pupil in the 1960s and 70s; it was ‘everywhere’. Throughout the Twentieth Century it slowly became ‘The Commonwealth’ – 54 countries, from Antigua to Zimbabwe – 53 of which have a shared history of being ‘discovered’ by, fought over by, exploited by, traded with, run by, indoctrinated by, evangelised by, the UK. I was taught that it was an empire built on daring exploits, courageous explorers, clever trade policies, and a strong navy. It was also an empire built on violence, slavery, exploitation, racism and record keeping; on bullying, bullets and bureaucracy.

Many historians of jurisprudence have referred to Magna Carta of 1215 as an early example of democracy in action (Sen, 1999; Gedicks, 2009) but this document was negotiated between King John and his barons – it had nothing to do with or for the common people, who remained the chattels of the nobility. Fear of the revolution in France influencing the disenfranchised in Britain was a major factor in political reform in the nineteenth century. According to the UK’s National Archives, in 1780 only 3% of the population had the right to vote. There were significant reforms in the mid-nineteenth century, including widening the franchise to include more men but also explicitly debarring women from voting. In Sweden there was limited female suffrage in the 1860s, in the UK it didn’t happen until 1918 – for wealthy women – and, on equal grounds to men, in 1928. Catholics were barred from public office until 1829, Jews until 1858. Today, senior Anglican clergy have automatic seats in the second chamber of the legislature, the House of Lords; by tradition the Chief Rabbi (who represents one particular trend in Judaism) is also a member of that house. No other faiths have such an entitlement.

Until 1906, trade unions were liable for employers’ losses due to strike action; since 1992 they have again been liable except in very specific circumstances. There are currently serious and far reaching discussions in the UK on limiting press freedom since the Levenson Report. The Human Rights Review (2012) reports that it was not until 1998 that the law recognised the right to peaceful

assembly and freedom of association, and that '[p]olice misuse of surveillance, stop and search powers, and other pre-emptive legal action by the police and private companies inhibits peaceful protest' (p. 279).

There are an estimated 5.9 million CCTV surveillance cameras in the UK – almost one for every ten people. There is also a long tradition of radicalism in the UK, from the Peasants' Revolt of 1381 to the UCS sit-ins of 1971/2; from the English Civil War 1642-51 to a general strike in 1926; from trade unionism developing in the nineteenth century to the Greenham Common Women's camp of the 1980s and 90s. Not all these movements have been successful, but whatever successes they achieved were in the face of 'democratic' establishment opposition. In noting this, it is also important to observe that many nations have had much more repressive regimes and a much slower and thornier path towards democracy. It is particularly important to also observe that there is no reference to these radical traditions in any of the textbooks scrutinised.

Method

As this paper concentrates on the visual images in textbooks aimed at 14-16 year old students of citizenship education in England, the dominant method is one of image analysis; what individual images – but more significantly, what the collective impression of a series of images – tell us about the perceptions or intentions of those who have selected them; they are scrutinised for Freire's '*whys*'. In all cases the images are accompanied by written text, but it is the images which catch one's eye and which tell the story of being a citizen.

There were a total of 699 pages in the textbooks, and 907 illustrations. Excluding title pages, examination technique sections, glossaries and index pages, there were 648 pages of text, most of which had pictures or other images – averaging almost 1.4 images per page, along with text, activity boxes, assignment suggestions, graphs and charts.

Carney and Levin (2002) confirm Fang's (1996) findings, that the images within or accompanying text serve several functions: they

- a) establish the context of the text,

- b) define/develop characters, (or, in our context, institutions and personalities)
- c) extend/develop plot, (or, in our current context, the narrative)
- d) provide an alternative viewpoint,
- e) contribute to the coherence of the text, and
- f) give emphasis to the text.

Fang goes on to list several benefits that pictures provide, including such things as motivating the reader, promoting creativity, serving as mental scaffolds, fostering aesthetic appreciation, and promoting children's language and literacy (Carey and Levin, 2002, p. 6). Given their role in motivation and scaffolding, it can be seen that images play a significant role yet one it is sometimes easy to overlook.

The predetermined focus for analysis is on those images which portray or relate to gender, class and ethnicity; what those images indicate regarding the 'official' perception and presentation of these socially constructed and defined categories, and the extent to which that perception can be said to be verified or sustained through other data. A fourth category, the 'English citizenship' perception of the foreign – the European Union and the world beyond Europe – is also considered.

Findings from individual textbooks

Textbook A (143 images) offers a range of faiths and ethnicities, including a quotation against racism from Sir Alex Ferguson (a white Scot), then manager of Manchester United FC, and an image of Hope Powell, the (black) manager of England's women's football team. Nelson Mandela is present – the most frequent person presented throughout the books is Nelson Mandela. There are also images of an Asian teacher, an Orthodox Jew, Japanese in traditional costume, a church and a mosque. The multi-racial Notting Hill Carnival is shown, as is an anti-racism meeting with three Asian and two white people, and there are images and discussion relating to the 1993 murder of black teenager Stephen Lawrence.

The only non-white political figures who are shown are from outside the UK: Mandela, bin Laden, S Hussein, Mao and five unnamed 'Commonwealth Leaders'. All are male and three have had a poor press in the UK. Of the 31 political figures shown, all but three are men, the exceptions being Queen Elizabeth and two women in a photograph of the Prime Minister and his cabinet. Gender representation in general lacks balance and insight, with 57 men shown in a variety of occupations as opposed to 10 women – one judge and others involved in 'traditional' activities, including the carer/mother role.) One particularly challenging image is of a woman protesting for the right to die as she suffered from an incurable wasting disease.

In common with the other textbooks, *Textbook A* offers a confused, limited and diluted interpretation of the relationship between the UK and the European Union. There is a picture of the EU parliament, one of some Euros, a map of the countries which were at that time the member states, and a picture of the Eurostar train. It is not explained that England has no relationship with the EU other than as one component member of the UK, nor is there discussion of the how 'ordinary' Europeans behave – indeed, there is no image of people in, of or from European countries other than one of German anti-nuclear protesters.

The wider international image presented appears to be largely of a benevolent UK supporting a backward and often violent rest of the world. Images of world populations range from child soldiers, child labour and starving children in Africa, through an idyllic beach in the 'West Indies', to destruction of the rainforests and over-fishing of whales. UN troops are shown 'keeping the peace' and there is a picture of the UN building in New York. George W Bush is added to Mandela, bin Laden, Hussein and Mao (who died 26 years earlier) as world leaders. Where protests in the UK were shown to relate largely to environmental issues, this was juxtaposed with the Tiananmen Square protests in China in 1989.

Overall, the images in this textbook indicate a secure, content, multicultural, male- dominated England holding its head up and doing its bit in a nasty and deprived world. There is a tendency for representation to centre on London rather than throughout the country, further distorting the notion of Britishness through Englishness to a vague Londonness.

Textbook B (133 images) presents a broad range of images of ethnicity, including Christians, Muslims, travellers and Chinese in Britain. Black police officers, black students, black voters and black footballers also feature. There section on immigration (but not on emigration) and one which features black women and children in relation to HIV Aids. The notion of 'being British' involves images of Morris dancing, the Notting Hill Carnival, the English countryside, and Gerri Halliwell (Ginger Spice) who had ceased to be involved in pop music in 1998. Nothing about empire/imperialism, war, resource exploitation, inventiveness. . .

Gender distribution tends to the stereotypical while possibly also being an accurate representation. There are three male politicians and one female, as close as whole numbers allow as proportionate to membership of the House of Commons. Other portrayals of women include barrister, boss, secretary, Victoria Beckham (Posh Spice and footballer's wife), journalist, property owner, recipient of aid, carer, teacher, police officer, food safety officer, shoppers, and parent. The range for men is narrower, restricted to police, footballers, trading standards officer, borrower, councillor, criminals and two television journalists.

The image of the European Union is limited to a picture of two unnamed men in suits and one of euro paper money and coins, while the UN is represented by Kofi Annan, UN soldiers, and reference to flood aid. On the wider international front there are asylum seekers and refugees, child soldiers and child labour, charity in Gambia, an African woman receiving a commonwealth loan, and African youths on motorbikes. There is also an indigenous South American drinking Pepsi Cola.

Again there is the presentation of a contented and egalitarian England/Britain, standing against an unpleasant world of 'others'. Southern Englishness predominates, as does an apparent tendency by the authors to attempt to latch onto youth interests (e.g. Spice Girls images), but not quite managing.

All of the books include cartoons/drawings, but in *Textbook C* (116 images) these considerably outnumber photographs. Of the recognisable images, men are represented variously as MPs, statesmen and parents, while women are graduates, weavers, footballers, mothers and a political

activist. The activist is Emily Wilding Davidson, who died trying to stop a horse race during the UK campaign for women's suffrage in 1913.

There is little explicit reference to issues of ethnicity, other than showing black families with black parents. Summarising the history of education in Britain by referring exclusively to legislation affecting education in England presents an inaccurate impression of national unity /consistency; however, Scotland and Ireland have their own separate systems while the Welsh education system shares much with its English counterpart but differences remain.

The international images touch on Europe by the presentation of a members' map, and on the UN through UNICEF. There is reference to relief charities, to refugee camps and asylum seekers, while the more 'stable' environments of an African 'tribal' family and an indigenous South American Weaver are also presented. Notable international figures are shown to be Nelson Mandela (twice), Aung San Suu Kyi, and Osama bin Laden, leading to the Taliban and the events of 11th September 2001. Other international events of record were the Rio de Janeiro environmental summit of 1992, and the Sharpeville massacre in South Africa in March 1960.

While the events of September 2001 were clearly highly pertinent to a 2002 learner, a terrorist attack on a train in Angola the month prior to the USA attacks received no mention. Eleven years later (at the time of writing) the attack in Spain (2004) or, for example, in India (2008), Pakistan (2007), Russia (2002, 2004), Iraq (2004, 2007), Indonesia (2002) – not all perpetrated by al Qaeda – might be more relevant to young European learners with Asian and Eastern European classmates and neighbours. While these clearly could not have been included in texts published prior to the events, there is no evidence of newer texts emerging which contain such references.

Textbook D (283 images) presents employment as predominantly male and white. 36 males included a head teacher, an Imam, two chief executives of large companies, a number of athletes and an heir to a throne. The nine political figures shown in images were all men. The six women portrayed comprise two engineers, one teacher, one dismissed worker, and one monarch, with only the dismissed worker not being a white person. On the broader impression of ethnicity, the Chinese New Year celebrations in London, and the Notting Hill Carnival both appear, as do images of Sikhs,

Jews and Muslims – at a wedding, in school and, separately, meeting Prince Charles. There are also images of the Bradford Race Riots of 2001 and relating to the murder of Stephen Lawrence in 1993. The other criminal reference is to the notorious murder of a two year old boy by two ten year old boys in 1993.

In that uncertain space between the UK and the rest of the world is Ireland. The situation there is illustrated with pictures of troops and civil unrest, with a text which ignores events prior to the late 1960s and makes no mention of the historical relationship between Ireland and the rest of the British Isles. On a more secure international footing, *Textbook D* offers a group of white drummers – part of a missionary group – playing to an indigenous African audience. African wildlife is shown, as are child labour, a ‘send a cow’ campaign aimed at alleviating poverty in the developing world, pictorial reference is made to famine, floods and favela, and there are two pictures of Nelson Mandela and one of Rev Martin Luther King Junior (died 1968). The EU is once more depicted by a map, although there is also reference to the 1989 Prague protests. Protest in Israel/Palestine is illustrated with images of the West Bank, tanks and refugees, again without reference to history other than a version of the most immediate past.

Textbook E (232 images) offers a lot of cartoon-like illustrations which are difficult to categorise under the headings with which this paper is concerned as ethnicity and gender are rarely clear in them. None the less, some pictures do clearly relate to gender and to an international dimension.

Women are shown variously as punk, shopper, nurse, tube driver, mother, computer operator, MP, disabled person, and asylum seeker. The textbook also usefully mentions the UK’s first woman MP, Countess Constance Markievicz, correcting the widely held mistaken belief that it was Lady Nancy Astor. However, neither her name nor her party (Sinn Fein) is named. Uniquely amongst the textbooks considered, men are given comparatively little photographic attention – illustrated as judge, doctor, MP, prisoner, scientist, and disabled person.

The international perspective is more limited than in the other textbooks, but remains noteworthy. The general state of ‘foreignness’ is represented by refugees and reference to 11 September 2001. International politics are illustrated by an EU flag and a picture of the European Parliament, UN

peacekeeping, the ubiquitous Nelson Mandela and Osama bin Laden, GW Bush and New York's Mayor Rudy Giuliani, and Slobodan Milosevic. Giuliani's appearance is in relation to 9/11, while reference to Milosevic concerns his role in the collapse of Yugoslavia as an illustration of the demise of the Soviet bloc. No demonstrations, no monetary union, no internationalist perspective.

Contexts, analysis and discussion

As observed above, events have overtaken all five publications. Responsibility for this cannot be laid at the authors or the publishers of these texts, but the lack of texts which provide reference to them can be laid there and with those schools which fail to invest in up to date learning and teaching materials. There are websites with such references, but not all schools, teachers, pupils, have the time, financial resources, will to find, check, evaluate and use them. It might be expected that qualified and experienced teachers of citizenship can use their wits, awareness, contacts and resources to address the shortfall between published perceptions and evidence-based reality, but there are fewer than 3000 such teachers and 3917 secondary schools. In the most recent government inspection report, ascertaining whether schools manage to adequately address even the limited requirements placed upon them in the teaching of citizenship, it was asserted that 32% of citizenship lessons are not good enough, generally because 'teachers' subject knowledge and expertise led to only limited and superficial learning.' (Ofsted, 2013, p5)

Ethnicity

In UK Census categories (ONS, 2005), ethnicity equates to vague notions of skin colour and region of origin (e.g. Black British, Black African) rather than to any value system or shared set of beliefs or cultural norms, so it is not possible to compare the frequency of ethnicity representations in the textbooks to their statistical frequency in England and Wales (data for Scotland and Ireland are published separately). Between them the books offer a fairly comprehensive and positive image of a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic society. There are positive role models across a range of occupations and social circumstances for members of some minority ethnic groups, although most illustrations of employed people appear to present white people. While this might not offer positive role models, it does reflect reality – unlike the overall impression given by the illustrations.

There were 161 religions listed in the UK census returns (ONS, 2005), mainly subsets of Christianity, but over 4,000,000 decided not to answer this optional questions while roughly 7,300,000 asserted they had no faith at all. Attitudes to religion are perhaps indicated by the 390,127 who identified themselves as Jedi Knights , which placed it as the third most common religion after Christianity and Islam (BRIN, 2011), and by the almost complete lack of news coverage of this. By 2011 the number of Jedi Knights was almost halved, but it was still the 5th most common religion in the UK. (BRIN, 2011).

None of these figures, nor the attitudes behind them, is reflected in the textbooks. There are Muslim, Christian, Jewish and Buddhist representations, but none for atheism, agnosticism, or Jedi. By 2011 over 25% of the population of England and Wales stated they had no religion and a further 7% chose not to respond (ONS, 2012). It is therefore likely that over 30% of the population is non-theistic, yet that possibility is not considered in any of the textbooks.

The range and nature of ethnicity images also raises some questions. While there are clear and positive role models such as Hope Powell and black police officers, the interethnic joy of carnival alongside the Englishness of Morris dancers, we wonder that the only reference to HIV Aids is illustrated with a black woman and her child – when almost 50% of all those with AIDS/ HIV in 2001 were white males (by 2011 66% of AID cases were white and 62% male) and that the incidence of AIDS/HIV transference from mother to child was consistently in the region of <1%, far less than the incidence of transference through homosexual (65%) or heterosexual (32%) activity. (AVERT, 2011)

Most of the books draw attention to the murder of Stephen Lawrence, in South London, in 1993. This was a cause celebre at the time and recognised as a racist murder for which two out of five accused were eventually jailed (in 2013). In 2009, over 9,000 people were convicted of racially aggravated crimes in England (HMG, 2010), a figure we can extrapolate to over 70,000 during the period between Lawrence’s death and the gathering of data for the books. The Institute for Race Relations (IRR, 2012) identifies 96 other racially motivated murders during the same period. To focus on this one event, no matter how significant or media emphasised it became, is to obscure the truth – that young black men are statistically more likely to be stopped and harassed by police officers, or assaulted by people they know, than to be murdered by strangers (Bowling & Phillips, 2007).

The 4.6 million people self-classified as non-white are not evenly distributed across the country but tend to live in the conurbations, with 45% of them living in London. (ONS, 2005, p. 3) It might therefore not be surprising that representations concentrate on that region, but the 45% in one place are shown having fun at Notting Hill or London's China Town, whereas the majority (55%) are 'elsewhere' seen only in relation to race riots. That Stephen Lawrence's murder took place in South London is not mentioned as being significant.

National self-identity is a challenging concept to illustrate through photographs and other images. According to the ONS (2005, p. 7), the majority of non-white people in the UK describe their national identity as British as opposed to English, Scottish or Welsh. Those in the White British group were 'more likely to describe their national identity as English (58%) rather than British (36%)' (ONS, 2005, p. 7) whereas, for example, three quarters (76%) of people of Bangladeshi origin identified themselves as British, whereas only 5% identified themselves as Scottish, English or Welsh (ONS, 2005, p. 7).

Images of employment did not discriminate between occupations and ethnic groups, although menial lower status employment is rarely illustrated. While this perhaps provides positive role models and encourages aspiration amongst all pupils, it does not match reality. Non-whites are more likely to be unemployed than whites (ONS, 2005, p.5), while there is a higher proportion of Chinese and Indian 'professionals' than there are of white professionals. (Proportion and number can serve to confuse here, as there are still many more white professionals than there are from all other ethnic groups, which reflects the relative size of those groups.) In relation to women and employment, there is a particular disparity between image and reality; nursing was the largest area of women's employment (10% of Black African women and 3% of White British women) yet there is only one image of nursing. Similarly, the main occupational areas for Indian women (sewing machinists) and for (Pakistani women (packers, bottlers, canners and fillers) (ONS, 2005, p. 10) are not mentioned.

Gender roles

Gender depiction is largely centred on occupation, in which women and men are represented unevenly – a common feature in all books is the significantly greater number of men than women in

occupational roles and, indeed, in depiction in general. Women are not invisible but, in a proportion of roughly 8:1, they are certainly obscured. The occupations shown for women do include the traditional parent/carer (as they do for men) and some of what Caplow (1978) described as the Ten Deadly C's of women's roles – e.g. shopper, secretary, teacher, nurse, shop assistant. Others women's roles include barrister, MP, journalist, property owner, police officer, food safety officer, footballer, dissident, engineer, punk, tube driver, computer operator; perhaps not representative and certainly not comprehensive, but reasonably aspirational. Although men were shown much more often, the number of roles in which they were portrayed was much more limited – head teacher, Imam, executive, statesman, judge, doctor, MP, scientist, police, trading standards officer, councillor, MP, TV journalist; more limited but generally higher status. That they were also shown as criminals, athletes, footballers and borrowers shows that it was not all male dominant inequality, even if largely so.

Politics – gender, ethnicity, self-image and social class

UK domestic politics are depicted as predominantly male and exclusively white in 2002. Not only does this not provide aspirational role models, it is wildly inaccurate – in 2001 16% of MPs were women (currently 22%) including 5 cabinet members (out of 24) and 4% (no change and none of the cabinet) were members of minority ethnic groups – and came only five years after the country had had its first female prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, who is depicted only once. The only other female political figures depicted are the Queen of the UK and the dissident Burmese, Aung San Suu Kyi despite there being at least nine other women heads of state/ government at that time.

Political action beyond the ballot box is represented in several ways. Images of the 1985 miners' strike, although not with any of the police intimidation and violence (Waddington, 1987; Milne, 2004) feature in one text, while others present environmental protest, Greenpeace, Fair Trade, animal rights and anti-globalization. Emily Davidson's death during the suffrage movement illustrates simultaneously the sacrifices made to get the vote and the dangers inherent in agitation. Europeans are more present here than in sections dealing with the EU, in the form of German anti-nuclear protests and anti-communist protests in Prague in 1989, while the world stage is represented by anti-communist protests in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, also in 1989 and anti-apartheid demonstrations in Sharpeville 1960. Virtually all of these protests resulted from or with

state violence yet none of the books examines or portrays violence by the state as worthy of citizens' concern.

On the world political stage ethnicity/nationality representation is inevitably more diverse than in the UK, but not diverse enough to reflect reality. Nelson Mandela (South Africa) enjoys eight representations, far outstripping all other political figures. He, along with Aung San Suu Kyi (Burma), Ray Giuliani (USA), GW Bush (USA), Kofi Annan (UN) and Martin Luther King (USA), are depicted clearly as role models and defenders of freedom. Presented on behalf of international terror and injustice are Osama bin Laden (al Qaeda) seen three times, Saddam Hussein (Iraq) twice, with Mao Zedung (China) and Milosevic (Serbia/Yugoslavia) one each.

Given that the United Nations had 189 member states when the books were being developed, they might have offered a more contemporary and geographically wide-ranging selection. Limited accounts of the Israel/Palestine situation and of the history of Ireland, the lack of representation of Europeans other than Milosevic and the relative preponderance of figures from the USA and UK/USA 'enemies' in the 'war against terror' are clear reflections of UK government policy and rhetoric. The citizenship National Curriculum extant in 2002 required that pupils should learn about 'the United Kingdom's relations in Europe, including the European Union, and relations with the Commonwealth and the United Nations' (QCA, 2002, p. 196), aspects of the curriculum with which these books deal very superficially, if at all.

The European dimension is reduced to maps and/or photographs of buildings, money, a train and a handshake. The Commonwealth is seen in photographs of meetings of heads of state, and the United Nations is represented through UNICEF, the General Secretary, 'peace-keeping' troops, and pictures of the inside and outside of the UN building in New York. While the accompanying text explains elements of these institutions, there are no pictures of people going about their daily lives as there are for the specifically 'British' content. These organisations are portrayed as separate, impersonal, authoritarian, and different – even though the UK, and therefore England, is a part of each.

The wider international domain rests in stereotypes of child soldiers, child labour, starving Africans, 'tribal' Africans, charity dependence, refugees, famine, floods and favelas. A more positive but still stereotypical image is presented through tourism, wildlife and idyllic West Indian beaches.

Brief critical summary

This paper was introduced as presenting a focus on images of gender, ethnicity, class and Britishness/Englishness in relation to otherness. The outline of political imagery illustrates an isolationist and uninformed image of 'abroad' – that the EU has different money and the world is full of terrorists, starving homeless, and floods; the message appears to be 'thank goodness for the Americans'.

Gender is portrayed largely as an area of equality in England, despite comprehensive data which contradict this viewpoint. There were 1.7 million lone parents with dependent children in the UK in 2001, a figure which grew to 2 million by 2011 - 29% of all families. 92% of lone parent households were headed by women (a situation which had not changed by 2011 (ONS, 2011c), yet neither the general issue of lone-parent households nor the specific one of female-led families was addressed in any of the books. One of the consequences of such households is inequality of income, and data clearly indicate that the gap between male and female income is narrowing. At the current rate, extrapolating from TUC (2007), full-time wages will be the gender equal by 2057 and part-time wages by 2067. As Metcalf puts it, there is undoubtedly 'a problem of pay discrimination and that women's work is undervalued' (2009, p. iv). Gender discrimination in wages has been illegal in England since 1970, so this might also give fuel to any discussion on the meaning and value of equality in law.

Ethnic inequalities are more clearly illustrated but still underplayed. There can be no doubt that 'pay gaps are substantial for most, but not necessarily all, major ethnic minority groups. The gaps cannot be explained by the age, education or foreign birth of ethnic minority groups' (Metcalf, 2009, p. v). However, it should be noted that extant inequalities with regard to ethnicity are not restricted to wages or other forms of income. There is the paradoxically that, while 'the risk of being a victim of personal crime was higher for adult members of all BME groups than for the White group . . . Black persons were stopped and searched 7 times more than White people . . . and . . . 21,878 prisoners

(just under 26%) were from BME groups' (HMG, 2010). Unemployment is higher amongst ethnic minority groups. Life expectancy is lower. None of this appears in the GCSE images or in text.

The books offer a fixation with historical references which, while generally accurate and often appropriate to the contexts in which they are presented, are none the less highly selective. Sharpeville (1960), the Prague uprising and Tiananmen Square (both 1989) illustrate state violence against the people, yet no mention is made of for example the UK government's use of the army against striking Welsh miners in 1910 and 1911, of tanks against Scottish workers in 1926, nor of the use of the army to break strikes in the 1980s. Reference to suffragettes and to the first woman MP show that there is not a reluctance to consider the early twentieth century, but only to what might be presented as progressive rather than establishment-directed oppression.

Neither the photographs nor the text have anything to say with regard to social class. This might, of course, mean that social class is a term no longer relevant to life in England/UK; it is certainly missing from the 'equality strands' which form the basis of current legislation. However, had reference to class been made, illustrations, photographs or text might have had to address that '[t]here were large social class inequalities in self rated health, with rates of poor health generally increasing from class 1 (higher professional occupations) to class 7 (routine occupations). . . Women had higher rates of poor health compared to men in the same social class' (Doran et al, 2004). They might have had to address the ethnicity and gender inequalities identified earlier in this paper and, crucially, the reasons for these and other inequalities. They might have had to consider why it is, for example, that 7% of the population produces 38% of MPs, 47% of Oxford University undergraduates, 54% of Chief Executives, 60% of the Cabinet, 68% of barristers and 70% of judges (Hansard, 2013; Sutton Trust, 2009, 2010, 2012; Leighton, 2013)

Conclusions

The books provide what Banks (2004) terms an 'assimilationist model', not unlike that which underpinned Parks' (1926) 'Immigrant/Host Model' within the Chicago School of sociology – that those with power are secure, reasonable and rational beings in a stable and wholesome society, and that newcomers and dissidents must learn to fit in and accept the status quo. This is also the

situation which Gramsci describes as a dominant hegemony. Whilst it is true that cultural, national, and global identifications are interrelated in a developmental way, and that students cannot develop thoughtful and clarified national identifications until they have reflective and clarified cultural identifications, and that they cannot develop a global or cosmopolitan identification until they have acquired a reflective national identification (Banks 2004, p295), we must, on the basis of these textbooks, consider the nature of those images with which students are required to relate and upon which they are required to reflect. That those images represent a highly selective and distorted version of the reality of being English, one which promotes a false consciousness and acceptance of the status quo, is beyond doubt.

References

- Ali-Khan, C. (2013) Seeing what we mean: visual knowledge and critical epistemology, in Kress, T. M. (ed) *Using Critical Research for Educational and Social Change* Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 43-62 [a reproduction of *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 24 (3)]
- Althusser, L. (1971) *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays* London and New York: Monthly Review Press
- Andrews, K. R. (1991) *Trade, Plunder, and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire 1480 – 1630*. Cambridge: CUP
- AVERT (2012) *UK HIV and AIDS Statistics* <http://www.avert.org/uk-statistics.htm> (accessed 28 July, 2013)
- Bailey, R. (1996) The Irony of The National Curriculum, in Hayes, D. (ed) *Debating Education: Issues for the new millennium?* Canterbury: Canterbury Christ Church College, pp. 14-18
- Banks, J. A. (2004) Teaching for Social Justice, Diversity, and Citizenship in a Global World. *Educational Forum*, 68, pp. 289-297
- Bowling, B. & Phillips, C. (2007) Disproportionate and discriminatory: reviewing the evidence on police stop and search. *The Modern Law Review*, 70(6), pp. 936-961
- BRIN (2011) *British Religion in Numbers* <http://www.brin.ac.uk/figures/> (accessed 25 July 2013)
- Burns' Country <http://www.robertburns.org/works/97.shtml> (accessed 6 July 2013)
- Caplow, T. (1978) *The Sociology of Work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Carney, R. N. & Levin, J. R. (2002) Pictorial Illustrations Still Improve Students' Learning From Text. *Educational Psychology Review*, 14(1), pp. 5-26
- Department for Education (2013a) *The National Curriculum in England: Framework document*. London: DfE

Department for Education (2013b) <http://www.education.gov.uk/popularquestion> Accessed 18 October 2013

Doran, T., Drever, S., & Whitehead, M. (2004) Is there a north-south divide in social class inequalities in health in Great Britain? Cross sectional study using data from the 2001 census. *British Medical Journal*, pp. 328-1043 <http://www.bmj.com/content/328/7447/1043>(accessed 7 August 2013)

Fang, Z. (1996) Illustrations, text, and the child reader. What are pictures in children's storybooks for? *Read. Horizons*, 37(1)

Freire, P. (2006) *Pedagogy of Hope*. New York: Continuum

Gallagher, J. (2004) *The Decline, Revival and Fall of the British Empire: The Ford Lectures and other Essays*. Cambridge: CUP

Gedicks, F. M. (2009) An Originalist Defense Of Substantive Due Process: Magna Carta, Higher-Law Constitutionalism, And The Fifth Amendment. *Emory Law Journal*, 58, pp. 585-673

HMG (Her Majesty's Government) (2010) *Statistics on race and the criminal justice system 2010 - statistical tables*
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/race-and-the-criminal-justice-system-3> Accessed 28 July 2013

Human Rights Review (2012)
http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/humanrights/hrr_article_11.pdf (accessed 16 October 2013)

IRR (Institute of Race Relations) (2012) *96 Murder's Since Stephen Lawrence's*
<http://www.irr.org.uk/news/96-murders-since-stephen-lawrences/> (accessed 29 July 2013)

Leighton, R. (2012) *Teaching Citizenship Education: A Radical Approach*. London: Continuum

Leighton, R. (2013) *Citizenship Education for children of the elite in England*. Paper presented to CiCe conference, University of Lisbon, June 2013

McLeod, B. (2009) *The Geography Of Empire In English Literature 1580–1745*. Cambridge: CUP

Metcalfe, H (2009) *Pay gaps across the equality strands: a review*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission

Miles, R. (1984) *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. London: Taylor and Francis

Milne, S. (2004) *The Enemy Within: The Secret War Against The Miners*. London: Verso

OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education) (2013) *Citizenship consolidated?* Manchester: Ofsted

ONS (Office of National Statistics) (2005) *Focus on Ethnicity & Identity*. London: Office for National Statistics

ONS (2011a) *Who we are; How we live; What we do*
<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/census/2011/index.html>(accessed 28 July 2013)

- ONS (2011b) *Population Estimates by Ethnic Group 2002 – 2009*. Newport: ONS
- ONS (2011c) <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/family-demography/families-and-households/2011/stb-families-households.html> Accessed 7 August 2013
- Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) (2010) *Citizenship established? Citizenship in schools 2006/09*. Manchester: Ofsted
- Park, R. (1926) *The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and a Moral Order*. Chicago: UCP
- Postman, V. (1970) The politics of reading, in Keddie, N. (ed) (1978) *Tinker, Tailor . . . the myth of cultural deprivation*. London: Penguin
- QCA (2002) *The National Curriculum for England and Wales: Teachers' Handbook*. Nottingham: QCA/DfES
- Sen, A. (1999) Democracy as a Universal Value. *Journal of Democracy*, 10(3), pp. 3-17
- TUC (2007) *Closing the Gender Pay Gap: An update report for TUC Women's Conference 2008* <http://www.tuc.org.uk/equality/tuc-14435-f0.pdf> Accessed 7 August 2013
- UK National Archives
http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pathways/citizenship/struggle_democracy/getting_vote.htm (accessed 16th October 2013)
- Waddington, P. A. J. (1987) Towards Paramilitarism? Dilemmas in Policing Civil Disorder. *British Journal of Criminology*, 27(1) pp. 37-46
- Wilkins, C, (1999) Making 'Good Citizens': The social and political attitudes of PGCE students. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25(1-2), pp. 217-230

What are the gender, class and ethnicity of citizenship? A study of upper secondary school students' views on Citizenship Education in England and Sweden

Laila Nielsen & Ralph Leighton (2017)

The purpose of this article is to examine and compare how the ethnicity, gender and social class conditions of citizenship influence, and are understood by, teachers and secondary school students in England and Sweden. The intention is also to compare how conditions of citizenship are dealt with in social studies for upper secondary school in England and Sweden. The relationship between students' education and real conditions for citizenship is complex and partly differs between, as well as within, the two countries. The present comparative examination and analysis aims to visualize both specific and common conditions of citizenship in England and Sweden. This is to draw attention to how the meaning of frequently used terminology and images in the field of Citizenship Education do not always coincide with teachers' and students' own opinions and perceived meanings. By doing this we hope to contribute some new knowledge regarding one of the most difficult challenges that citizenship education is struggling with, whether the provided knowledge and values prepare today's youth to defend and develop future democratic and just societies. To achieve this, we have conducted a number of interviews with teachers and secondary school students and asked them about their experiences and opinions regarding Citizenship Education and the nature of citizenship. The following main questions were central to the interviews:

- What knowledge and skills does a citizen need in a democracy and how is the meaning of citizenship connected to gender, class and ethnicity?
- How are personal liberties affected by the citizen's gender, class and ethnicity according to the respondents?
- What are teachers' and students' experiences of Citizenship Education and how does school pay attention to citizens' conditions based on gender, class and ethnicity?

In recent years, both public debate and published research⁹ have shown that, in order to understand the real meanings of citizenship, it is necessary to understand and interpret formal citizenship rights and responsibilities from individuals' social and cultural conditions as characterised by gender, ethnicity and social class. During the 2000s, the Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket) presented recurrent reports that shows how socio-economic background, in combination with foreign background, are crucial for pupils' school results. The reports also show how segregation between schools and residential areas has increased on the basis of residents' socio-economic and ethnic background.¹⁰ This group of students are a part of tomorrow's citizens, which are also likely to remain marginalized even as adults. The links between Swedish school policy, pupils' school results and the democratic development of society at large has been observed and analysed in contemporary Swedish research.¹¹

In England, the picture is slightly different with the 7 per cent of the population who experience private education being over-represented in positions of power and influence. In May 2012, the then Secretary of State for Education Michael Gove provided a list of leaders in the arts, sciences, politics, sports, journalism, entertainment and other fields who had all been to independent schools, concluding that

“the sheer scale, the breadth and the depth, of private school dominance of our society points to a deep problem in our country . . . Those who are born poor are more likely to stay poor and those who inherit privilege are more likely to pass on privilege in England than in any comparable county.”¹²

There is significant evidence that socio-economic background, in combination with ethnic background, continue to be highly influential on pupils' school results.¹³ Links between national education policy, social class and pupils' school results appear to remain entrenched in England.

⁹ For example: Leighton, 2012; Shafir, 1998; Sheldrick, 2015. The difference is illustrated by the perception of several respondents that men and women are *formally* entitled to equal pay but, in *reality*, there is a pay imbalance.

¹⁰ Swedish National Agency's (Skolverket) reports from the years 2004, 2012 and 2016.

¹¹ See for example: The Swedish Governments official investigations (SOU); 2005:112, Englund, 2000; Boström, 2001; Dahlstedt, 2009; Strandbrink and Åkerström, 2010; Larsson, 2013.

¹² Gove, 2012.

¹³ Gillborn, et al,2012; UK government, 2016.

When we identify cultural and social conditions as in any way hindering the status of citizenship, we do so from a perspective which does not seek to blame the less powerful for holding particular cultural perceptions but which recognises the barriers a dominant culture sets against those with less power. The insight that tells us it is necessary to comprehend individuals' social and cultural conditions in order to understand and interpret their formal citizenship rights and responsibilities is not, however, particularly recent. Marx wrote over 160 years ago that, "if you assume a particular civil society . . . you will get particular political conditions"¹⁴, from which it must follow that any society divided on the grounds of class, ethnicity and gender will present political conditions which reflect such divisions. It is also the case that there is likely to be a significant space between *what is* (the real) and *what is perceived* (the formal); just because there is inequality it does not follow that everyone is aware of that inequality.

A theoretical approach to citizenship and how it interacts with gender, class and ethnic background

In order to clarify the conditions necessary for citizenship in its real meaning (as opposed to the merely formal), we refer to the British sociologist T. H. Marshall's noted lecture in 1949. In Marshall's main thesis regarding Citizenship is that, in Western industrialized countries, it takes three forms:

- i. *Civil Citizenship*, which is represented in equality before the law, freedom of speech and freedom of religion, and other personal liberties;
- ii. *Political Citizenship*, typified by universal and equal suffrage
- iii. *Social Citizenship*, including the right to education, health care, and other conditions for social welfare.¹⁵

These forms of citizenship share equality as a common principle, which must include social citizenship as a right that involves benefits for all citizens. Marshall defined citizenship as "a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community"¹⁶, in accordance with his forms above. As Yuval-Davis points out, by linking citizenship to membership in a community, Marshall's definition makes it possible to discuss citizenship as potentially simultaneous membership of several collectives, such as neighbourhood, social class, ethnicity, nation or international community.¹⁷ We

¹⁴ Marx and Engels, 1973, p. 660.

¹⁵ Marshall, 1950/1991.

¹⁶ Ibid. p. 14.

¹⁷ Yuval-Davis, 1997, p. 6.

regard the meanings of civil and political citizenship to be understandable in themselves, while social citizenship requires further definition and clarification. Social citizenship relates to the extent to which people of all socially constructed categories have sufficient conditions and capabilities to be considered as full citizens of any given society. This is not only in terms of their legal status but has to include their status and experiences in relation to those of other citizens and as seen by those other citizens. It is not enough, for example, to have legislation that grants equal rights with regard to pay or employment; social citizenship requires that people's daily experience is that they do have equality of payment and employment, and that their fellow citizens regard this as natural and proper. What is therefore more significant here is recognition by the 'ordinary person' of the attitudes, accepted practices, existing prejudices etc. which limit people's social citizenship, i.e. the *real* citizenship.

Feminist scholars have criticized Marshall's position for failing to discuss the issues of gender and racial hierarchies within society.¹⁸ While this might be excused by some to be a reflection of Marshall's time and place, we consider that this nonetheless ignores the limitations which are placed on Marshall's position as an approach to be currently applied. We agree with the criticisms of the lack of awareness and consideration of gendered and ethnically imposed hierarchies, and believe that class, ethnic and gender perspectives must all be included in the real meaning of citizenship.¹⁹ In this intersectional approach, sexuality and disability are also important aspects of and influenced by people's conditions, and are therefore also needed for a more complete understanding of the meaning of citizenship. These latter factors were not included in this study and we recognise this as a shortcoming and as aspects of real citizenship to be considered as our research continues to develop.

As we show below,²⁰ recent research and debate in both countries show how gender, class and ethnicity have great influence on students' conditions and results in school, which generally has shown to also have a significant impact on youngsters' future prospects as adult citizens. In this intersectional approach, we support the view of Yuval-Davis that these aspects in focus should not

¹⁸ Fraser and Gordon, 1992.

¹⁹ The theoretical approach based on T. H. Marshall's theory of citizenship and Fraser and Gordon's critique of the same is also used in Nielsen, 2015, p. 103-104.

²⁰ Read the section on "The importance of ethnicity, gender and class for students' school results in a Swedish/English context" below.

primarily be seen as perspectives of social differences in an additive way. Instead, we consider them as aspects that, depending on the specific empirical context, interact mutually to constitute the conditions that affect people differently.²¹ As an example, a female student of Asian and middle class background in England might not share her experiences and conditions from school with an English middle class girl, nor with an Asian middle class girl in Sweden. In order to avoid getting lost in diffusely relativity reasoning we make use of Yuval-Davis' three analytical levels from which political and social belongings are constructed:

"The first facet concerns social locations; the second relates to people's identifications and emotional attachments to various collectivities and groupings and the third relates to ethical and political value systems with which people judge their own and others' belonging/s. These different facets are interrelated, but cannot be reduced to each other."²²

As the present study focuses on students' conditions and values, citizenship education as a school's mission to educate and prepare the future citizens of society, knowledge is a key issue. A person's knowledge can be formed and influenced by social locations in several ways. For instance the formal school system, based on political decisions, represents in itself a set of values as well as objectives and guidelines for the schooling students are offered. In many Western countries, residential segregation has long been a growing problem both between urban and rural areas as well as between neighbourhoods in cities. The different geographical areas of people's belonging and origin are examples of how social locations have multiplied in pace with globalization. These, often multifaceted, experiences give people different types of knowledge that is more or less valued and useful in a certain context. The diverse contexts compose an essential part of the identity and emotional attachments a person has to different groups. For some young people, the school has a crucial importance for the opportunities or limitations they may have later in life. For others, the importance of social and cultural origin overshadows the importance of formal school education. As Yuval-Davis points out, 'not all belonging/s are as important to people in the same way and to the same extent and emotions, as perceptions, shift in different times and situations and are more or less reflective.'²³ For example, certain identities and affiliations tend to become more important to people the more threatened they become or believe they become. From this follows the third analytical level, that different social locations and belongings are also strongly affected by how these are assessed and valued by one self and by others. It may be a question of whether they are

²¹ Yuval-Davis, 2011, p. 4.

²² Ibid, p. 5.

²³ Yuval-Davis, 2011, p. 5.

considered as good or bad for a group or person. This analytical level of ethical and political value systems is also related to how categorical boundaries should be drawn in the sense of attitudes and ideologies to be considered as inclusive or exclusive.²⁴

The intersectional approach, based on Yuval-Davis research, represents a necessary development of Marshall's theory of citizenship, one which aims to visualise the complex picture of how citizenship and citizenship education interacts with gender, class and ethnic background in England and Sweden.

Citizenship Education provision in the two countries

Citizenship Education has been a statutory part of England's National Curriculum for secondary age pupils (12-16) since 2002. Public examination is not compulsory and it is frequently the case that schools do not observe the minimum statutory requirements²⁵. It can also be noted that the National Curriculum for Citizenship has gone through various iterations,²⁶ which has made it difficult for teachers, particularly non-specialists, to respond to statutory requirements.²⁷

There are no compulsory subjects for the research age group (16-18 years) in England's National Curriculum, and Citizenship Education is no longer available for study by the research age-group, so it is as well to be aware of the background education that age-group should have had in the subject. At the time of conducting interviews there was no requirement for Citizenship Education in the primary phase (4-10 years). The National Curriculum for 11-14years provides detailed direction on the content to be taught, with the overarching principles being that

Teaching should develop pupils' understanding of democracy, government and the rights and responsibilities of citizens. Pupils should use and apply their knowledge and understanding while developing skills to research and interrogate evidence, debate and evaluate viewpoints, present reasoned arguments and take informed action.²⁸

²⁴ Ibid. p. 5-6.

²⁵ Keating et al, 2010; Leighton, 2012, 2013; Ofsted, 2006, 2010.

²⁶ QCA, 2002, 2007, 2010; Department for Education, 2013a.

²⁷ Keating et al, 2010.

²⁸ National Curriculum in England, 2013.

Some new content is required for 14-16 years, with the expectation that a spiral curriculum²⁹ will enable greater breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding. The instruction here is that:

Teaching should build on the [above] programme of study to deepen pupils' understanding of democracy, government and the rights and responsibilities of citizens. Pupils should develop their skills to be able to use a range of research strategies, weigh up evidence, make persuasive arguments and substantiate their conclusions. They should experience and evaluate different ways that citizens can act together to solve problems and contribute to society.³⁰

As Citizenship is no longer available as an examination subject for students aged 16-18, the sample in England were primarily students of Sociology and/or Politics and/or Psychology, with English Literature also widely studied.

Best practise in the teaching of Citizenship Education militates against the use of textbooks as many of the 'facts' and personalities central to the subject change at a pace which outstrips processes of publication. Specialist teachers of Citizenship Education are often encouraged during their pre-service education to ensure that learning is tailored to their pupils' interests and experiences.³¹ The report which recommended the introduction of Citizenship Education into England's National Curriculum also offered advice on teaching strategies, advice which has been unevenly adopted.³² The state school pupils in the sample all attended schools which complied with the statutory curriculum and were taught by specialist teachers. Neither situation was the case at the independent school.

The Swedish school is expected to equip students with the skills and knowledge they need as citizens in a democratic society, which may also be called civic competences. The national curriculum presents frameworks, conditions and goals for the school's mission to promote democracy, fundamental values and norms. In the Swedish school, and unlike the English school system, citizenship education is not represented as a separate school subject; instead it is the community-

²⁹ Bruner, 2009.

³⁰ National Curriculum in England, 2013.

³¹ Leighton, 2012.

³² Keating et al. 2010.

oriented school subjects³³ that, together with a set of norms and values, are responsible for citizenship education. In the Curriculum for upper secondary school it appears from the first paragraph that “Education should impart and establish respect for human rights and the fundamental democratic values on which Swedish society^{[L]_{SEP}} is based.”³⁴ When it comes to societal rights and obligations the schools fundamental values regarding citizenship education are spelled out as:

It is not in itself sufficient that education imparts knowledge of fundamental democratic values. It must also be carried out using democratic working methods and develop the students’ ability and willingness to take personal responsibility and participate actively in societal life. Opportunities for students to exercise influence over their education and take responsibility for their studies requires that the school clarifies the goals of education, its contents and working forms, as well as the rights and obligations that students have.³⁵

Among the community-oriented school subjects, with special responsibility for citizenship education, the contents of the subject Social studies distinguishes itself with the clearest focus on the mission to prepare and train future citizens. The subject is by its nature interdisciplinary and consists mainly from political science, sociology and humanities.³⁶ In the aim of the subject Social Studies it says for example; “[...] teaching should contribute to creating conditions for active participation in the life of society.”³⁷ The overall subject content should give students the opportunities to develop the following:

- 1) Knowledge of democracy and human rights, both individual and collective rights, social issues, social conditions, as well as the function and organization of different societies from local to global levels based on different interpretations and perspectives.
- 2) Knowledge of the importance of historical conditions and how different ideological, political, economic, social and environmental conditions affect and are affected by individuals, groups and social structures.^{[L]_{SEP}}

³³ That is social studies, history, religion and geography.

³⁴ Skolverket, *Curriculum for the upper secondary school*, 2013, p. 4.

³⁵ *Ibid.* p. 5.

³⁶ It also includes other disciplines from social sciences and humanities.

³⁷ Skolverket, *Subject Plan in Social studies*, 2011.

3) The ability to analyse social issues and identify causes and consequences using concepts, theories, models and methods from the social sciences. ^[L]_{SEP}

4) The ability to search for, critically examine and interpret information from different sources and assess their relevance and credibility. ^[L]_{SEP}

5) The ability to express their knowledge of social studies in various types of presentation.

^[L]_{SEP}

These different knowledge and skills are taught in courses of three different levels. For all secondary school programmes - both vocational and university preparatory - the first level of 100 credits is compulsory, which means basic knowledge in the subject of social studies. The core content covers points 1-5 above and is for example about how democracy and political systems work at local and national level, and in the EU; human rights; the labour market; group and individual identity; personal finance and methods for critically processing information. ³⁸ It is also compulsory for all programmes to study the first 100 credits in the courses of history and 50 credits of the subject religion. ³⁹

In addition to these fundamental compulsory courses, it is only the pre-university programmes that offer in-depth education in these subjects. Before the school reform GY2011, all secondary school programmes gave competence to higher education, but as a result of the reform, the (for citizenship education so important) community-oriented compulsory courses at higher levels disappeared from the vocational programmes. ⁴⁰

The importance of ethnicity, gender and class for students' school results in a Swedish context

In the light of recent years' socio-economic and political changes in Sweden, research has shown that gender, class belonging and ethnic origin **do** have significant impact on the extent to which students succeed in school as well as for their future and general life conditions as adult citizens. Englund described in 1999 how one of the most obvious changes that have taken place in the

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Skolverket, "program structure and degree objectives", 2016.

⁴⁰ Students in vocational programmes, however, may within each programme select courses that give general qualifications for higher education. But, unfortunately, this is not so common.

Swedish school system happened in the 1980s' shift in approach from the 'public good' to the 'private good'. In short, the 'public good' approach derived from a tradition of education where post-war reforms aimed at providing an equal education and citizenship education that was available to all regardless of background. The shift to a 'private good' represented social and political changes with liberal overtones in the 1980' in Sweden as well as in other Western countries. Focus shifted from equality in its former meaning to the individual's/family's needs and freedom of choice for the children's future. According to 'private good' private school alternatives, school capitation allowance and a free choice of school have been reforms that in a fundamental way changed the conditions for school activities.⁴¹ The Swedish school agency presented a report in 2006 in order to illuminate the development of equivalence in schools during the period 1998 – 2004. It appeared from the report that equivalence in Swedish schools has deteriorated during the period covered. One conclusion was that freedom of choice and decentralization reforms in the early 1990s in all probability contributed to this development, although other factors may also have played a role.⁴²

In 2012 a follow up to the 2006 report was presented which provided a longer time perspective. The 2012 report showed that results between schools had increased significantly which, from an international perspective, was a low level that more than doubled since the late 1990s.⁴³ During the same period of school reforms, which is the last two-three decades, Swedish society has also changed regarding socio-economic conditions shown as widening gaps between rich and poor. For example, the income gap has increased by 31 percent between 1991 and 2010.⁴⁴ In the 2012 report the School agency concluded that over the whole period, 1998-2011 there have been no major changes in the importance of the connections between socio-economic background and deteriorating school results. The student groups which have the greatest difficulties to achieve passing grades in school are especially students of immigrant background, combined with poor socio-economic conditions.⁴⁵ In the PISA report presented in 2013, it appears that Swedish 15-year-olds' knowledge of mathematics, reading and science continues to deteriorate. This trend appears as the worst of all OECD countries.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Englund, 1999, pp. 30-32. Swedish school politics are discussed further in Nielsen, 2013 and 2015.

⁴² National Agency for Education, "Summary", 2012.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Government's spring budget bill, 2012.

⁴⁵ National Agency for Education, 2012.

⁴⁶ PISA, 2012, Education's report.

In addition to class and ethnicity, school results also depend on gender. A summary of the Swedish school statistics shows that boys, on average, reach 90 % of the girls' achievements. There is also a larger proportion of boys who receive various types of special education. The statistics also show that the differences in results based on gender are not related to ethnicity or social background. Although the proportion among the most low achievers are boys, that does not explain the whole average difference of 90 %.⁴⁷

In summary, students' affiliation based on gender, class and ethnicity are of great importance to both the greater disparities and the total deterioration of the results in Swedish schools during the past decades. The causes of these correlations have been analysed and discussed in numerous reports and studies, and is not the primary focus here.

The importance of ethnicity, gender and class for students' school results in an English context

Recent research shows that, to some extent similar to Sweden, social and cultural conditions continue to have a significant impact on students' success in school in England, as well as on their future and general life conditions as adult citizens. However, it is very clear that the effects of gender and ethnicity on examination performance do not show success as a white male prerogative⁴⁸ as girls outperform boys in almost all subjects and, within social classes, there is little significant difference in achievement by ethnic groups other than that students of Chinese origin are more likely to gain higher grades.

Girls continue to outperform boys at the age of 16, when school pupils in England sit their public examinations prior to either leaving education for work or continuing in academic or vocation education for at least two further years. Other than in economics, mathematics, and physics, girls achieve higher grades than boys at 16 and 18.⁴⁹ Girls out-perform boys in every social class, although middle class boys out-perform working class girls. While it is possible to identify an overall higher level of achievement for girls, grades vary considerably between subjects and such data also have to

⁴⁷ SOU, 2010:51, p. 12.

⁴⁸ UK Government, 2016.

⁴⁹ Joseph Rowntree Trust, 2012.

be considered with regard to entry numbers.⁵⁰

Ethnicity is perceived as having a more complex relationship with education than in Sweden. Pupils of Chinese origin achieved a pass rate of 78.2%, the highest for any ethnic group, and they are joined by Indian, Irish, Bangladeshi and black African pupils in outperforming their white British peers.⁵¹

Social class is less clearly definable than gender and ethnicity but it remains true that “[s]ocial class remains the strongest predictor of academic achievement”,⁵² a situation made more complex by other factors when we consider that “pupils eligible for free school meals, those whose first language is other than English, and pupils with SEN [Special Educational Needs] continue to perform less well than their peers”.⁵³ In England 12 % of pupils do not have English as a first language and, across the country, over 300 languages are spoken in the homes of school-aged pupils.

While overall examination results in English schools have not shown deteriorated in recent years, it is clear that such results in areas of multiple deprivation continue to fall behind those in more affluent and otherwise less deprived regions.⁵⁴ The pupil group which has the greatest difficulties in achieving passing grades is working-class white males, with recent female migrants from the Indian sub-continent also faring particularly poorly. It has been demonstrated⁵⁵ that socio-economic deprivation is the single most important factor in educational attainment in England in this period, irrespective of gender or ethnicity. PISA (2015) confirms that immigrant status had no statistically significant impact on examination performance.

It is therefore beyond dispute that students' gender, class and ethnicity are of great importance to the disparities in results in recent decades, with social class being the significantly most substantial factor.

⁵⁰ Social Trends, 2014.

⁵¹ UK Government, 2016

⁵² Perry and Francis, 2015.

⁵³ UK Government, 2016.

⁵⁴ Office of National Statistics, 2014.

⁵⁵ Gilborn et al, 2012.

Comparative summary

Based on the summary description of how previous research and reports have understood the importance of ethnicity, gender and class for students' school results in Sweden and England, there follow some reflections. A clear similarity is apparent from investigations in both countries is that girls generally perform better in school than boys. The Swedish school agency showed in a report that students' results had increased between schools in a period of at least thirteen years. The agency concluded that the student groups being over-represented among the declining school results had a combined background of immigrants and poor socio-economic condition.⁵⁶ This conclusion shows the importance of not looking at different social differences separately, but in combination, which is to visualise how different aspects mutually interact to constitute the conditions that prove to have great explanatory value in the Swedish school context. However, because this type of survey report is based on statistics, as well as on the questions submitted, it does not appear clearly whether school results differ between different ethnic groups or in combination with the students' gender. The report also raises new questions such as if the social location of the school context – or any other contexts – appears as the most important community to the students when it comes to their identity or valuation of different locations? Comparing the Swedish case to the English, it appears clearly that the English students' ethnic background shows a more complex relationship with school results. Current English research also shows that the student group having the greatest difficulties in achieving passing grades in school is the white male students of working-class background. Also these conclusions raise further questions; how do the students value the importance of their own social class or ethnic background? What other communities or groups do they identify themselves or others with, and, what ethical and political values, do they express? These are some of the questions we asked our respondents.

Methodology

We decided on focus group interviews of senior pupils and individual interviews of teachers, using opportunity samples of schools. As Griffiths demonstrates with her billiard ball analogy⁵⁷, it is extremely unlikely that another researcher (or, if we were to repeat the study, that we) would make the same inquiries of the same sample and get the same answers to be analysed in the same way to produce the same results. It is also highly improbable that, if we had interviewed each other's samples, we would have obtained the same results. Of greater importance than replicability was that there is validity, that what we have identified, analysed and discussed gave an insight into

⁵⁶ National Agency for Education, "Summary", 2012.

⁵⁷ Griffiths, 1998.

perceptions of 'the Citizen' in both Sweden and England. Focus groups allowed our pupil respondents to feed off each other in offering or challenging ideas and perceptions, while the individual interviews with teachers were directed more to an awareness of school provision and the realities of that professional context. The English students were interviewed in mixed groups and the Swedish students in separated groups according to gender.⁵⁸

We recognise that differences in sample and differences in 'follow up' questions could be seen to create difficulties for consistency of analysis and comparison. However, we interpret those differences as, in themselves, data to be considered and analysed. That teachers and/or students in England and Sweden understand both ethnicity and social class in different ways tells us something about the different ways in which citizenship identity is constructed in the two countries. As an example, since English is widely spoken internationally, language is seen as a more significant issue in Sweden than in England. Therefore, it makes sense for this to be pursued by the interviewer in one context more than the other. In summary, the variance of emphasis and in perception of what is important is, in itself, an indicator of differences in what constitutes being a citizen. What is perhaps more important for the study's results are some significant differences between the socio-economic contexts the respondents were from as well as their present school context. Students from the Swedish sample group who read vocational programmes were more clearly influenced by both social heritage and study direction than was the case among the English students from working class backgrounds. One possible reason for these differences was that the English students' studies were more theoretically oriented than the Swedish vocational programmes. These differences appeared from their answers and from how the students had acquired their knowledge and positions on various social issues.

In both countries the sub-samples were 26 learners and 4 teachers, not large enough to be representative but certainly large enough to be considered usefully indicative. Although identical in size, they were not identical in composition as all the English sub-sample were in their final two years of schooling, while the Swedish sample included four adult female students of Swedish as a second language. Three of the English schools were state schools with the other coming from the

⁵⁸ The decision to split the Swedish students into different groups based on gender was a conscious choice by Nielsen. The decision was based on an assumption and from previous experiences that youngsters – and girls in particular – express themselves differently in gender separate groups. However, we do not believe that the various approaches have influenced the results in each country in any way that would have a significant impact on comparisons.

independent⁵⁹ sector, while the Swedish sample comprised two vocational oriented secondary schools, one university preparatory secondary school and one adult education school.

The class, gender and ethnic composition of the English sub-sample was:

Girls Middle Class Black English = 1

Girls Middle Class White English = 4

Girls Working Class White English = 11

Boys Working Class Asian/English = 1

Boys Working class White English = 9

Teachers: 2 male, 2 female. Two of the teachers were of students interviewed while two were not.

The class, gender and ethnic composition of the Swedish sub-sample was:

Girls Middle Class Swedish = 4

Girls Middle Class of immigrant background = 3

Girls Working Class Swedish = 2 + 3 (small farmers)

Girls Working Class of immigrant background = 3

Boys Middle Class Swedish = 3

Boys Middle Class of immigrant background = 2

Boys Working Class Swedish = 5 + 1 (small farmers)

Female teachers Middle Class Swedish = 1

Female teachers Working Class Swedish = 2

Male teacher Middle Class Swedish = 1

⁵⁹ 7% of school student in England attend schools which are wholly independent of the National Curriculum and other state strictures and which charge fees of up to £40,000 annually. State schools have been given increasing autonomy from local authority control but most remain answerable to the Secretary of State for Education; independent schools are not so answerable.

It was found that, when analysing data, definitions of ethnicity vary between the two countries. In England someone of Indian heritage who was born in the UK would be considered to be a British Asian (or, as described above, Asian English); in Sweden that person would be classified of immigrant background.⁶⁰

We collaborated on the design of the interview schedule which addressed general areas regarding the required taught curriculum, teachers' and students' experiences of citizenship teaching and learning and the experiences of being a citizen. We agreed in advance that the schedule should be a guide rather than a script, allowing respondents the freedom to address those issues they considered most important and allowing the interviewers scope in returning to themes raised in previous interviews.

Results

The presentation of results from our interviews is based on the themes that have been discussed with the respondents. After each theme there is a brief comparative summary, which is expanded upon in the concluding section of this article. Due to the different techniques used to record the interviews there are significantly fewer verbatim quotations in the presentation of results from England. This provides an unfortunately uneven impression but is unavoidable due to differences in technical support and does not reflect differences in degree of depth or accuracy of recorded responses.

What knowledge and skills does a citizen need in a democracy and how is the meaning of citizenship connected to gender, class and ethnicity?

England

The key factors identified by teachers were a need for citizens to be a) media savvy, and b) politically literate in the sense of both understanding the political system and in knowing how to access political processes. There was virtual unanimity amongst the school students that the greatest skill set required of citizens was that which enabled them to get involved, recognising that this had to be

⁶⁰ The classification according to class, gender and ethnicity is based on the respondents' own information and identities. It is possible that official statistics or relevant research in the area had made a different classification. For the present study, we considered that the respondents' own identities constituted the most appropriate basis.

preceded by a desire to get involved. For them this was more than watching news or reading newspapers, and had to involve developing the skills required to understand how to interpret media content and how to articulate argument and discussion with others regarding that content and the motives behind its inclusion.

One male teacher expressed the opinion that social class appears to have disappeared from discussion, even though its influence clearly remains. This, he felt, could be most clearly seen in popular TV programmes such as 'Benefits Street' (where the lives of welfare claimants were under constant scrutiny); he believed that these were leading society inexorably towards a 'Hunger Games' mentality⁶¹ reminiscent of Juvenal's 'panem et circenses', (bread and circuses). The media are not only distracting attention away from social inequality and social issues, they are creating entertainment from others' difficulties. This media exploitation of class voyeurism was perceived by him as much stronger than any possible comparable gender or ethnically-based distorting emphasis, in part because class is less openly discussed and because there is a prevailing opposition to – or at least diminution of – gender and ethnically based discrimination (both legally and culturally). None of the other teachers offered class as a significant focus for citizenship, nor was it an aspect raised by students even when explicitly asked. Those teachers and the students considered economic opportunity and cultural attitudes to be more significant than an undefined notion of 'social class'.

All the teachers raised issues of taxation and voting systems as being important for citizens. How taxes are raised and where the expenditure is were deemed useful ways to both politically and economically educate citizens, particularly in allowing teachers to address myths regarding benefit levels without being considered biased in their teaching. As well as the UK's general use of First Past The Post, it was considered important that citizens have some grasp of the principles of proportional representation, not least because various forms of this are used in Scottish Parliamentary, Welsh and Northern Irish Assembly, and European Union elections. All agreed that one regularly successful strategy had been to run mock elections in school, exposing learners to Marshall's notions of both Civil and Political Citizenship.

The students were agreed that political involvement was key, and that this was a prerequisite of active citizenship. For the students at state schools [3 of the 4 sample schools] one of the most important pieces of information and understanding they had gleaned regarded the role of pressure

⁶¹ A popular USA film based on a series of books by Suzanne Collins. Two young people from each district in the fictional country of Panem are selected by lottery to participate in the annual Hunger Games where they try to eliminate their competitors while the citizens are required to watch the televised games.

groups, a category of activity, which their non-Citizenship peers had not thought of as political. At the independent school the students did not consider their active citizenship, which was – across the school – at a higher level of involvement than in any of the state schools, to be political so much as ‘the right thing’; in this their activities were therefore closer to ‘worthy acts’⁶² than political activity. That none of the students identified issues of taxation to be important underlines the teachers’ concern over this omission, while leading one to wonder why the teachers were not themselves addressing this as it has consistently featured in England’s National Curriculum. We see here a deficit in regard to Marshall’s classifications of Citizenship; Civil and Political in that pupils should be experiencing their rights/obligations and freedoms as citizens – to understand both why they pay tax and how it is spent - and Social, as they would appear not to be given the opportunity to learn about taxation and its social role.

There was little spoken of rights and responsibilities. This did not indicate a lack of perceived importance so much as teachers’ belief that their pupils had a very secure, if not always wholly accurate, sense of their rights, and at least one teacher advocated that pupils would benefit from not only knowing about their responsibilities but also acting upon these. The student respondents considered that their rights and responsibilities needed to be made clearer. Despite the cynicism of at least one teacher who stated that students were only interested in exploiting their rights for selfish ends, the students said that they felt they needed to know more about rights as well as responsibilities as they considered that the word is often misused and misunderstood by their generation. One female student explained this with the example of having the right to own a mobile phone not being the same as a right to have it in school. With regard to responsibilities, state school students perceived a lack of opportunity to accept and act upon these in a school setting as they had little freedom to seek or accept responsibilities but had authoritarian expectations placed on them; this was not the perception of the independent school students, who considered that they were gradually given responsibilities in accordance with teachers’ perceptions of their developing maturity and ability to accept such responsibilities as were deemed appropriate. What those responsibilities were did not clearly emerge from subsequent discussion.

⁶² Truly active citizenship is engaging, and requires reflexivity and deliberation. It requires pupils to take action on problems and issues in order to achieve clearly identified outcomes in relation to them. Any event or activity which is planned and developed by teachers or other adults, which does not allow pupils to develop and to learn, is not an example of active citizenship but constitutes – at best – a worthy act, where a short-term good is met at the expense of long-term engagement. Leighton, 2010, 2012.

For the teachers the meaning of citizenship connected to gender, class and ethnicity was unclear. The female teachers perceived gender issues more strongly than the males, with one extending this to consideration of sexuality and other determinants of social identity such as region and age. None suggested that there was a practical way of separating the social reality of any of these factors as people in all three categories simultaneously. For all the students, the meaning of citizenship connected to gender, class and ethnicity was dictated by an individual's sense of belonging to a society. One male student argued that, particularly in the post-Thatcher UK (since they were born) society has become all about individuals and self-motivation and that it was therefore how the individuals saw themselves that created that person's sense of citizenship. There was consensus that gender and ethnicity were issues of greater concern for people like the researcher (old, white, middle class, male) as the students considered themselves beyond categorisation or evaluation in terms of gender and ethnicity. With explicit regard to gender, for example, reference was made to not only Thatcher's political success at the end of the 20th Century, but also that three significant political parties – the Scottish National Party, Plaid Cymru and the Green Party were led by women. For them, class remained an issue but more with regard to 'chavs',⁶³ a widely used derogatory term for members of the underclass used to "distinguish the 'rough' from the 'respectable' working class"⁶⁴ and issues of income rather than social class. The interviewer did not offer a definition of class and, while students clearly held their own concepts, these were not aired and examined. The notion put forward that class mattered less than income, opportunity and culture, to which the students generally subscribed, is clearly problematic and begs the question, 'what is class, if not defined by income, opportunity and culture?'

Sweden

Starting with the open question of what it means to be a citizen, almost all the respondents answered that so-called civil and political citizenship is central. They mentioned, for example, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, the right to vote, etc. The majority of both teachers and students felt that these democratic rights and freedoms should also be considered as obligations; partly in the sense of actively exercise your rights and also the responsibility not to violate or impinge on another person's rights and freedoms. As one female teacher expressed it: "To live in a collective involves that my freedoms extend until they clash with the next person's freedoms. To have rights also include an obligation of how to manage them."

⁶³ Nayak, 2006, p. 813.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

Teachers and the students with Swedish as a second language emphasized the importance of having sufficient knowledge to be able to exercise their rights. They underlined good language skills, and general civic-knowledge, as two important pre-conditions for active citizenship. Based on the experience that groups of citizens in society lack such knowledge, two male students objected to considering civil and political rights as obligations. One student asked: "How can you see it as an obligation? In some neighbourhoods, the number of voters is very few, like 50%. Should we despise them because they do not vote?" Both views regarding the importance of or the lack of sufficient knowledge are examples of, albeit indirectly, also paying attention to the importance of social citizenship, that is, the right to education, health care and other prerequisites for prosperity. However, it was only the female students that in a more direct way mentioned social rights as a vital aspect of citizenship. Finally, all the respondents felt that good behaviour and respect for their fellow citizens is an important feature and a responsibility for everyone. This is also connected to the importance of common basic values. One male student at the vocational programme expressed his view as:

S (Student): I believe that everyone has the obligation not to be an asshole!

L (Laila): What do you mean by not being an asshole?

S: You should not be mean to other people.

L: What are your thoughts regarding being a part of a democracy?

S: Go and vote!

L: Go and vote, is a right?

S: It is an obligation.

L: You mean that it is rather a duty than a right to go and vote?

S: Yes! Otherwise you cannot complain. You must vote! It is not a right but an obligation.

There are those who can't vote. Therefore, one must do it.

Teachers' and students' opinions were divided when discussing whether there is a norm for citizens based on gender. Two of the teachers, half of the female students and one male student answered clearly that there exists such a male norm, which for example become visible in that men generally have more power and better salaries than women. The remaining respondents' replied that there is no specific norm based on gender. However, several felt that there are specific male and female characteristics and areas of interests in society. When the question was asked whether boys or girls are most interested in social issues a number of respondents answered that it depends on the issues

at stake. Some students believed that girls are more interested because they have worse societal conditions and therefore more reasons to get involved.

There was more evident consistency among the respondents' opinions about the importance of class and ethnicity for the development of citizens' conditions and societal competence. The teachers saw a connection between students' capabilities to reach the necessary knowledge and their parents' level of education and ability to support their children. Necessary knowledge was again identified as language skills and general civic-knowledge, which both could be achieved through education, employment and integration. Most of the students argued in a similar way and identified migrants' difficulties as a lack of language, unemployment and alienation in Swedish society. These obstacles for integration into Swedish society are often class-related because they interact with low incomes, segregation and poor housing conditions. These relationships were made very clear when two male students from a pre-university programme discussed the question, "When is an immigrant perceived as a Swedish citizen?":

S1: The language is of course important, that is, how to speak and write. (He turns to his buddy S2 who has non-Swedish origin): It's really not much difference between us, except that you have a little bit darker beard than me.

S2: There are more differences. Name and such things are also very important. It should not be forgotten.

S1: No, sure it is. He is called Emre and my name is Anton (fictitious names). I mean, you hear right away that there's a difference. I have the advantage of having a Swedish background.

L: Beyond that, is Emre a good example of someone who has become Swedish?

S1: I'm not acquaintance with Emre's family or so, but Emre is a perfect Swede based on the expectations that ... So yes, he is well integrated.

S2: Why am I well integrated? What is it that makes it work for me? That's the problem: If I was born and raised in the suburbs. If I had not been middle class. If I had talked what is called Rinkeby Swedish (a famous suburb of Stockholm). If I had not been good in school. If I had opinions that are a little more what you relate to the fundamentalists. Had I still been seen as Swedish? Even if I had been born in Sweden?

S1: No!

S2: Probably not! And I'm well aware of it. Therefore, I usually don't talk much about ... Many people who have a different ethnicity knows that people look differently at

them, and accordingly, they develop a different behaviour. They do so because they want to fit into a special norm.

Without clearly separating the two aspects, there was a consensus among the respondents that the combination of social class and ethnicity has importance when it comes to whether one is perceived as a fully Swedish citizen or not. The only students who expressly said that class background has a negligible importance in Swedish society were the students who study Swedish as a second language. When they compared class conditions of the Swedish society with conditions in their former homelands, they perceived Sweden as an egalitarian society.

Comparative summary

Regarding the question of what knowledge and skills are considered necessary in a democracy, we found both differences and similarities in the respondents' answers. All respondents agreed on the importance of political knowledge in the sense of both understanding the system and knowing how to get involved and influence on politics. The meaning of these skills were for example such as to have sufficient knowledge to both receive and participate in public debate, the right to be heard and the obligation to vote and knowledge of their civil liberties. When it came to the importance of social rights as a precondition for citizens' knowledge and skills, it was above all the teachers in both countries and a few Swedish students who drew attention to this aspect. In the Swedish context, the importance of adequate language skills were discussed as a key issue both as an important general question for the integration of immigrants, but also as a tool to be able to participate actively in society.

Respondents in both countries were aware of inequalities based on gender. Whether they explicitly pointed at the subordination of women, which mainly the female respondents did, or "only" pointed at the existence of different conditions between sexes, there was a consensus that men generally live under better conditions than women in society. Not surprisingly, it was foremost the female teachers and students who clearly identified with the gender issue. Despite women's relatively poorer social conditions, none of the respondents claimed that this affected the status of women as citizens, reflecting Yuval-Davis' observation that 'not all belonging/s are as important to people in the same way and to the same extent and emotions, as perceptions, shift in different times and situations and are more or less reflective'.⁶⁵ It is possible therefore to both acknowledge the

⁶⁵ Yuval-Davis, 2011, p. 5.

existence of different social conditions and the limitations for female citizens and still judge this as not affecting women's status as citizens.

Among the English respondents, class was considered less significant than income and opportunity, while ethnicity was understood to be a barrier to social acceptance in some spheres but not a barrier to the legal status of citizen. As regards the students' knowledge of democratic rights and freedoms, English teachers have a greater belief in their students' awareness than was the case among the Swedish teachers. These differences could (as mentioned above) be attributed to the different socio-economic contexts that the students originated from. However, there was also a similarity between the English and Swedish students' answers, which can be associated with their self-image and self-confidence. In Sweden, the students in vocational programmes had a rather weak self-confidence, while the pre-university students had good self-confidence as future citizens. The English students seemed to be generally more aware of their rights and freedoms, but students of state schools did not feel that they had enough responsibility or freedom of action in school as was the case for students of independent schools.

It is interesting to notice how both teachers and students overlapped in England, putting less emphasis on the importance of class and ethnicity for the real conditions of citizenship than was the case among the Swedish respondents. One possible explanation for this may be that class distinctions in England have been evident for so long that the population has become inured, while Sweden used to be a welfare state with a comparatively small differences in socioeconomic conditions. However, as stated above, the Swedish situation drastically changed in the early 1990s as the income gap increased by 31 percent between 1991 and 2010 and Swedish schools have shown clearly deteriorating results in recent years. On the basis of these drastic changes the general Swedish consciousness is probably more aware of and pays much greater attention to these issues.

These differences in analysis and valuations between the English and Swedish respondents, to refer to Yuval-Davis, is also related to the definition of different categories based on attitudes to the social differences that should be considered to be inclusive or exclusive. Another concrete example is when the Swedish student Anton do not realize the importance of Emre's background in the middle class, but only looks at the importance of ethnic background when he explains why he believes that Emre is well integrated in Sweden. While Emre, with his non-Swedish origin, is able to identify with immigrants being treated differently based on their socio-economic conditions in the suburb, understand the importance of social class.

How is personal liberties affected by the citizen's gender, class and ethnicity, according to the respondents?

England

When asked whether gender affected a citizen's freedoms, teachers' responses were consistent that there were stereotypical expectations not borne out by reality. They perceived a society which, by statute, clearly prohibited limitations on any group or individual freedoms under any of the three social conditions under consideration here. At the same time there was awareness that legislation and reality do not always coincide, and that women's mean income was lower than that of men and that there were fewer women in significant roles in society. It was clear that the students, across genders and social class, felt that gender equality was a fact of life. They were aware of the inequalities identified by the teachers and that such inequalities represented out-dated attitudes. One female student observed that, as old people die, old attitudes will also die away. Several males spoke of their gender attitudes having arisen from friendship groups including females rather than from school, home or mass media – all of which they considered to be less forward looking and egalitarian.

With regard to ethnicity, teacher perceptions were again consistent as well as similar to their perceptions regarding gender, that legislation prohibits discrimination or unequal treatment but there are none the less differences in income and status. These differences were considered to be more marked than with regard to gender, particularly with reference to recent immigrants, many of whom were not [yet] citizens and who were therefore subject to quite stringent limitations of movement and economic activity in particular. Limitations on more established immigrants were seen by most to derive from their language skills as well as institutional structures which resulted in many working in occupations considerably lower in status and income than those for which they were qualified.

Students' perceptions of a 'typical British person' are discussed below but, in terms of ethnicity, it was clear that they did not have a specific image themselves. All were clear that they considered the UK to be a multi-cultural society and that, while some members of some cultures were less likely to be actively involved in society than others, they were still non the less British. While the students demonstrated awareness of racism and disadvantage, they were both sensitive to it and considered such conduct to be the behaviour of a minority. The stereotype of the racist Brit held no more truth for them than the racist stereotypes of ethnic minorities sometimes perpetrated by, for example, far right political parties.

Teachers were not aware of discriminatory practices or conduct amongst their students but those in the state schools were acutely aware of overt racism in their schools' localities. These schools were all in urban areas, with one in the parliamentary constituency considered nationally to be the most likely to return an anti-immigration party (UKIP) candidate during the election taking place on the day of the interviews. That the teachers did not live in the immediate area might have lessened their sensitivity to some students' day-to-day experiences.

Social class was considered still to make a difference in attitude and access to political and citizenship involvement, more due to cultural attitudes than to structural inequalities. The teacher at the independent school had not considered class as an issue, while the other teachers considered that perceived poverty was probably more significant than any externally determined hierarchical classification. In common with their teachers, students considered social class to matter in relation to class cultural attitudes as well as to notions of "speaking proper" [*sic*] and how they presented themselves for work and interviews. This, in turn, arose from aspirations for personal progress and, crucially for at least one male student, being able to afford to aspire; "It takes money to dress right, it takes money at home to mean you can go to university and not pay your way. That isn't class, it's income."

Sweden

Both teachers and students expressed that social class has a great importance for citizens' social commitment, which have to do with how confidence and attitudes differ appreciably between classes. A teacher from a vocational programme put it as:

T (Teacher): Yes, I think so. It's important, it's all about self-confidence and ... If we're talking about the middle class, they realize their own worth: I have a right to know about this! They dare to question and ask questions. If you don't have the same self-esteem, you don't do it: it's not worth it ... It's so much related to your class background and your network.

Most of the respondents agreed that students have different conditions, such as practicing freedom of speech and freedom of religion, depending on their parents' education and socioeconomic status. Some students felt that, depending on class background, children also get different education and language from school, which have to do with housing and school segregation. Some girls from a

vocational programme believed that people from lower social classes also have a lower self-confidence; one of the students continues the reasoning by saying of herself:

S: I would never be able to study further. I'm not such a theoretical person. I am not able to do it! But then of course, I'm not gonna get the same education as those who are more theoretical. So, just because I'm more practical, I don't want to be valued lower. I just don't like to sit and read all the time!

All respondents agreed on the importance of gender, class and ethnicity regarding people in possession of power. The importance lies in that they represent certain issues and social groups, and that they are role models with which different groups of citizens might identify. Some males on a vocational programme thought that more people listen to a Swedish man in power than to a woman or a person with a foreign background. However, other students underlined that those in power from a working class background, with disabilities, being women or having a non-Swedish background are important for under-represented groups to voice their experiences and interests. Students of vocational programmes emphasized above all the importance of social class.

Some of the vocational students expressed xenophobic perceptions on marginalized immigrant groups. These students were convinced that immigrants are positively discriminated in the social security system by receiving higher economic grants and other benefits than Swedes get. Two students discussed the issue:

S1: For example, you may go to an employment service if you are Swedish. You are not entitled to get any training if you haven't been unemployed for at least six months. But a black person, excuse the expression, he will receive training within five minutes. This is the problem...

S2: Do you have statistics on that?

S1: Statistics and statistics ... I don't know. But I have a number of witnesses telling me that's how it is!

There was also a broad consensus that societal groups are not completely equal in reality before the law. This is particularly true on the basis of gender and ethnicity. Some argued that people with immigrant background often were judged harsher than Swedes, by the courts as well as by media and the public. Different attitudes were expressed from some students of a vocational programme. They felt that immigrants who commit crimes should be sent back to their original countries:

S1: I do not think it is right that they end up in a Swedish prison and that we must pay taxes for them.

S2: It is better to spend that money on schools and care for the elderly ... Otherwise, the state spends a lot of money on those who do wrong...

Girls on pre-university programmes believed that women are sentenced harder if they neglect their children and sometimes are judged on the basis of their behaviour when they've been raped. When we discussed civic rights and freedoms, one teacher believed that people with immigrant background often experience worse treatment in their everyday contact with the authorities than Swedes. Some students agreed that there exist an ethnic discrimination regarding immigrants' opportunities to get jobs and housing.

It was mainly females, both teachers and students, who believed that women were disadvantaged in various societal contexts. One student explains: "It has always been men who have the higher positions and it might be hard for them to understand the situation for women." The girls also believe that it is more equitable in their own generation and that it will be better in society when those over fifty years no longer possess the power. They were mostly upset concerning that there are still big differences in payment between men and women.

Comparative summary

There are significant similarities in the responses from England and Sweden, as well as a few notable differences. The disparity between legislation and reality is a common perception, that the law might claim to treat all the same but social reality does not present this as a lived experience. In both countries it is social class which appears to be considered the major obstacle to social mobility and full citizenship rights/participation. In both countries, income level and language are mentioned as significant class markers. However respondents' notion of class is not consistent across the national boundaries. The English students describe different cultures and attitudes on the basis of class, while the Swedish students mention importance of self-esteem and access to equal education. These differences may partially be explained by how the student groups in the two countries differ in their composition: Students from the Swedish vocational programmes respond partly based on their own experiences from a less educated background. The English students express themselves based on their experiences of encounters between different social classes. These differences in response based on the students' class background, rather than national background, constitute a clear

example of how different social locations affect students' judgements of their own and others' perceptions and meanings of belonging.

The differences in the composition of response groups were also significant regarding the importance of ethnicity. Students in both societies perceived ethnicity as a barrier but, in Sweden, some of the students themselves had anti-immigrant beliefs: For instance, they reported preferential treatment for migrants, usually presented anecdotally rather than on the basis of evidence. English students were aware that such perceptions are held in their locality and elsewhere in the country but did not hold such views themselves nor were they aware of evidence to support them.

Perceptions of women's citizenship experiences are common to both countries, although the English students identified and condemned this irrespective of gender whereas in Sweden it was of greater concern to female students. In both countries, the respondents considered that women generally earn less and are under-represented in influential positions in society in the same way as is the case for different minority groups.

What are teachers' and students' experiences of Citizenship Education and how does school pay attention to citizens' conditions based on gender, class and ethnicity?

England

Non-specialist teachers were concerned that pupils gained some understanding of voting and processes of taxation and expenditure, and – while effort was spent ensuring an understanding of rights – that more could be done with regard to gaining an understanding of citizens' responsibilities. These are all elements of the required National Curriculum but the teachers concerned did not feel competent to address them; non-specialist teaching is a common occurrence in Citizenship Education in England.⁶⁶

The more experienced specialists considered it more important to identify and challenge social inequality and mobility barriers. Social class was perceived as still present but a less significant barrier than in the past; pupils were perceived as class aware, perhaps more sensitive to issues of poverty and income than to sociological definitions of employment class. One female teacher commented on the media exploitation of class voyeurism, particularly in relation to 'reality' TV shows such as Big Brother, while one male teacher expressed the view – subsequently reiterated by

⁶⁶ Leighton, 2004, 2010; Keating et al, 2010.

one of the female teachers – that parental ignorance or bias in relation to each of class, ethnicity and gender was a greater influence than could be countered by school.

Virtually all students mentioned the need for young people to become involved in society, to know how to listen to and understand news and current affairs rather than be passive recipients of one institutional version of events. They considered it important that schools enable knowledge and understanding of pressure groups, extending the notion of ‘political’ beyond party definitions and party activities. There was also general agreement that a full understanding of rights and responsibilities would be beneficial as this was an area considered to be confused and confusing, and that one of the reasons for young people’s lack of political engagement was that they do not yet have responsibilities nor do many think about what those will be. There was also consensus that much more political education is needed, that the political parties do not engage with young voters who are often ignorant or disinterested.

The central concerns for teachers were not around issues of social differentiation but of the status and provision of their subject. One female teacher described how Citizenship Education was seen in her school as a subject for the less academically able, for example to replace the demanding assessment tasks in history, while a male teacher observed that the subject is not rated by colleagues. Another female teacher commented that there was particular concern rather than opposition in her school at the reintroduction of Citizenship Education as there were cuts elsewhere in the school budget and some of her colleagues felt this was not the right time to spread expenditure so thinly. Disparity of support amongst parents/carers was also reported, with some very supportive and expressing regret that the Citizenship Education had not been available to them [it was introduced into England’s National Curriculum in 2002] while others did not consider it to be ‘a real subject’.

All teachers claimed that their schools had strong extra-curricular provision and clear value systems. Activities such as charity work and campaigns, fund-raising, links with schools in less economically developed countries were cited. The teachers in most schools saw their students as politically aware, which was considered not to be the case for those in the independent school. They also considered that gender and ethnicity held little significance for their students’ perceptions or expectations, and that attitude rather than social class was a key determinant of civic involvement.

The teachers were unanimously of the opinion that textbooks were of limited value and that it was more helpful to develop resources, which related to students' own perspectives and experiences, referring in particular to images which were aspirational rather than realistic – particularly with reference to gender.

One group of students stressed the need for more substantial development of the individual's sense of and place in society. They were aware of Margret Thatcher's alleged dictum that "there is no such thing as society. There are individual men and women, and there are families" proposed during a speech in Bruges in 1988; this was an attack on a perceived entitlement culture but became popularly understood as an advocacy of absolute individuality, an advocacy of individualism and selfishness which the students did not interpret as representative of their local community but perhaps of the country at large. Two white working class female pupils made a point about which there was again general agreement:

F1 "Citizenship is active"

F2 "Yeah. Citizensship is the active part; a citizen is just someone who lives somewhere".

Paradoxically, this is very close to what Mrs Thatcher might have meant⁶⁷. With regard to gender and Citizenship Education, it was stated that:

S10 (male): elected representatives have generally always [*sic*] been male. Women might feel excluded. Plaid Cymru, SNP, Greens have women leaders and are left leaning parties. They have grown as outsiders in their gender, region, and politics. The media portrayal of them is minimal and vindictive.

One group of pupils who has experienced Citizenship Education in their earlier secondary schooling considered that their school provision of Citizenship Education was far better than in other schools as it was a compulsory subject throughout, with an optional course for the public examinations for pupils at the ages of 16. The impression they had of other schools was of weak provision and ignorant peers. One female in this group stated that "people at other schools just laugh at the subject." This view was reflected in the responses of those students who did not have compulsory Citizenship Education – a combination of uninformed opinion and disparaging remarks.

⁶⁷ See Woman's Own magazine interview transcript at <http://www.margareththatcher.org/document/106689>.

There was a consistent theme that teachers and academics are out of touch (ever thus and probably correct). This final point arose when one male student suggested that the fixation on social differences is a generational one – that the National Curriculum is decided upon “by people like you (middle-aged, white, male researcher). We don’t worry about these things; we’re not racist, we’re not sexist.” He and his fellow students argued that there were more important things to worry about than constructions such as class, ethnicity and gender, and that education should focus on what matters now rather than what used to matter.

Sweden

The teachers said that they adapt their teaching in different ways to each student group on the basis of what knowledge teachers believe that their students may need in the future. It was particularly evident among the teachers at the vocational programmes. Their teaching had focus on everyday-related and practical skills such as dealing with the authorities, to influence on working life and the local environment, strengthen the students' self-confidence and the right of everyone to express themselves and to be heard.

A teacher working on a vehicle technical programme believes that the objectives of the school policy documents are a bit too theoretical for his students. Instead he highlights the importance of linking citizenship education to the students' career choices and everyday life as young adults. The skills involved in writing a CV and how to contact authorities are important.

Another teacher from a pre-university programme underlined that since she had taught citizenship education to her students for three years, as in contrast to the vocational programme’s one-year courses, it provides her a significant opportunity to teach both at the basic and at a more advanced level. She was also the only teacher who claimed to have sufficient time for her teaching. The other three teachers felt that lack of time is a decisive reason for their limitations in Citizenship Education. As it also has emerged earlier from the interviews, all the teachers stressed the importance of language skills for the students to orient themselves and get involved in the community. However, the meaning of language skills differed depending on which programme the students follow. Students who are newly arrived are trying to assimilate the basic Swedish language while students in an academic preparatory programme listens to radio programmes such as "philosophical room"⁶⁸ and discuss the meaning of various abstract concepts.

⁶⁸ A programme on Swedish radio where classical philosophical topics are discussed.

The students' experiences and views on Citizenship Education differed according to gender and on which programme they studied. The students at the vocational programmes felt that they were limited and only got a superficial knowledge of how society works. They described that they essentially got factual knowledge about Parliament, voting procedures and the EU. Some of the girls on a vocational programme expressed a wish to develop more in-depth knowledge for their future. Some of the guys on the same programme felt that such knowledge was unnecessary and that they instead would devote themselves to more useful everyday skills for adult life; such as social rights, contacts with authorities, insurance companies, etc. All the students wanted more education of the so-called everyday knowledge, however, vocational students also valued everyday knowledge higher than more general knowledge of society's various decision-making bodies, general politics, administrations and functions.

On the contrary, the students at the pre-university programme described how their knowledge gradually was deepened during the three years they have studied social studies. The girls also discussed the importance of language from a class perspective. One girl says that the less educated have a more childish way of expressing themselves, which means that you do not listen to them as much. Some male students in a vocational programme confirmed this in a way when they expressed an indifference towards whether the school should expand the teaching about citizens' rights and obligations:

S1: An additional lesson on society ... Everyone had ... I do not know what. Not a joy exactly [...] If you want to be heard, you may have to learn how to do it.

L: Don't you want to be heard?

S1: I don't know. If no one listens, it doesn't matter after all.

L: But you have told me some interesting things today.

S2: Yes, but that is because you want to listen. One want to be heard by those who listen.

The female students of Swedish as a second language experienced Citizenship Education very differently depending on where they had studied. Their experiences ranged from SFI (Basic language courses in Swedish for immigrants) to university courses on a more advanced level. All women with non-Swedish background shared the experience that they have received information and teaching that does not always match their needs. They felt that immigrants often are treated as a homogeneous group who all have the same needs. However, when they compared with teaching in their countries of origin they were quite happy with the Swedish education.

All of the interviewed teachers and most of the students shared the experience that Citizenship Education seldom paid attention to social conditions according to class, ethnicity and gender. Those who were most satisfied with the teaching of these issues were students at the university preparatory programme. However, the majority of respondents felt that education is inadequate and needed to be developed. According to some teachers and students the reason for this inadequacy was because class, ethnicity and gender are difficult and sometimes controversial issues to deal with in the classroom

In addition to reasons such as the lack of time and experience for dealing with these issues other reasons were mentioned. On the basis of sexes, the students expressed different attitudes against inadequate education. The girls at both programmes believed that this is important knowledge and should be made available to all, while some of the male students believed that the issues were important but doubted whether they needed to expand their own knowledge.

When I finally asked the students if there was something they would like to add, something we have not paid attention during the interview, they suggested some slightly different viewpoints. Some girls in a vocational programme felt that homosexuals were subjected to prejudices in a similar way as immigrants. A couple of male students at the pre-university programme said that some problems are forgotten: "We talk about social class, but there are also disabled who are mentally and physically ... It is the first time we learn about this in twelve years. We talk about their difficulties and that society is not adapted for them." The girls at a university preparatory programme mentioned environmental issues as very important. Issues that is not given sufficient attention. A student clarified: "We do have a responsibility to future generations, you know."

Comparative summary

It has appeared from the interviews that the students and teachers had some similar experiences from Citizenship Education in general, but the differences seemed to be more between the two countries when it came to paying attention to conditions based on class, gender and ethnicity. An apparent similarity, however, was that virtually all respondents were keen to develop and expand Citizenship Education. Within the teacher groups of both countries they believed that inadequate teaching arose from the lack of time, resources, and that they did not feel fully competent for the task. Among the Swedish teachers this uncertainty was especially regarding issues of class, gender and ethnicity, which may be perceived as controversial to discuss in the classroom. Another

similarity was that the more qualified teachers in England and the teachers on academic programmes in Sweden drew attention to issues of social inequality to a greater extent than the non-specialist and vocational teachers did.

Among the English teachers the central concerns were about the academic status and provision of the school subject 'Citizenship Education'. With cuts in education expenditure, Citizenship Education was not considered a priority. In Sweden - where Citizenship Education is not a separate subject - the content is vague and teachers' interpretations of the assignment differ distinctively between the different schools and programmes.

One similarity that emerged between the two countries' student groups was that the students who read Citizenship on academic programmes in Sweden and England valued the importance of citizenship education for their further studies and adult life significantly higher than what was the case for other student groups. This was reflected even in that teachers in these programmes perceived their students as more politically aware than was the case for the Independent School in England and vocational programmes in Sweden.

When we asked students about the extent to which the school pays attention to citizens' conditions based on gender, class and ethnicity, the answers partly differed. The English students and students on the Swedish academic programme thought that the school challenged stereotypes – primarily regarding gender and ethnicity. Even if the importance of class was not as prominent, these students were aware of differences in income and that there were significant socioeconomic inequities in society. The Swedish students on vocational programmes highlighted the importance of social class more, both regarding their own identity and conditions as well as conditions of class society in general. It was also in these programmes that some of the students expressed xenophobic ideas. As it has appeared already from above, both the Swedish teachers and students considered social class as a more important aspect for citizens' conditions than what was the case among the English respondents. This interesting difference will be further discussed below.

Concluding analysis and discussion

One of the most interesting results of the study is how the respondents of the two countries answered on the importance of class for citizenship in its real meaning. In the Swedish context, attention was paid particularly to how the combination of class and ethnicity interact and make it difficult for exposed societal groups to gain the real meaning of citizenship. This was valid both

concerning the necessary preconditions from school as well as citizenship conditions in general. The English respondents - both teachers and students - were well aware of how both ethnicity and income contribute to unequal social conditions. However, most of the English respondents claimed that social class is not of any particular importance today, but rather an aspect of the past.

These differences in attitudes and opinions about social class are quite remarkable given that Sweden in the post-war period has been well known for the Swedish welfare state, while the UK has continued to clearly be a class society. Even today, the student group, which has the greatest difficulties in achieving passing grades in English school, is white young men from the working class. We need to do a brief historical review and refer to previous research for a reasonable analysis. In the 1980s' social and political changes with liberal overtones in England and Sweden, as well as in other Western countries, brought a shift in focus from the 'public good' to the 'private good'.⁶⁹ As stated above, these societal changes were also reflected in the Swedish school policies over the past two-three decades. The curriculum prior to when this liberalization and individualization began was written in a leftist social climate with demands for greater equality. One of the primary school purposes was described as "to prepare all children and young people, regardless of their place of residence and other external conditions, real access to equal educational opportunities".⁷⁰ The curriculum was clearly problem-oriented and aimed to "encourage students to debate and question the prevailing conditions".⁷¹ Swedish research has shown how the increased liberalization in the 1980s and 90s brought the needs of the individual and freedom of choice before everyone's right to an equal education. Based on this view, private school options, school voucher and free school choice have been reforms that have fundamentally changed the conditions for the Swedish school.⁷² Boström expresses his concern over this development as: "Democracy will be equal to that citizens choose between different options (in various markets) as well as to think freely - but what is beyond that has nothing to do with democracy. What kind of citizens will people become with such beliefs?"⁷³

In the English school context, the development has been different due to an earlier and more dominant emergence of new right neo-liberalism. Until 1988 there was no national curriculum and the inspection regime for schools was largely advisory and encouraging. Since then the curriculum

⁶⁹ Englund, 1999, McSmith, 2010.

⁷⁰ Lgr 69, p. 11. For an historical perspective on the Swedish school system, see Englund, 1986; Nielsen, 2015.

⁷¹ Ibid. p. 14.

⁷² Englund, 1999; Boström, 2001; Dahlstedt, 2009; Nielsen, 2015.

⁷³ Boström, 2001, p. 42.

has become increasingly proscriptive and knowledge based⁷⁴ and the inspection process increasingly severe and homogenising, discouraging the creativity, innovation and teacher autonomy, which marked the 1960s and 1970s. There has also been a dismantling of local accountability of schools through legislation that has created 'academies' funded jointly by central government and 'sponsoring' private businesses, and 'free schools' established by parents and funded by central government. In questioning this policy, Miller observes that "The government is responsible for providing education, and passing responsibility of this to parents and private interests raises serious questions about the government's motives."⁷⁵

Trying to understand the consequences of these developments for the school's various actors, empirical studies like this are useful. Based on respondents' experiences and opinions, the Swedish study has shown clear differences between university preparatory and vocational students' self-image - and the image of others - in terms of both conditions in school and the prospects for adult life as citizens. In revisiting Marshalls' ideas about the need of social citizenship, we are led to consider the last decades of liberalization of school as changes that depleted social citizenship and entailed greater demands and responsibilities for the individual. This kind of change always hits the resource-poor hardest, who in the Swedish school context have been identified as students with a combination of foreign and poorer socio-economic backgrounds. While in England socio-economic background outweighs all other factors, although ethnicity – particularly amongst recent immigrant populations – remains important. However, it would be an oversimplification to identify students who experience difficulties in school as solely resource-weak groups of foreign origin. In this study, those pupils who identify themselves as working class in the Swedish context were students on vocational programmes. Although this group of students has relatively good socio-economic prospects,⁷⁶ they give expression for both lower self-confidence and interest regarding citizenship education and of societal engagement than was the case among the university preparatory students. Even the teachers at vocational programmes felt that their students find it difficult to receive social related theoretical education. Although the composition of the student groups we interviewed clearly differed in some respects,⁷⁷ we saw an interesting similarity between Sweden and England. In a similar way as the Swedish vocational students, the English students at the independent school also showed lower interest in citizenship education for adult life than was the case among the

⁷⁴ What constitutes useful and appropriate knowledge being also strictly proscribed.

⁷⁵ Miller, 2011, p. 170.

⁷⁶ The percentage of unemployed among foreign-born was in 2015 of 15.5 percent, which is 11 percentage points higher than for those born in Sweden (4.5 percent). Central Bureau of Statistics (SCB), 2015.

⁷⁷ As stated above, the Swedish student groups were more heterogeneous (based on pre-university or vocational programme) than the English student groups with a theoretical focus on their studies.

English (and Swedish) students who studied citizenship at a higher level. We may perceive the similarity regarding students' more negative attitudes to citizenship education as an expression of their social background - or social location to refer to Yuval-Davis - which have a relatively larger impact on how these students identify themselves and how they judge their own and others' belonging, than what school teaching may offer. Another way to put it is that students from more resource-rich home environments probably have a stronger identification and emotional attachment for the goals and ideals that citizenship education represents than is the case for more resource-poor pupils.

The interesting and important issue of students' identification with and understanding of social class is an area that we intend to continue working with in our future research.

It was clear from all respondents' answers how they referred to ethnicity as a social hierarchy; however, students' attitudes to the importance of ethnicity for Citizenship differed both between the two countries and within Sweden. All the English students and most of the Swedish students expressed great understanding and support for a multicultural society. They were aware that anti-immigrant views existed among political groupings and some social groups, but did not consider ethnicity as a barrier to citizenship in its real meaning. As stated above, the Swedish respondents claimed that ethnicity combined with social class clearly affects the conditions of citizenship. In addition, among the Swedish vocational students, some anti-immigrant ideas were expressed. That such xenophobic attitudes get strongholds amongst community groups with lower education is not exclusive to Sweden. According to Yuval-Davis, certain identities and affiliations tend to become stronger to people the more threatened they become or believe they become.⁷⁸ The Swedish sociologist Sernhede has studied the Swedish suburbs and marginalized groups. Based on international research he describes how the last decades of growing racism and xenophobia in many European countries can be understood in the light of the general uncertainty that the disintegration of the traditional forms of national identity entailed. Another factor, he points out, is the competitive situation that has arisen between the traditional working class and immigrant groups. The contradictions can partly be explained by that the two groups compete for similar low-skilled jobs.⁷⁹ Similar findings are offered by Tippett et al⁸⁰, with similar explanations, while there is a wealth of evidence of the growth of xenophobic youth conduct throughout Europe.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Yuval-Davis, 2011, p. 5-6.

⁷⁹ Sernhede, 2007, p. 30-31.

⁸⁰ Tippett, Wolke and Platt, 2013.

⁸¹ Licata and Klein, 2002; Ziebert and van der Tuin, 2008; Worger 2012.

These differences in how the students looked at the importance of ethnicity as a social hierarchy may probably also be explained historically. England has been established as a multicultural society for longer than the Swedish society. In Sweden, it was only in the 1990s, and to an even greater extent during the recent year's major refugee flows, as Swedish society has shown difficulties in receiving and integrating these groups.⁸² Again, such difficulties are more related to socio-economic difficulties than to ethnicity. In the British context, different ethnic groups are more established and are not perceived as a homogenous group of refugees. It is rather the case that different ethnic identities more prominent and known as a part of English society. These differences between how the two countries have developed in relation to immigrant groups can of course also be explained by Britain's past as a colonial power. Britain's colonial contacts have enabled emigration to a greater extent than has been the case for a country like Sweden, where contacts with non-European cultures were relatively more limited in the past.

When we discussed how equal citizens are before the law, we also got quite similar answers. Most respondents - both students and teachers - felt that formally we are all equal before the law, but in reality, we are different doomed both in court and by the common man, which, inter alia, is based on ethnicity, class and gender. Some of the students in both countries assured the interviewers that gender equality would probably improve when generation 50+ has handed over power to the younger generations. However, it was pointed out that especially with regard to wages and important positions in society, it is still men who make the most money, and hold the greatest power.

In Sweden it was above all the female students and teachers who drew attention to the importance of gender for citizens' conditions, but the English students identified this irrespective of their own gender. These different attitudes towards gender between the two countries may possibly be explained by the different socio-economic context that the students originated from. The political awareness and involvement in general appeared to be more evenly distributed among the English students, who were more homogeneous group and their studies theoretically oriented, than was the case among the Swedish respondents who were split between vocational and pre-university programmes. The result shows that female Swedish students seem to be less influenced by their social background when it comes to attitudes toward gender and citizenship education in general than was the case among male students. This is perhaps not surprising given that investigations in both countries shows that girls - regardless of class and ethnicity - generally performs better results

⁸² Migrationsverket, 2016.

in school than boys.⁸³ In a report from the Swedish National Agency for Education in 2006, it appears that in addition to that girls out-perform boys, girls tend to a greater extent to choose pre-university programs. The report also shows that the gender gap both in terms of school achievement and educational choice is greatest in the vocational programmes.⁸⁴

However, these differences, based on gender are in not exclusive to Sweden. The tendency that girls show better school results and increase their participation in education is an international trend, including in England as noted above. Still, there is little research done on the reasons behind these gender-differences.⁸⁵ What questions raised in school research is obviously affected by factors such as the public debate and by internationalization. Sometimes the term "travelling discourses" is used, which refers to how e.g. discussion on boys' underachievement travelled from the Anglo-Saxon research and policies to the Nordic countries. The discourse presents boys failure as caused by inadequate pedagogical efforts and the feminization of school. Nyström indicate that the risk is that gender-stereotypes will be cemented and that more complex interpretations, of what is happening in the school, is ignored. Interpretations that could have been made possible from an intersectional perspective based on different social hierarchies and focusing on the specific context, time and place. What is further problematic is the implicit assumption that there are only two genders that exist, and that the normal order of society is heterosexual. We agree with Nyström's analysis and will deepen and develop our intersectional approach further in future studies.⁸⁶

Based on the students' and teachers' experiences of the contents of Citizenship Education, the differences were greater in Sweden than was the case in England. This may be explained in that Citizenship Education has existed in England since 2002 and is relatively well established in comparison with Sweden where the school subject of Citizenship Education does not exist. In Sweden there is a shared responsibility for citizenship education and a special responsibility is on the community-oriented subjects. Furthermore, the policy documents, goals and guidelines are more clearly formulated in England, while in Sweden there is a greater space for interpretation.⁸⁷ The Swedish teachers use this space of interpretation to adapt their teaching to the current student groups, which have had the consequence that the contents of Citizenship Education in Sweden differ greatly between schools.⁸⁸

⁸³ SOU 2010:51, p. 12.; Joseph Rowntree Trust, 2012; Social Trends, 2014.

⁸⁴ Skolverket, 2006, p. 47-55.

⁸⁵ Nyström, 2010, p. 8-9.

⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 22-23.

⁸⁷ School Inspection, 2011, p. 1-2.

⁸⁸ National Agency for Education, "Summary", 2012.

When we asked about the extent to which the teaching recognizes the importance of social conditions based on class, gender and ethnicity the responses differed slightly. The students' experiences in England were that stereotypical notions of ethnicity and gender were challenged in school. Given the imagined limited importance of class, the aspect was not given any greater attention in their education. In the Swedish context the contents of education were more dependent on the access of time and the teachers' experience in the area. Actually, the teachers in both countries mentioned limited time and resources as main reasons to not being able to develop their teaching as they wished.

Finally, to return to our starting point of T.H. Marshall's (1950) classifications of Citizenship – Civil, Political and Social – our findings indicate some degree of consistency within and between the two countries. While in England students appear to want more depth of analysis and greater potential for social action, the students in Sweden differed more in their experiences according to the programme they studied. There is otherwise agreement that Civil and Political Citizenship appear to be present but that Social Citizenship is haphazard at best. As it has been stated in this article, with references to official statistics, investigations and a range of current research data, women and members of minority ethnic groups are perceived to be less enabled than men and members of the host community. While social class is also understood to be a factor in inequality, we have shown that this term is constructed differently in each country, as well as, in different contexts within the two countries. We have, through our intersectional approach, with the support of Yval-Davis' theories, wanted to show how the various social hierarchies - gender, class and ethnicity - cannot be considered in an additive way, but instead, depending on the empirical context as mutually interacting aspects that create conditions that affect people differently.

During the interviews, the respondents mentioned other areas - than class, gender and ethnicity - as important for citizens' real conditions. These were for example the importance of sexuality, (dis)ability, age, urban / rural and religion. These are examples of origins and identities that would be interesting to investigate in future studies. Also the relation between national, European and global identity are today important factors which influence people's lives. As has already been indicated from the results of this study, the countries' history and traditions of citizenship and Citizenship Education provide a significant impact on the state of affairs today. A more clearly historical perspective would certainly contribute to a deeper understanding of today's conditions. An historical perspective would also contribute to preparedness for the future. How teachers and students understand and wish for the future would be an interesting subject for further research.

If our responses are considered reliable, it is now time to take stock of approaches to Citizenship Education in the two countries that form the focus of our study, and beyond. In particular, educators need to listen to what the pupils/students perceive to be reality, to take account of their visions of now and the future rather than imposing educators' views from the past. There appear to be significant benefits in the specialist teaching of citizenship throughout the secondary age-groups of a subject known as citizenship rather than leaving non-specialists to do their best with vague guidance and no curriculum time allocated. We do not argue that students should write their own curriculum but they should at least have an influence on it, in the spirit of Freire's⁸⁹ awareness that learners bring their own experiences to their learning. Nor do we argue that such approaches will remedy all social ills. At this juncture we feel we have only scratched the surface of young people's perceptions of being a citizen; with more understanding of those perceptions, educators and young learners can collaborate to produce a more fulfilling, relevant and effective curriculum.

References

BBC <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-20677515>

Boström, Bengt-Ove. "Styrningen av den svenska skolans värdegrund i kritisk belysning". *Samhällets demokratiska värdegrund, En fråga om mångfald, olikhet men lika värde*. Ed. Bo Andersson. Gothenburg University, 2001. 33-58.

Bruner, Jerome. *The process of education*. London: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Census data <http://localstats.co.uk/census-demographics/england/> accessed 14/8/16

Dahlstedt, Magnus. *Aktiverings politik, Demokrati och medborgarskap för ett nytt millennium*, Malmö: Liber, 2009.

DfE. Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools Departmental advice for maintained schools. London: DfE, 2014.

Englund, Tomas. *Samhällsorientering och medborgarfostran i svensk skola under 1900-talet*, Pedagogisk Forskning i Uppsala nr 65, Uppsala Universitet, 1986.

Englund, Tomas. "Den svenska skolan och demokratin". *Det unga folkstyret SOU 1999:93*. Ed. Erik Amnå. Stockholm: Elanders Gotab, 1999. 13-50.

Englund, Tomas. *Deliberativa samtal som värdegrund – historiska perspektiv och aktuella förutsättningar*. Stockholm, Skolverket, 2000.

Everson, Michelle. 'Subjects', or 'Citizens of Erehwon'? Law and Non-Law in the Development of a 'British Citizenship'. *Citizenship studies*, 7.1 (2003): 57-83.

⁸⁹ Freire, 2002

- Fraser, Nancy and Gordon Linda. Contract versus Charity: Why there is no social citizenship in the United States. *Socialist Review* 3. (1992): 45-67.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Bloomsbury, 2000.
- Giddens, Anthony. "Structuration theory. Past, Present and Future". *Giddens' Theory of Structuration. A Critical Appreciation*. Ed. C. Bryant, and D. Jary, (eds.). London: Routledge. 1991
- Gillborn, D., Rollock, N., Vincent, C. and Ball S. J. "You got a pass, so what more do you want?": race, class and gender intersections in the educational experiences of the Black middle class" in *Race Ethnicity and Education*, Volume 15 [1]: (2012) pp 121-139.
- Gove, M. *Speech at Brighton College*. 2012.
<http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/speeches/a00208822/brighton-college>
- Griffiths, M. *Educational Research for Social Justice: Getting off The Fence*. Buckingham: Open University Press. 1998.
- Hazareesingh, S. *From subject to citizen: the Second Empire and the emergence of modern French democracy*. Princeton University Press. 2014.
- Institute of Fiscal Studies, 2013 and 2014.
[http://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/?sorting=newest&q=&partial_results=1&year_published\[start\]=2013&year_published\[end\]=2014&categories\[0\]=38&author=&page=1&](http://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/?sorting=newest&q=&partial_results=1&year_published[start]=2013&year_published[end]=2014&categories[0]=38&author=&page=1&)
- Institute of Race Relations, 2014. <http://www.irr.org.uk/>
- Joseph Rowntree Trust, 2012. <http://www.jrct.org.uk/>
- Keating, A., Kerr, D., Bento, T., Mundy E., and Lope, J. *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). Research Report DFE-RR059*. London: DfE. 2010.
- Lgr69, *Läroplan för grundskolan, Lgr69*, Allmän del, Stockholm: Skolöverstyrelsen. 1969.
- Larsson, Hans Albin, *Vår demokratis värdegrund*, Ordförandet i Eksjö AB. 2013.
- Leighton, R. *Teaching Citizenship Education: A Radical Approach* London: Continuum. 2012.
- Leighton, R. "The nature of Citizenship Education provision: an initial study." *The Curriculum Journal* 15:2. 167-184. 2004.
- Leighton, R. "Radical Education: the past?" in J Arthur and I Davies, *Routledge Educational Studies Textbook* London: Routledge, 207-215. 2010.
- Leighton, R. *Teaching Citizenship Education: A Radical Approach*. London: Continuum. 2012.
- Licata, L. and Klein, O., 'Does European citizenship breed xenophobia? European identification as a predictor of intolerance towards immigrants'. *Journal of community & applied social psychology*, 12(5), pp.323-337. 2002.
- London's Poverty Profile, 2016. <http://www.londonpovertyprofile.org.uk/key-facts/overview-of->

[london-boroughs/](#)

McSmith, A. *No such thing as society: A history of Britain in the 1980s*. London: Constable. 2010.

Margaret Thatcher Archives, 2016. <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/106689>

Marshall, T.H. "Citizenship and Social Class" in C Pierson and F.G. Castles, *The Welfare State Reader* Cambridge: Polity, 2006[1950].

Marx, K. and Engels, F. *Selected Works* London: Lawrence & Wishart. 1973.

Mezzadra, S., Citizen and subject: a postcolonial constitution for the European Union. *Situations: Project of the Radical Imagination*, 1(2). 2006.

Migrationsverket, "Historik", 2016. <https://www.migrationsverket.se>

Miller, P. 'Free choice, free schools and the academisation of education in England' *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 6(2), 2011, 170-182.

National Agency for Education, *PISA 2012, Sweden*, 2013. <http://www.skolverket.se/statistik-och-utvardering/internationella-studier/pisa/pisa-2012-1.167616>

National Agency for Education, *Educational equity in the Swedish school system? A quantitative analysis of equity over time*, 2012. <http://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/publikationer>

National Curriculum, in England, 2002. <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/32/contents>

National Curriculum in England, Citizenship programmes of study for key stages 3 and 4 Statutory guidance, 2013. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-citizenship-programmes-of-study/national-curriculum-in-england-citizenship-programmes-of-study-for-key-stages-3-and-4>

Nayak, A. "Displaced Masculinities: Chavs, Youth and Class in the Post-industrial City" in *Sociology* 40:5. 2006, 813–831.

Nielsen, L, "Pass or Fail in the Swedish school? A historical perspective on citizenship, diversity and social justice" in Cunningham, P (Ed.) *Identities and Citizenship Education: Controversy, crisis and challenges*. London. 2013.

Nielsen, L, "Vad har en samhällsmedborgare för genus, klass och etnicitet? Om svenska skolans medborgarundervisning och elevernas formella och reella villkor som blivande samhällsmedborgare historiskt och idag", in Larsson (Ed.), *Det historiska perspektivet*. Jönköping: Samhällsstudier & didaktik. Aktuellt om historia. 2015. 100-132. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:896252/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

Nyström, E. *Nordisk forskning om genus och jämställdhet i skola och utbildning: 2005 – 2009*.

Nordiskt institut för kunskap om kön – NIKK, Umeå universitet. 2010.

Office of National Statistics (UK)

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peoplenotinwork/unemployment>

accessed 25/4/16

Perry, E. and Francis, B. *The social class gap for educational achievement: A review of the literature* London: RSA. 2015.

PISA, Results in Focus. 2012. <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/keyfindings/pisa-2012-results-overview.pdf>
accessed 31/5/2016

QCA, *The Final Report on the Teaching of Citizenship and Democracy in Schools* London: QCA, 1998.

SCB, "Arbetskraftsundersökningarna (AKU) – SCB, 2015. www.scb.se

School Inspection, *Litteraturoversikt för kvalitetsgranskningen Skolors arbete med värdefrågor och demokratifrågor*. 2011.

Sernhede, O, *Alienation is My Nation*, Stockholm, 2007.

Shafir, G. (ed), *The Citizenship Debates: A Reader* U of Minnesota, 1998.

Sheldrick, M. *The Magna Carta at 800, the myth and reality of the birth of the rule of law*, 2015.

<https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/the-magna-carta-at-800-the-myth-and-reality-of-the/>

Skolverket, *Elever med utländsk bakgrund*, 2004:545, 2004. <http://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/publicerat/publikationer>

Skolverket, *Könsskillnader i målpuppfyllelse och utbildningsval*, 2006:287, Stockholm. 2006.

Skolverket, *Curriculum for the upper secondary school*, Stockholm, 2013.

Skolverket, (2012) *Likvärdig utbildning i svensk grundskola?* Report 374, Stockholm

Skolverket, *En bild av skolmarknaden*, 2012b. <http://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/publicerat/publikationer>

Skolverket, *PISA 2012, Summary of the report 398*, 2013.

<http://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=3127>

Skolverket, "program structure and degree objectives", 2016. <https://www.skolverket.se/laroplaner-amnen-och-kurser/gymnasieutbildning/gymnasieskola/programstruktur-och-examensmal>

Smith, T.E. Subject and citizen. *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, 8(4), 2010. 385-409.

Social Trends, 2014. https://data.gov.uk/dataset/social_trends accessed 20/5/2016

SOU, 2005:112, *Demokrati på svenska? Om strukturell diskriminering och politiskt deltagande*, Stockholm: Fritzes Offentliga publikationer, 2005.

SOU, 2010:51. 2010.

http://www.skolverket.se/polopoly_fs/1.203100!/Menu/article/attachment/Konsskillnader_skolprestationer.pdf.

Speaker's Commission, *Encouraging Citizenship* HMSO. 1990.

- Strandbrink, Peter & Åkerström, Linda, *Goda medborgare och onda tider? svensk demokratipolitik och myten om den passiva medborgare*, Umeå: Bokförlaget h:ström – Text & Kultur, 2010.
- Sutton Trust <http://www.suttontrust.com/news/news/the-educational-backgrounds-of-500-leading-figures/>
- Sutton Trust <http://www.suttontrust.com/research/the-educational-backgrounds-of-government-ministers-in-2010/>
- Sutton Trust <http://www.suttontrust.com/research/the-educational-backgrounds-of-mps/>
- Thomas, M. and Young, L. June. *More subject than citizen: age, gender and political disengagement in Canada*. In Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, York University, Toronto, ON. 2006.
- Tippett, N., Wolke, D. and Platt, L., 'Ethnicity and bullying involvement in a national UK youth sample'. *Journal of adolescence*, 36(4), 2013. 639-649.
- UK Government publications. 2016. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gcse-results-2016-infographic>
- UK Government Treasury <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/hm-treasury>
- UKonline, 2016. <https://www.ukonlinecentres.com/funding/current-funding/uk-areas-of-deprivation>
- Universities and Colleges Admissions System [UCAS] 2015 <https://www.ucas.com>
- Worger, P., 'A mad crowd: Skinhead youth and the rise of nationalism in post-communist Russia.' *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 45(3), 2012, 269-278.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira, "Women, Citizenship and Difference" in *Feminist Review* No 57, 1997, 4-27.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira, "Power, Intersectionality and the Politics of Belonging". Aalborg: Institut for Kultur og Globale Studier, Aalborg Universitet. (FREIA's tekstserie; No. 75). DOI: 10.5278/freia.58024502. 2011.
- Ziebertz, H.G. and van der Tuin, L., (2008). 'Displeasure at plurality and fear of strangers? An empirical study among youth in Germany and the Netherlands.' *Intercultural Education*, 19(1), 2008, 53-65.

Leighton, R (2018) 'Formally equal, but not really: the second stage of an ongoing study into English school students' perceptions of 'the citizen'.' *Citizenship teaching and learning* 13[1], pp31-44

Abstract This paper presents a discussion based primarily upon the findings of the second stage of on-going research into school students' perceptions of 'the Citizen'. The first stage was an analysis of images in textbooks intended for GCSE Citizenship Studies students aged 14-16, the second stage – a year later – involved interviews with A Level Citizenship Studies students aged 16-18 and with teachers of Citizenship. It was found that the images present a particular and unrepresentative image of 'being British', a part of which students appear to absorb into their own perceptions, irrespective of their personal experiences. The homogeneity of responses, across class, ethnicity, gender and professional role struck the researcher as notable, and similarities and differences are examined. The images represent a highly selective and distorted version of the reality of being English, one which promotes a false consciousness and acceptance of the status quo; uncovering whether or to what extent that version of reality is accepted by those involved is the purpose of this study. Responses in interviews showed that neither the students nor their teachers subscribed to the message behind the images, and that they had their own versions of the reality of 'the Citizen'.

Key words: Citizen Class Ethnicity Gender Students Teachers

Introduction

This paper follows on from recent research (Leighton 2014) into school representations of 'the citizen' that discussed the images presented in Citizenship Education textbooks aimed at 14-16 year olds in England. It is summarised here in conjunction with the second stage of the research: interviews with 'A' level (the examination for school students 16-18) Citizenship Studies¹ students and teachers (Nielsen and Leighton 2016). Based on these studies, there is an examination of the apparent deficit in schools in England of understanding who citizens are.

In order to understand what citizenship really means, it is necessary to understand and interpret formal citizenship rights and responsibilities in relation to individuals' social and cultural conditions. Marx and Engels wrote over 160 years ago that, "if you assume a particular civil society . . . you will get particular political conditions" (Marx and Engels, 1973, p. 660), from which it must follow that

any society riven with divisions (such as of class, ethnicity and gender) will present political conditions which reflect such divisions. It is also the case that there is potentially a significant space between *what is* (the real) and *what is perceived* (the formal); that inequality exists cannot be taken to mean that everyone is aware of that inequality.

In this research, self and social concepts of citizenship were examined in particular relation to gender, ethnicity and class. There are further socially constructed categories not explicitly addressed in this paper; for example, sexuality and disability are also important aspects of and influenced by people's conditions, and insight into these is therefore also needed for a more complete understanding of the meaning of citizenship. The next stage of the research will therefore extend the scope of constructed categories to be considered, and utilise Yural-Davis' (2011) intersectional approach to discussion and analysis of simultaneous belongings .

The subject will not be available for examination at this level after summer 2017. Advanced [A] levels are the examinations at the end of secondary school and form the basis of evidence of suitability for higher education and/or employment. The initial data were derived from analysis of the illustrations in five textbooks aimed at those young people taking public examination courses for 16 year olds in Citizenship Education – of whom there were 23,779 in 2016. The main substance of this paper develops from those data and from subsequent interviews with three focus groups of Citizenship Education students working at Advanced Level, and individual interviews with their teachers. The data from the first stage gives some context to the interviews; a more substantial account of that research is available elsewhere (Leighton 2014). While the subject has been a discrete statutory part of England's National Curriculum since 2002, examination is not compulsory and it is frequently the case that schools do not observe the minimum statutory requirements (Keating et al 2010; Leighton 2012, 2013; Ofsted 2006, 2010). It is also to be noted that the National Curriculum for Citizenship has gone through various iterations (QCA 2002, 2007, 2010; Department for Education 2013a) since the books were published.

The interviews, however, showed a diversity of opinion and insight at odds with the images presented in the textbooks. While it would be possible to state that this reflected the teachers' views, particularly bearing in mind that the textbooks are not universally used, this diversity of opinion and insight was not wholly a reflection of the teachers' positions. More probably, but as yet

tentatively, more appropriate conclusions would be that students of Citizenship Education are a) influenced by a range of factors, not just books and teachers; b) able to think independently and have their own insights into the nature of society; c) living experiences not considered by textbooks or teachers (or academics).

The General Certificates in Education (GCSEs) are subject specific examinations taken at the end of compulsory schooling in England. The context presented here relates to the textbooks in Citizenship Education in England in that, while widely available, they are not widely used by specialist teachers. This leads to a brief comment on the 'official' status of the content of the textbooks scrutinised. The research methods for the second stage of research, which this article represents, are then outlined and the results presented and discussed. The primary conclusions are that an 'assimilationist model', which the textbooks proffer and which appears to be the perception approved of by the state, is largely rejected by students and teachers.

Context

Specialist teachers of Citizenship Education are encouraged, during their pre-service education, to ensure that learning is tailored to their pupils' interests and experiences (Leighton 2012) – something which no one text book can achieve. There are fewer than 3000 such specialist teachers in England and almost 7000 secondary schools, including 3268 which have a statutory obligation to follow the National Curriculum and, therefore, to provide Citizenship Education. This clearly illustrates that most children in England's secondary schools do not have the benefit of specialist subject teaching in their Citizenship Education lessons, particularly as some have more than one specialist, some specialists in Citizenship Education teach other subjects, and some specialist Citizenship teachers have left the teaching profession. This might in part be explained by Citizenship Education being one of only two National Curriculum subjects for which there is no bursary for those enrolling on pre-service qualification courses. As shown above, recent government inspections of Citizenship Education have criticised, amongst other things, the lack of expertise of many non-specialist teachers, and the lack of support provided for them when asserting that 32% of citizenship lessons are not good enough because "teachers' subject knowledge and expertise led to only limited and superficial learning." (Ofsted 2013, p5)

There also exists a considerable bank of images, data and activities available through the internet that teachers can use and manipulate to determine the perceptions and ideas they wish to develop as part of Citizenship Education. Freire's observation that 'a deed, a gesture, a poem, a painting, a song, a book are always wrapped in thick wrappers. They have been touched by manifold *whys*' (2006, p10) reminds us that the images deployed by teachers of citizenship – whether specialist, convert, volunteer or coerced – carry messages not always immediately obvious but none the less influential. The first stage of this research considered those images found in textbooks. The second stage, the main focus of this article, investigated the images held by students, derived from whichever sources their teachers have deployed and from sources other than those presented formally in school.

According to Ofsted, in those schools where the quality of Citizenship Education was deemed less than good (32%),

Provision . . . was characterised by insufficient teaching time, teachers' lack of subject expertise and a lack of systems that could identify and address important weaknesses. Such schools did not recognise that non-specialist teachers often require support to develop their skills and expertise in teaching citizenship; in these schools, teachers had not received the necessary training and support to deliver more challenging aspects of the curriculum (Ofsted 2013, p4)

The books were chosen as representing a collective image designated by the Department for Children, Families and Schools (as it was known when they were published, now the Department for Education), delineated by the examination boards, and projected by schools, to pupils in the 14-16 age range, of what it means to be English. The textbooks were produced to support the learning required to meet the demands of the GCSE examination in Citizenship Education taken as an option by 23,779 young people in 2016. The specifications of all such public examinations have to be approved by a state agency. That the specifications were so approved, and that the textbooks were in turn approved by the examination boards, clearly implies approval by the state of the general thrust of these books.

Summary of findings from textbook analysis

While there are clear and positive role models in relation to gender and to minority ethnic group membership, these are considerably outnumbered by inaccurate or 'aspirational' images rather than reflecting statistical reality. For example, the only reference to HIV/Aids in any of the textbooks is illustrated with a black woman and child. Yet, in England 66% of all those with AIDS/HIV in 2001 were white and 62% male, and the incidence of AIDS/HIV transference from mother to child was consistently in the region of <1% in the first decade of the 21st Century, far less than the incidence of transference through homosexual (65%) or heterosexual (32%) sexual activity.

The textbooks' representation of black men and crime, by singling out one particular historical event, wholly ignores that young black men are statistically more likely to be stopped and harassed by police officers, or assaulted by people they know, than to be murdered by strangers (Bowling and Phillips, 2007). Images of employment did not discriminate between occupations and ethnic groups. However, non-whites are more likely to be unemployed than whites (ONS 2005, p5), while there is a higher proportion of British Chinese and British Indian 'professionals' than there are of British white professionals.

Women were not invisible in the textbooks but, in a proportion of roughly 8:1, they were relatively obscured. Men were shown much more often, in a greater number of roles which were also generally of higher social status. That both women and men were shown as criminals, athletes, footballers and borrowers might be construed as some recognition of gender equality. There are no images which explicitly represent social class, as if there are differences in employment but these do not result in significant difference in social experience. The absence of such images could be interpreted to imply that the 'official' version of life in Britain is that social class does not exist to any significant extent.

Method

Data were collected through engagement with focus group interviews of school pupils aged 17-18 and individual interviews of teachers; opportunity samples of schools were used, partly for convenience and partly due to parallel research being conducted in Sweden with which it was intended to compare data and analysis and so similar methods and samples were required. In

accordance with Griffiths (1998) there is recognition that it is extremely unlikely that another researcher (or, if I were to repeat the study, that I) would make exactly the same inquiries of exactly the same sample and get exactly the same answers to be analysed in exactly the same way to produce exactly the same results. Of greater importance than replicability was that there is validity, that what has been identified, analysed and discussed gives an insight into young people's perceptions of 'the Citizen' in England.

The two studies, from England and Sweden, have been brought together in a more substantial form in Nielsen and Leighton (2017). The sample comprised 26 learners and 4 teachers, not large enough to be representative but still usefully indicative. Three of the schools were state schools with the other coming from the independent sector. The state schools were all schools where Citizenship Education is an established curriculum subject taught as an examination option, while the independent school has a long established Citizenship programme but not a public examination course. Independent schools in England have a statutory requirement to provide a 'broad and balanced' curriculum, but they are not bound by the National Curriculum.

The class (based on school profiles), gender, and ethnic composition of the sample was

Girls Middle Class Black English = 1

Girls Middle Class White English = 4

Girls Working Class White English = 11

Boys Working Class Asian/English = 1

Boys Working class White English = 8

Individual interviews were with two male and two female teachers. Two of the teachers were of pupils interviewed while two were not.

The teachers and students were asked about their experiences and opinions regarding Citizenship Education and the nature of citizenship. The following core questions formed the basis of the focus group interviews:

- What knowledge and skills does a citizen need in a democracy and how is the meaning of citizenship connected to gender, class and ethnicity?
- How are freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and other personal liberties affected by the citizen's gender, class and ethnicity, according to the respondents?
- What are teachers' and students' experiences of Citizenship Education and how does school pay attention to citizens' conditions based on gender, class and ethnicity?

All students explicitly mentioned the need to become involved in society, to know how to listen to and understand news and current affairs rather than be passive recipients of one institutional version of events. They considered it important that schools enable knowledge and understanding of pressure groups, extending the notion of 'political' beyond party definitions and party activities. There was also general agreement that a full understanding of rights and responsibilities would be beneficial as this was an area considered to be confused and confusing.

One group of students stressed a need for a greater sense of the individual's sense of and place in society. They were aware of Margret Thatcher's alleged dictum that "there is no such thing as society. There are individual men and women, and there are families" proposed during a speech in Bruges in 1988 (before they were born); she was being critical of a perceived entitlement culture but became popularly understood as an advocacy of absolute individuality, an advocacy of individualism and selfishness which the students did not interpret as representative of their local community but perhaps of the country at large. Two white working class female students made a point about which there was again general agreement:

Student 1: Citizenship and being a citizen aren't the same thing.

Interviewer: Can you clarify that? What do you mean?

Student 1: Citizenship is active

Student 2: Yeah. *Citizenship* is the active part; a citizen is just someone who lives somewhere. Paradoxically, this is very close to what Mrs Thatcher might have meant. (See Woman's Own magazine interview transcript at <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/106689>.)

As to social differentiation, a white working class male observed that “Notionally we’re all equal, except the Queen. Men are paid more and dominate social roles – equality in law but not in fact.” This ‘legal but not real’ perception of equality as citizens was a recurring theme in all focus group sessions.

Across all student respondents there was therefore general agreement that to be a citizen is to be a member of a community, but that citizenship goes further to imply some form of active involvement. Ethnicity was seen as a potentially differentiating factor to the extent that a white Briton or a black African might define it differently in detail, but the principle is the same. There was a perception that many politicians continued to push an anti-immigration agenda, ignoring – from the students’ perspective – that “some people need a safe place”. The perception was also prevalent that England was ‘still not’ an equal country for all ethnic groups, that institutional racism continued to be experienced.

While legislation can and does help, this was considered to be effective only to a limited extent; for example, legislation cannot change attitudes. Ethnicity as not seen as a limiting factor in itself – there was no suggestion that members of any ethnic groups were somehow less able to be active and constructive citizens.

With regard to gender and citizenship, there was no dissent from the opinion expressed by one male student:

Student 3: elected representatives have generally always [*sic*] been male. Women might feel excluded. Plaid Cymru, SNP, Greens, have women leaders and are left-leaning parties. They have grown as outsiders in their gender, region, and politics. The media portrayal of them is minimal and vindictive.

Other than this, there was general consensus that women and men enjoy equality in most aspects of public life. There was some awareness that women’s average income was less than men’s, ascribed to the different jobs people do, yet no feeling that women are systemically prevented from achieving those better paid posts. That imbalance was ascribed to either lack of ambition for some

women or their families of origin, or men feeling safer replacing themselves with other men. As well as changing attitudes, there was a perception that women lose out in employment because of parenting responsibilities, that there was a need for parental leave as well as maternal. In common with perceptions of ethnicity in relation to the status of the citizen, gender as seen to be equal in the eyes of the law but not in the reality of day-to-day interactions. The views thus expressed are much closer to social reality than the images to which the students had been exposed in their textbooks.

Social class was again seen as having less of a role in determining citizenship and social involvement than in the past, but there was certainty that it was still a relevant (if confused) concept. The interviewer did not offer a definition of class and, while students clearly held their own concepts, these were not explicitly stated or examined. The notion put forward was that class mattered less than income, opportunity and culture, which is clearly problematic and begs the question, “what is class, if not defined by income, opportunity and culture?” Students referred to the ‘Chav’⁹⁰ image promoted by television programmes in particular as well as throughout the mass media more generally, citing television programmes such as the Jeremy Kyle Show, Big Brother, and Benefits Street as examples of holding the poorer and less articulate up to ridicule. There was a perception of both an underclass and of a society experiencing embourgeoisement, where there is a large middle mass, a small group with the bulk of wealth and power, and a small group detached from society and from opportunities for social involvement. The observation that “region matters as well” was given in relation to a notional preponderance of civic power resting within the M25 orbital motorway [London and its immediate environment] and that, the further away from London people lived, the less opportunity they had to exercise influence in public life.

Respondents were also asked whether there was such a thing as a ‘typical British person’. While some suggestions were forthcoming - patriotic, balding, white male, in his 40s, drinks tea and eats a full English breakfast – these features were recognised as stereotypical. This was a question which prompted one focus group to have a heated discussion regarding the correct way to make a cup of

⁹⁰ A widely used derogatory term for members of the underclass; Nayak (2006, p813) suggests that it is used to “distinguish the ‘rough’ from the ‘respectable’ working class” and issues of income rather than social class.

tea, which struck the interviewer as a stereotypically English issue⁹¹. It was agreed in every case that Britain is too multicultural and regionally diverse for a generic image to have any validity.

There was a consistent theme that teachers and academics are out of touch, raised by three of the focus groups. This was typified by one male student's response.

Interviewer: Do you feel enough attention is given to social differences in the Citizenship Education National Curriculum?

Student 4: [The National Curriculum] is set up by people like you [middle-aged, white, male researcher]. We don't worry about these things; we're not racist, we're not sexist.

He and his fellow students argued that there were more important things to worry about than constructions such as class, ethnicity and gender, and that education should focus on what matters now rather than what used to matter.

Teachers

For teachers there was a perceived need that citizens should be both media smart and politically literate, that citizens – particularly young citizens – need an understanding of the political system and how to access political processes to their advantage. One male teacher expressed the opinion that

Teacher 1: social class appears to have disappeared from discussion, even though its influence clearly remains.

This, he felt, could be most clearly seen in popular TV programmes such as 'Benefits Street' (where the lives of people who claimed welfare benefits from the state were under constant scrutiny), 'Jeremy Kyle' (in which people were brought face to face with family members or acquaintances to resolve bitter disputes such as inter-household sexual dalliances), and others which

⁹¹ When the researcher presented an early draft of findings to a group of post-graduate students in England, it was the issue of making teas which stimulated the most heated discussion. There is insufficient data for a reliable conclusion as to whether this reflects the centrality of tea making to the English psyche or a lack of attention holding skills on the part of the researcher.

– he believed – were leading society inexorably towards a ‘Hunger Games’⁹² mentality reminiscent of Juvenal’s ‘panem et circenses’, (bread and circuses), and Herbert Marcuse’s ‘Happy Consciousness’.

Teacher 1: The media are not only distracting attention away from social inequality and social issues, they are creating entertainment from others’ difficulties.

This media exploitation of class voyeurism was perceived by him as much stronger than any possible comparable gender or ethnically-based distorting emphasis, in part because class is less openly discussed and because there is a prevailing opposition to – or at least diminution of – gender and ethnically based discrimination (both legally and culturally).

None of the other teachers offered class as a significant focus for citizenship. Those teachers considered economic opportunity and cultural attitudes to be more significant than an undefined notion of ‘social class’. All the teachers raised issues of taxation and voting systems as being important for citizens. How taxes are raised and where the expenditure is were deemed useful ways to both politically and economically educate citizens, particularly as it allowed teachers to address myths regarding benefit levels without being considered biased in their teaching. As well as the UK’s general use of First Past The Post, it was considered important that citizens have some grasp of the principles of proportional representation, not least because various forms of this are used in Scottish Parliamentary, Welsh and Northern Irish Assembly, and European Union, elections. All were agreed that one regularly successful strategy had been to run mock elections in school, exposing learners to Marshall’s notions of both Civil and Political Citizenship.

Experienced specialists considered it most important to identify and challenge social inequality and mobility barriers. Social class was perceived as still present but a less significant barrier than in the past; students were perceived as class aware, perhaps more sensitive to issues of poverty and income than to sociological definitions of employment class. One teacher commented on the media exploitation of class

⁹² A popular USA film series based on books by Suzanne Collins. Two young people from each district in the fictional country of Panem are selected by lottery to participate in the annual Hunger Games where they try to eliminate their competitors while the citizens are required to watch the televised games.

voyeurism, particularly in relation to 'reality' TV shows such as Big Brother, while one male teacher expressed the view – subsequently reiterated by one of the female teachers, that parental ignorance or bias in relation to each of class, ethnicity and gender was a greater influence than could be countered by school. Identity politics did not appear to be an issue.

There was unanimity that textbooks were fairly useless. Some gender representations were seen to exaggerate or over compensate for reality, while the teachers considered that they should offer realistic rather than aspirational images. Teachers showed awareness that issues of gender and ethnicity were less significant for students now than in the past; while it was considered still important that these categories were raised by the National Curriculum and in textbooks, there was a consensus that the emphasis should be on detail rather than broad generalisation. The two female teachers raised that sexuality is still ignored in the National Curriculum, which appears based on an assumption of universal heterosexuality. They considered that their prime needs in developing citizens were for more preparation time and more curriculum space. All the teachers made their own resources rather than resort to textbooks whenever possible.

The books considered in the first stage of this study uniformly present what Banks (2004) terms an 'assimilationist model', similar to that which underpinned Parks' (1926) 'Immigrant/Host Model'. They also fit what Gramsci (1985) described as a dominant hegemony. When we scrutinise those images to which students are required to relate and upon which they are required to reflect, we find that they represent a highly selective and distorted version of the reality of being English which promotes a false consciousness and acceptance of the status quo.

The interviews, however, showed a diversity of opinion and insight at odds with the images presented in the textbooks. While it might be tempting to conclude that this reflected the teachers' views, particularly bearing in mind that the textbooks are not universally used and that many teaching materials are developed personally or collectively by teachers, this diversity of opinion and insight was not wholly a reflection of the teachers' positions found in this study. More probably, but as yet tentatively, more

appropriate conclusions would be that students of Citizenship Education are

a) influenced by a range of factors, not just books and teachers;

b) able to think independently and have their own insights into the nature of society;

c) living experiences not considered by textbooks or teachers (or academics).

There was considerable homogeneity of responses within each of the groups, although not as much between them. That homogeneity was such that it is possible to summarise the perceptions of each sub-sample and to offer comparisons and contrasts. One issue on which there was unanimity between all interviewees was that law and reality don't always coincide. The most notable observation throughout all the interviews was that a significant disparity between legislation and daily life was regularly identified, a perception that social reality did not present the rule of law as a lived experience. This has particular significance in the light of subsequent government policy being to promote 'Fundamental British Values' which are given as the Rule of Law, Tolerance, Democracy, and Respect for the beliefs of others.

There was awareness amongst the students that the law does not allow discrimination, yet women's and men's mean salaries are very different, with some mention of 'the glass ceiling'. While not articulated by the teachers, this writer assumes some teacher influence here as 'glass ceiling' is not otherwise an everyday phrase in young people's lexicon.

It was common to both groups that gender and ethnicity are no longer seen as significant barriers to civic membership nor to an individual's social or economic wellbeing. In relation to social class there was a greater diversity of opinion, in part due to the lack of clarity among students in what they considered the meaning of social class to be. Teachers appeared to have a clearer sense of class but were not significantly more persuaded that it was a major factor in citizenship.

The multicultural nature of British society was another element about which there was consensus. Not only in the nature of that society but also that it was a situation to be welcomed and one which was largely accepted and celebrated.

Further agreement can be seen in perceptions of what is lacking in Citizenship Education. The students felt that the curriculum was outdated and that their teachers were therefore also out of touch, on the assumption that teachers have some influence over curriculum content; they do not. The teachers agreed with the students, being very specific in saying that there needed to be much more about voting systems specifically and political structures more generally, and that the young needed to be more aware and better informed about systems of taxation than the National Curriculum required.

This was a surprising observation, given that the Citizenship National Curriculum for Key Stage 3 (11-14 year olds) explicitly requires that

Pupils should be taught about

- *the development of the political system of democratic government in the United Kingdom, including the roles of citizens, Parliament and the monarch*
- *the operation of Parliament, including voting and elections, and the role of political parties* (DfE 2013)

This requirement is repeated for Key Stage 4 (14-16 year olds), with the expectation of more depth and detail, and with the addition of “income and expenditure, credit and debt, insurance, savings and pensions, financial products and services, and how public money is raised and spent” (DfE 2013). One can only conclude that the teachers have not read the National Curriculum guidelines or that the political and economic aspects of it have been downplayed. It is also worth noting that all schools have to provide a programme of Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education (PSHEE). While this does not have specific guidance, it seems an appropriate locus for economic issues such as taxation.

Female teachers emphasised gender issues more strongly than their male counterparts, whereas there was no such identifiable separation amongst the students. One female teacher, in extending her perception of social inequality to include sexuality and other determinants of social identity such as region, age, and dis/ability, raised points not identified by other teachers nor by the students. It was consistently proposed by both categories of interviewees that there was no practical way of separating the social reality of any of these factors as people experience their places in all three

categories simultaneously. This perception is addressed by Yural-Davis (2011) and her discussion of intersectionality as an approach which both recognises and allows analysis of people's membership of multiple communities of identity. However, the students did not express much interest in identity politics, perceiving concern with gender, ethnicity and class as outmoded and not openly considering the other factors mentioned above.

Students and teachers agreed that there is no such thing as a typical British person any more than there is a typical any sort of person. All interviewees were clear in regarding the UK as a multi-cultural society and that all members of society were British, irrespective of any whatever other groups with which they also identified. They were aware of racism, regarding it as behaviour of a minority. Teachers in particular argued that there is no set of common yet unique British values, despite there being an official set of 'Fundamental British Values laid down by the government. This is another aspect of responses where Yural-Davis' (2011) work on intersectionality can give insight and understanding, in recognising that someone can identify as British while also identifying as European and/or Asian and/or Muslim and/or Jewish and/or Christian, as well as by skin colour, location, social class, gender, sexuality etc.

Social class, while a concept rarely clarified and certainly not uniformly understood, was none the less seen as exerting an influence on the extent to which civic and social participation is possible. Not all teachers showed an awareness of 'class' and the students tended to use synonyms, often suggesting it was class culture rather than systemic inequality which made it more difficult for some than others to get involved. Their awareness of their own class, for example, had not several of them from planning to become more involved in political and other community activities. All the students involved in Citizenship Education as a Key Stage 5 (17-18 year olds) subject intended to either become or continue to be politically active to varying degrees, whereas only two of those not so involved shared that intention.

There was also agreement across the interviewees that to be a citizen is to be a member of a society, actively or passively, but that to hold citizenship is to be active. It is this notion of active involvement – whether within one or more groups or in society as a whole – which, for students and teachers, defines citizenship. Active involvement, for them, was more significant than any socially or biologically determined label of culture, gender, class etc.

Conclusions

While all conclusions are offered tentatively as this study is yet to be completed, it is reasonable to conclude that students of Citizenship Education in England are influenced by a range of factors, not just books and teachers, as their attitudes and opinions do not reflect wholesale those offered either by their textbooks in earlier years, nor those of their teachers. Illich observed that “most people acquire their knowledge outside school” (1971, p20) and these data appear to support that.

From this and supported by the range of responses, it can also be seen that young people are perfectly able to think independently and have their own insights into the nature of society. In particular, an awareness that there is a social justice deficit for many citizens, that there appears to be equality in law but there is less evidence of equality in daily life and life opportunities: that there is *formal* equality but not *real* equality. While there was much consensus between them, and significant agreement with their teachers, responses were not uniform or provided in rote. This also indicates a third conclusion, that the students were living experiences not considered by textbooks nor by teachers and academics. It follows from this that, to gain insight into what matters to young people and to ascertain how best to provide for them an education which meets their needs now and for the future, we need to have a shift in mind-set. Rather than providing *for*, we need to start providing *with*, in line with Goodman’s recommendation that, “since schooling undertakes to be compulsory, must it not continually review its claim to be useful?” (1975, p19) – in this case, useful to students rather than to those who dominate society.

That teachers have some influence on their students is none the less clear. There are nuanced differences and, at times, significant contrasts, but the language used by many student interviewees reflected the language of the teachers e.g. terms such as ethnicity and glass ceiling being used in appropriate contexts and with clear understanding. It is also apparent that some teachers (all of this small sample) have a lack of a detailed familiarity with and understanding of the National Curriculum for Citizenship Education in England, and other recent policies. They identified areas they thought should be taught which were already in the required curriculum, and seemed unaware of, for example, the Fundamental British Values which have been at the core of the National Curriculum for three years. Whether this has come about due to lack of time, or lack of professionalism or lack of direction from school management, was not investigated. Given the dedication the teachers show to their students in spending time preparing learning materials and providing extra-curricular support,

it is unlikely that they lack professionalism; this leads to the conclusion that school managers need to provide more information, direction and time to teachers of Citizenship for them to meet the needs and aspirations of their students.

References

AVERT (2012) *UK HIV and AIDS Statistics* <http://www.avert.org/uk-statistics.htm>

Banks, J.A., (2004) 'Teaching for social justice, diversity, and citizenship in a global world.' In *The Educational Forum* 68[4], pp. 296-305

Bowling, B. and Phillips, C. (2007) 'Disproportionate and discriminatory: reviewing the evidence on police stop and search', in *The Modern Law Review* 70[6] pp936-961

Department for Education (2013) *The National Curriculum in England: Framework document* London: DfE

Freire, P. (2006) *Pedagogy of Hope* New York: Continuum

Gramsci, A. (1985) *Selections from Cultural Writings*. London: Lawrence and Wishart

Griffiths, M. (1998) *Educational Research for Social Justice: Getting off The Fence*

Illich, I. (1971) *Deschooling Society* Penguin: Middlesex

Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E. and Lopes, J., (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)*.

HMG (Her Majesty's Government) (2010) *Statistics on race and the criminal justice system 2010 - statistical tables* <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/race-and-the-criminal-justice-system>

Institute of Race Relations (2012) *96 Murders Since Stephen Lawrence's* <http://www.irr.org.uk/news/96-murders-since-stephen-lawrences/>

Leighton, R. (2012) *Teaching Citizenship Education: A Radical Approach* London: Continuum

Leighton, R. (2013) *Citizenship Education for children of the elite in England*. Paper presented to CiCe conference, University of Lisbon, June 2013

Leighton, R. (2014). 'England's self-image as portrayed in public examination Citizenship Education textbooks'. In *Innovative Practice and Research Trends in Identity, Citizenship and Education: Selected papers from the 16th conference of the CiCe Erasmus Academic Network* (pp. 140-155). CiCe.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1973) *Selected Writings of Marx and Engels* London: Lawrence and Wishart

Nayak, A. (2006) 'Displaced Masculinities: Chavs, Youth and Class in the Post-industrial City' *Sociology* 40[5] pp813-831

Nielsen, L. and Leighton, R. (2016) 'Gender, class and ethnicity in European citizenship education. A joint study of secondary school students' views on citizenship education in England and Sweden'. Paper presented at the CiCEa Conference, Madrid.

Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) (2006) *Citizenship Consolidated?* London: Ofsted

Ofsted (2010) *Citizenship established? Citizenship in schools 2006/09* Manchester: Ofsted

Ofsted (2013) *Citizenship consolidated? A survey of citizenship in schools between 2009 and 2012* Manchester: Ofsted

ONS (Office of National Statistics) (2005) *Focus on Ethnicity & Identity* London: Office for National Statistics

ONS (2011a) *Who we are; How we live; What we do* <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/census/2011/index.html>

ONS (2011b) *Population Estimates by Ethnic Group 2002 – 2009* Newport: ONS

ONS (2011c) <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/family-demography/families-and-households/2011/stb-families-households.html>

Park, R. (1926) *The Urban Community as a Spatial Pattern and a Moral Order* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

QCA (2002), (2007), (2010) *The National Curriculum for England and Wales: Teachers' Handbook* Nottingham: QCA/DfES

Yuval-Davis, N., 2011. *The politics of belonging: Intersectional contestations*. London: Sage.

<http://worldjusticeproject.org/opportunity-fund/rule-law-and-counter-terrorism>

<http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/106689>

<http://blog.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/2013/09/19/what-are-precious-liberties/>

Theorizing young people's perceptions of their citizenship identity

Ralph Leighton, Canterbury Christ Church University, UK

Laila Nielsen, Jönköping University, Sweden (2018)

ABSTRACT

The paradigm of social justice gives voice to those without the resources to deal with responsibilities imposed by a neoliberal agenda. The authors focus on pupils in Sweden and England, countries which have moved from a sense of communality to the growth of neoliberal societal individualism. To clarify real citizenship (rather than formal) they apply the concepts of intersectionality and of human capabilities in place of rights, which means that people adhere to numerous simultaneous collectivities and having the capability to do something requires more than an entitlement to it. While everyone might have the right to an education and to a dignified life, many live in powerlessness and in political, social and economic exclusion. Sufficient human capabilities are required in order to receive the education necessary for citizenship in its real meaning, and the intersectional approach enables interrogation of factors which coalesce, rather than viewing in them in isolation.

Keywords: Capabilities, Collectivities, England, Formal Citizenship, Intersectionality, T.H. Marshall, K. Marx, Neoliberalism, M. Nussbaum, Real Citizenship, A. Sen, Social Justice, Sweden, N. Yuval Davis.

BACKGROUND

We research and write with conscious commitment to the paradigm of social justice, aspiring to give voice to the powerless and the unheard. It is our contention that citizenship education must be relevant to the lives of learners and to their contexts of multiple communities if it is to have any worthwhile effect. We recognize the potential of citizenship education as an area of study which should enable learners to understand their own situations and their own potential to effect change, and which should enable them to become active participants in the creation of societies which serve the interests of the many rather than those of a small and powerful elite. We have come to recognize that the status of 'citizen' cannot be understood simply as a legal description or category as it must also relate to people's daily experiences. It is not enough that the law provides for equal rights, for example, if not all people have equal and unequivocal access to those rights; it is essential

that we understand the extent to which “social domination is exercised through the selective inclusion and exclusion of functions and people in different temporal and spatial frames” (Castells, 2010 p465) and the inequalities of life experiences, including the nature of citizenship, which result from that domination.

We have found it both helpful and necessary to differentiate between two forms of citizenship – the *formal*, official version to be found in government documents, legislation, and official pronouncements, and which national and international citizenship education curricula promulgate, and the *real*, everyday experiences of people as they encounter systemic and long established structural limitations on their ability to access the rights and responsibilities enshrined in citizenship in its *formal* condition. These forms overlap in some ways and to a limited extent, but they are fundamentally different. Of particular value to us in this discussion and research has been the concept of intersectionality as proposed by Yuval-Davies (2011) and the capability approach identified by Sen (1999) and by Nussbaum (2000). The background to this chapter stems from a currently ongoing comparative study of Sweden and England (Nielsen and Leighton, 2017) which is summarized below to provide a context for our comments and observations. We consider that our comparative approach can aid the visualization and identification of how similarities and differences between different provisions for citizenship education, as well as differences in young peoples’ conditions, may be explained by a common western context, and what circumstances may be declared as specifically national or local. While we recognize the dangers of generalization from a narrow research base, we would also propose that the insights gathered thus far indicate that young people’s experiences of citizenship are much more complex than is often assumed. Indeed, we are convinced that it may well be even more complex than we identify here.

EARLIER STUDY

We conducted one-to-one interviews with teachers and focus-group interviews with pupils in both Sweden and England, adhering to the same interview schedules and with identical sample sizes. They were asked about their experiences and opinions regarding Citizenship Education and the nature of citizenship, with a particular focus on ethnicity, gender, and social class. We found that the relationship between students’ education and the real conditions for citizenship is complex, exacerbated by the meanings of frequently used terminology and images in the field of Citizenship Education not always aligning with teachers’ and students’ own opinions and perceived meanings.

Considerable and ongoing public debate and published research have shown that, in order to understand the *real* meanings of citizenship, it is necessary to understand and interpret *formal* citizenship rights and responsibilities from individuals' social and cultural conditions as characterized by gender, ethnicity and social class.

Social Class

One of the most interesting results of the study is how the respondents of the two countries answered on the importance of social class. In the Swedish context there was awareness of how the combination of class and ethnicity interact and make circumstances challenging for certain collectivities, while the English respondents were well aware of how both ethnicity and income contribute to unequal social conditions but considered social class to be an aspect of the past. These different perceptions regarding the significance of social class can be partly understood as a consequence of the differences in composition of the sample groups in the two countries and that differences between the countries' development over the last three decades (see below) can contribute to the contrasting approaches. It became clear in discussion that the respondents in both countries had in mind a social underclass rather than a traditional definition of an industrial working class when we discussed the marginalization and vulnerability of some citizen groups.

Ethnicity

The English students, and those Swedish students following academic programs, expressed great understanding and support for a multicultural society. They were aware of sources of anti-immigrant sentiment, but did not consider ethnicity as a barrier to citizenship in its real meaning. There were some anti-immigrant opinions expressed by Swedish vocational students. Again, differences in the two sample groups might explain these contrasting perceptions and responses. The Swedish groups were composed of students from both theoretical and vocational programs, whereas all the English students studied on theoretical programs.

Gender

Experiences and views regarding gender relations were fairly consistent within and between the two countries. There was awareness that, particularly with regard to wages and important positions in society, it is still men who make the most money and who hold the greatest power. In both countries

students assured the interviewers that gender equality would probably improve when those currently in authority have handed over power to subsequent generations.

Law

There was considerable consistency of perception with regard to how equal citizens are before the law. Most respondents considered that there was a contrast between the official position that we are all equal before the law and the reality of daily experience that ethnicity, gender, class and other factors influence the application of law and of justice.

Language

While all respondents agreed that the teaching and general provision of citizenship required further development, for students with Swedish as a second language it was the mastering the Swedish language that was of particular importance. Language skills did not have the same priority among the English respondents, probably because the English language is more widely spoken and understood internationally.

Subject Importance

There was consensus that possessing sufficient knowledge of how society works is a prerequisite to hold an active citizenship, in opposition to being merely a passive citizen. Another similarity was that those who studied Citizenship Education for longer and at a higher level were also the students who valued such knowledge more, both as skills for professional life and for adult life as citizens. Strikingly, given their contrasting social and economic positions, it was the students who studied at the independent school in England and those on vocational programs in Sweden who valued civic education least.

Finally

During interviews, the respondents identified areas other than class, gender and ethnicity as of significance for citizens' *real* conditions; for example sexuality, (dis)ability, age, urban/rural location, and religion. It also became clear that the relation between national, European and global identities are seen as important influences on people's lives. We came to recognise, during the research and as we prepared articles and papers based upon it, that a more clearly historical perspective would give

a deeper understanding of today's conditions as well as contributing to preparedness for the future, and that we need greater insight into what pupils see, experience, mean and understand when they discuss being citizens. In order to develop that insight we have found the concepts of intersectionality and human capabilities to be particularly helpful as we theorize young people's perceptions of their citizenship identity.

BI-NATIONAL CONTEXTS

Two countries, similar but different – why Sweden and England?

Both England and Sweden can be perceived as liberal parliamentary democracies descending into the neo-liberal, as constitutional monarchies with long-reigning and fairly powerless incumbents, as welfare based, as European, and as experiencing significant levels of immigration. Both have a national curriculum which includes the teaching of citizenship education and both have widespread reporting of youth disengagement with politics and political processes.

They are different, however. Sweden has traditionally had an egalitarian approach to welfare provision which has weakened in recent years, and current levels of immigration represent a new and recent phenomenon. Sweden is also a committed member state of the European Union. With regard to education, the Swedish national curriculum provision for citizenship is for cross-curricular delivery through the social sciences.

Unlike Sweden, England is not a sovereign state but part of a greater whole, although research discussions – and years of UK education policies – appear sometimes to ignore this. England remains a class-based society, and the UK remains a regionally diverse country. Immigration is largely a consequence of imperialism and has a long and conflicted history. The referendum decision that the UK should leave the EU was largely an English and Welsh result as Scotland and Northern Ireland both voted to remain. Citizenship Education is a compulsory separate subject in the National Curriculum for England although, paradoxically, that curriculum is not compulsory for over 50% of secondary (11+) schools. The other countries which comprise the United Kingdom have their own separate curricula; it is only England's National Curriculum which seeks to perpetuate notions of 'Britishness' and of 'Fundamental British Values'.

Welfare

From the beginning of the 1930s until 1976, Sweden was ruled almost uninterrupted by the Social Democrats. This was the period in which it could be said that the Swedish welfare society grew up, particularly after the 2nd World War. The so-called Swedish welfare model was based upon a relatively prosperous economic situation for Swedish industrial production after the war and on government initiatives for a series of social reforms, particularly with heavy investment in housing, health care and schooling. By the late 1970s and 1980s, Swedish policy became influenced by the neo-liberal political changes seen throughout the western world, and the Swedish welfare model began to be scaled down.

In contrast, the UK has had a welfare tradition of class hierarchy from the introduction of the state control of education in 1870. There were other welfare reforms in the ensuing 70 years, culminating in the Beveridge Report of 1944 which was to address the '5 great evils' of: Illness, Ignorance, Idleness, Need, Squalor. Since the late 1970s government involvement in, and support of, these has declined in England. Significantly, those elements devolved away from central Government – primarily health and education – have not suffered in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland to the extent they have in England. The neo-liberal agenda of privatization of health provision and education; selling local authority housing stock and inadequate replacement; a punitive system of benefits based on victim-blaming – all have become the hallmark of the British welfare system.

Migration

From the mid-1800s up to the 1930s, 1.3 million Swedes emigrated, mainly to the United States as well as to Canada, South America and Australia in significant numbers. Following the 2nd World War, Sweden experienced labor immigration from, among others, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia and Turkey until the 1970s when migration fell due to legislation which regulated and controlled immigration. By the 1980s Sweden was experiencing a notable increase in asylum seekers common to other Western Europe countries and, during the Balkan war in the 1990s, more than 100,000 former Yugoslavian, primarily Bosnian, migrants found a new homeland in Sweden. With freedom of movement throughout the European Union, many European citizens have sought work in Sweden and relocated there for varying lengths of time.

The international refugee crisis of 2015 resulted in 162,877 people applying to Sweden for asylum, of whom 51,338 were from Syria. With the intention of reducing the number of asylum seekers, legislation was introduced in to establish temporary border controls in November 2015. As a result of this, in 2016 Sweden went from being the EU country which welcomed proportionately the most asylums seekers to one which accepted only the minimum of 28,900. The following year this number fell further, to 25,600 – primarily people from Eritrea, Iraq and Syria.

The English have long been a mixture of many migrant peoples. In the past 2000 years these have included Roman, Christian, Anglo-Saxon, Jute, 'Viking'/Scandinavian, Norman, Jewish, people from various parts of Africa (as soldiers in service to Rome and, later, as slaves), Huguenot, Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, Chinese, Caribbean, and Eastern European, influences brought by varying numbers, at different times and in a variety of circumstances. There has also been a long tradition of excluding 'alien' cultures, such as the 13th Century expulsion of Jews and the Aliens Act (1905) which limited migration from Eastern Europe. The British Nationality Act (1948) granted 'subjects of the British Empire' the right to live and work in the UK and Commonwealth citizens were actively encouraged to migrate to the UK. The Home Office estimated that the net intake from January 1955 to June 1962 was about 472,000. Currently this is mired in controversy as many of those people, and their descendants, are fighting attempts to 'repatriate' them as the UK brings in ever more stringent conditions for the right to work and remain in the country.

Over the last twenty five years, both immigration and emigration have increased to historically high levels, with immigration exceeding emigration by more than 100,000 in every year since 1998. In the year ending September 2017, for example, net migration to the UK was 244,000. [UK pop 65,577,608 as of Friday, September 1, 2017]. Migrant communities are particularly concentrated in the capital city, London, where 13.4% of the population is immigrant compared to 5.8% for England.

The United Kingdom is among the European Union (EU) countries with the largest inflows of foreign nationals, but it is not unique. In terms of net migration (those arriving minus those leaving) the countries with the largest net inflows of foreign nationals were Germany (1,220,000), the UK (373,000), Italy (205,000) and France (185,000). These figures take no account of overall population size, which is likely to be a major factor in people's perceptions of immigration in their own contexts, so it is therefore particularly informative to consider immigration in relation to population size.

According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD 2018), which defines migration as “all people who have ever migrated from their country of birth to their current country of residence”, Sweden has one of the highest proportions of immigrant population at 16% while the UK has 12%. This clearly demonstrates that, with regard to the two countries in this study, while the UK has taken in a larger number of immigrants, Sweden has taken a significantly greater proportion in relation to its population.

Language and Integration

In the Swedish context, language is an important key issue for integration. Poor language skills mean that people get isolated and alienated, it is much more difficult to understand social relationships and welfare processes, making it harder to access the housing market and employment. There are significant concerns regarding whether the provision of education for immigrants newly arrived in Sweden is adequate, with Swedish for Immigrants (SFI) lacking teachers and resources.

This is less of an issue in England given the language’s international use and that many immigrants have English as their first language. For those immigrants who do not have significant competence in English, very often women in traditionally patriarchal communities, the problems are very similar to those experienced in Sweden. Poor language skills mean that people get isolated and alienated, there can be a limited understanding of how society works, it is harder to get work legally, and English as an Additional Language (EAL) provision is uneven nationally and often lacks teachers with expertise and basic funding.

Citizenship Education in Schools

In the Swedish school, unlike in England, citizenship education is not represented as a separate school subject. Instead, it is the community-oriented school subjects (social studies, history, religion and geography) that – together with a set of norms and values – are responsible for citizenship education.

In England it has been a compulsory subject at Key Stages 3 and 4 (pupils aged 11-16) in the National Curriculum since 2002. Less than 50% of schools are required to follow the National Curriculum,

however, and fewer again have the subject taught by specialists. In a recent report, the House of Lords (18/4/18) called for the situation to be changed and the statute enforced, along with strengthening the recruitment and retention of specialist trained teachers.

CURRENT CHALLENGES

Formal and Real Terms for Citizenship

The *real* nature of citizenship comprises the everyday experiences of citizens and how they make sense of them. This will inevitably vary to some extent, dependent upon what constitutes an individual's capabilities. The *formal* is found in official documents and legislation, and often in textbooks and curricula. This is a reflection of the circumstances to which Giddens was referring when he wrote that what we now call social justice is "concerned above all with liberating individuals and groups from constraints which adversely affect their life chances" (1991, p210). As with Giddens, it is our perception that, for many citizens, legislation and everyday experiences, conditions and opportunities are far apart. While the *formal* will be consistent and entrenched, changing gradually in response to long-fought and hard won battles between vested and established interests, the *real* varies in respect of these and of different experiences, background, belonging, identities etc.

This *formal/real* dichotomy, and our research approach, raises several question of process and interpretation which we address below. There are many reasons to take a closer look at how English and Swedish schools arrange for youngsters' futures as citizens according to the *real* conditions for citizenship while it is important that they have an understanding of the *formal*. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify and investigate the *real* meaning of citizenship, to interrogate both provision and experience of the *formal* in order to identify and understand the *real*. To achieve this clarification there are several questions to be addressed, including:

- Who has unfettered access, who has limited access, and who is excluded?
- What identities and origins lead to full citizenship and which are limited?
- What is the relationship between education and citizenship?
- What knowledge is perceived as valuable and which is not?
- How important is school education in preparing young people to develop into citizenship in its real meaning?

In every case there is also the underlying question 'why?' These questions will form the core of our research once our theoretical approach has been defined and clarified but, for the time being, we emphasize our awareness, in common with Bourdieu (2009), that

[t]he relative weight of home background and of formal education . . . varies according to the extent to which the different cultural practices are recognized and taught by the educational system (p498)

and that *in the classroom, the dominant definition of the legitimate way of appropriating culture and works of art favors those who have had early access to legitimate culture, in a cultured household, outside of scholastic disciplines . . . (p499)*

Based on our position that social justice is of fundamental importance to both education and citizenship in their *real* sense, we prefer to utilize the concept of human capabilities (Sen, 1999 and Nussbaum, 2000) rather than that of human rights. As both Sen and Nussbaum emphasize, the concept of capability has a broader meaning than rights. To have (a *real*) capability to do something it is not enough to have a (*formal*) right to it; there are several prerequisites conditional to being able to have full access to that right. For example, although all students have the same right to an education to grow up to a dignified adult life as citizens, many grow up to a life of powerlessness, characterized by political, social and economic exclusion. Instead, sufficient human capabilities are needed to be able to receive the education necessary for citizenship in its real meaning.

THEORIZING

Marshall/Marx

In accordance with the principles of social justice, we recognize that, where and when cultural and social conditions can be interpreted as in any way hindering the status of citizenship, we do so in recognition of the serial barriers which a dominant culture sets against those with less or no power. Such recognition, and the insight that tells us it is necessary to comprehend individuals' social and cultural conditions in order to understand and interpret their formal citizenship rights and responsibilities, are not recent however; Marx and Engels wrote that, "if you assume a particular civil society . . . you will get particular political conditions", (1973, p660) from which it follows that any society divided on the grounds of class, ethnicity and gender will present political conditions which reflect those divisions. If, as is the case in both Sweden and England as well as many other countries, civil society is structured to the disadvantage of other collectivities, the condition of *real*

citizenship will reflect those as well. It is also the case that there is likely to be a significant space between *what is* (the *real*) and *what is perceived* (the *formal*); just because there is inequality it does not follow that everyone is aware of that inequality – including those who are disadvantaged by it.

Going beyond the confines of education to consider perceptions of – and access to – art and culture, for example,

[t]he denial of lower, coarse, vulgar, venal, servile – in a word, natural – enjoyment, which constitutes the sacred sphere of culture, implies an affirmation of the superiority of those who can be satisfied with the sublimated, refined, disinterested, gratuitous, distinguished pleasures forever closed to the profane. That is why art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences. (Bourdieu, 2009; p503)

The central issues here are those of power and of perceptions of civil society. Where Oakeshott writes of the conservative preference for the familiar, the tried and tested, facts, sufficiency, convenience, the present, etc., we must ask to whose benefit did or would such a system operate. Indeed, it is pertinent to ask whose laughter is heard if the vast majority of learners are downtrodden, have their cultures ignored or derided, their skills devalued, their needs suppressed. The quotation from Marx and Engels above regarding civil society originates from the middle of the nineteenth century, and it is clear that neoliberalism has a vision of and for society based on a return not only to old values but to old inequalities. As Bourdieu clearly indicates above, social differences and inequalities are hierarchical reflections of power, access and control. It may be that they are enshrined in laws and regulations, but that does not prevent them from establishing inequality. Quite the opposite.

More recently than Marx but nonetheless dated, Marshall (1950) continues have considerable relevance to anyone who is seeking to clarify the conditions necessary for citizenship in its *real* meaning rather than limiting their understanding to the *formal*. Marshall's main thesis regarding Citizenship shows awareness that there are both opportunities and limitations and that – in Western industrialized countries – it takes three forms:

1. Civil Citizenship, which is represented in equality before the law, freedom of speech and freedom of religion, and other personal liberties;

2. Political Citizenship, typified by universal and equal suffrage
3. Social Citizenship, including the right to education, health care, and other conditions for social welfare.

Marshall defined citizenship as “a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community” (1950, p14), which, when combined with Yuval-Davis’ linking of citizenship to membership of collectivities, makes it practical to discuss citizenship as potentially simultaneous membership of several collectives, such as neighborhood, social class, ethnicity, nation and/or international community. Marshall’s three forms of citizenship share equality as a common principle, which must include social citizenship as a right that involves benefits for all citizens. While we regard the conceptual meanings of civil and political citizenship to be relatively straightforward, whether or not we would agree that either form of citizenship is easily identified in any country dominated by neoliberalism, we consider that the concept of social citizenship is one which requires more depth of definition and clarification.

Social citizenship concerns the extent to which people of all socially constructed categories (which Yuval-Davis terms ‘collectivities’) have the appropriate conditions and adequate capabilities for the opportunity to be considered as full and active citizens of any given society. This is not only with regard to their legal status (again, the *formal*) but must also be considered with regard to their status and experiences in relation to those of other citizens and as seen by those other citizens. Social citizenship requires that people have equality of payment and employment, that their customs and traditions are freely enjoyed, and that other citizens regard this as natural and proper. It is not simply whether ‘the law’ says it should be so, but that it is a daily reality. The attitudes and conduct of ‘the ordinary person’, of neighbors, of ‘others’, are therefore of considerable importance in the construction or limitation of people’s social citizenship, i.e. the *real* citizenship.

Many scholars have quite rightly criticized Marshall’s position for the lack of any discussion of gendered and racial hierarchies within society. Such omission cannot be justified as a reflection of Marshall’s time and place as that would be to ignore the limitations which pertain to Marshall’s position as an approach to be currently applied. We agree with the criticisms of the lack of awareness and consideration of gendered and ethnically imposed hierarchies, and believe that at the very least class, ethnic and gender perspectives must be included in any worthwhile discussion

and analysis of the *real* meaning of citizenship. In addition, sexuality and disability are also important aspects of and influenced by people's conditions, and are therefore also needed for a more complete understanding of the meaning of citizenship. These latter factors were not included in our initial study and we recognize this as a shortcoming and as aspects of *real* citizenship to be considered as our research continues to develop, which led us to look more substantially at how we could usefully theorize young people's perceptions of their citizenship identity and – therefore – to the work outlined in this chapter.

Intersectionality – Identity and Belonging

In a recently published article (Nielsen and Leighton, 2017) we problematized young people's access to *real* citizenship based on the importance of social class, ethnicity and gender. Our focus on these three aspects was developed on the basis of previous research and reports, such as the PISA reports. We have since reflected upon the results of that previous study and realize that we largely governed our interviews with young people based on what we considered to be the most important factors affecting young people's terms of *real* citizenship rather than giving close attention to what the young people themselves deemed to be important. Indeed, one of our English respondents made exactly that point when he said that “[The National Curriculum] is set up by people like you [middle-aged, white, male researcher]. We don't worry about these things; we're not racist, we're not sexist.”

We have therefore turned to Yuval Davis and an intersectional approach to inform our understanding of how young people construct their perceptions of their identities as citizens. In particular, we understand the benefits which accrue from recognizing that everyone has simultaneous membership of several collectivities: as well as identity and belonging based on social class, sexuality, disability, gender, for example, we are also influenced and our identities constructed by geographical areas of origin and of current locality. The interactions between these collectivities, and between them and the constructed identities of others, serve to create a much more complex and fluid sense of identity than we had originally envisaged. Understanding these interactions and accessing people's own insights which derive from provides a much richer and more complete sense of *real* citizenship.

These different aspects should not primarily be seen as perspectives of social differences in an additive way as the importance of identities and belongings changes depending on the context and person. They interact mutually to constitute the conditions that affect people differently. From this it follows that different social locations and belongings are also strongly affected by how these are valued by one's self and by others. It becomes a question of whether different experiences and knowledge are considered or found to be valuable or useless by an individual in a specific context.

The Capability Approach

To reconnect with the distinction between formal and real terms for citizenship, we turn to Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum's capability approach. As we have already identified, the *formal* terms for citizenship refer to the rights as they appear from legislation, official documents and curriculum, while the *real* terms for citizenship relate to the actual preconditions and circumstances needed to have full access to such *formal* rights. Such *real* conditions are what Sen and Nussbaum define as Human Capabilities.

Sen defines capability as "a person's ability to do valuable acts or reach valuable states of being; [it] represents the alternative combinations of things a person is able to do or be" (1993, p 30) This contrasts with the utilitarian perception that the best actions or decisions in any given situations are those which bring the greatest happiness or advantages to the most people, a position which fails to adequately consider social conditions such as justice and equality. 'Human capabilities' should not be considered as an individualistic approach; rather, Sen clarifies,

[...] the freedom of agency that we individually have is inescapably qualified and constrained by the social, political and economic opportunities that are available to us. There is a deep complementarity between individual agency and social arrangements. It is important to give simultaneous recognition to the centrality of individual freedom and to the force of social influences on the extent and reach of individual freedom. To counter the problems that we face, we have to see individual freedom as a social commitment. (Sen, 1999, pp. xi-xii)

There is a strong consistency between the intersectional approach and the capability approach. Students' capabilities are their *real* opportunities to reach certain outcomes, and "[t]he capability approach, therefore, offers a method to evaluate real educational advantage, and equally to identify disadvantage, marginalization, and exclusion." (Walker and Unterhalter, 2007, p 5) Everyone is, to

some extent, responsible for shaping the kind of life they value rather than passively being shaped by others. Citizenship in its *real* sense involves the capability to actively participate in public debates and all other aspects of the democratic process and such capabilities must be considered with awareness of systemic opportunities; a person may well have a wide range of talents and considerable motivation yet be unable to fulfil those talents due to social and political conditions.

Synthesizing

It is when we bring together these perspectives – the dichotomy of *formal* and *real* citizenship, Marx's theory of the nature of civil society, Marshall's description of social citizenship, Yuval-Davis on intersectionality, and both Sen and Nussbaum with regard to human capabilities – that our position with regard to theorizing, researching and understanding young people's perceptions of their citizenship identity becomes clear.

Post-industrial societies of whatever political and economic organization are highly complex structures within which all members play a multitude of roles, whether ascribed or achieved. As explained by the work of Schutz (1970) and others, we occupy those roles at different times and adopt or are prescribed the concomitant labels at different times and in different ways. Berger and Luckmann (1991) show how we will make sense of these in different ways at different times, and that others will interpret them differently. In sum, we each construct our own identities and those of others from a range of collectivities whose interpretations depend upon yet other collectivities and influences. In that light, to return to our earlier study, we could consider our original position to be both naïve and simplistic; as it followed fairly standard procedures and established principles, the same might be said of other long-standing and accepted research findings – which does not serve to excuse our own shortcomings. The approach we now adopt and advocate serves both to rectify that error and to show a way forward to closer reflecting and understanding young people's perceptions.

It is not for us to ascribe potential attitudes to young people, to assume that any particular set of values or social expectations accrue to those we research; that includes perceptions of age. Rather than assume that we know what matters to young people and how it affects them, we bring into play our understanding of the complexity of society and accord our respondents the respect of assuming they know more about themselves than do researchers. This is not to justify a context-

devoid bricolage, but to give space to respondents to identify for themselves who they are, how they see and make sense of their contexts. It is then our job to bring those perceptions and constructs together to find whether there are patterns. It is possible, of course, that patterns will not emerge. That is in itself worth knowing.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing we can see that Sweden and England are similar enough to make comparison possible, yet different enough to make comparison worthwhile. It is not our intention to propose that our arguments apply in detail to all people in all contexts as our sample thus far is too small and too narrow to allow such generalization. Rather, we hope to stimulate further consideration of respondents' self-identities, particularly with regard to whose voice do we seek in research of this nature: the voices of the researchers or of the relatively powerless and unheard?

In identifying and clarifying the terms *formal* Citizenship and *real* Citizenship we have taken steps towards constructing greater understanding of the spaces between policy and reality. We do not argue that the *formal* does not happen but that it is the *real* which is experienced and daily relevant. The space between these is worthy of consideration and investigation but we contend that this must be preceded by a more substantial and more nuanced understanding of people's sense of self and of otherness. The *formal* meaning of citizenship is well established and generally agreed upon, while the *real* meaning appears to have been either assumed to be the same as the *formal* or it has been glossed over.

The principles of Intersectionality – identity and belonging – allow a deeper understanding not only of the *real* experience of citizenship, but also of how it is constructed. Following from which, the capability approach draws attention to the inequalities of access which underpin intersectional experiences and the lived reality of young citizens in Sweden and England; perhaps of young citizens of everywhere.

REFERENCES

- Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge* (No. 10). London: Penguin.
- Bourdieu, P. 'Distinction and the Aristocracy of Culture' in J. Storey (ed) (2009) *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture: A Reader 4th Edition* Essex: Pearson pp 498-507.
- Castells, M. (2010) *The Rise of the Network Society Vol 1 2nd Edition* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity* Cambridge: Polity.
- Leighton, R., & Nielsen, L. (2017). Ethnicity, gender, social class and citizenship: comparative views from England and Sweden. *Teaching Citizenship*, 45, 42-43.
- Leighton, R., (2011). *Teaching citizenship education: A radical approach*. London: Continuum Press.
- Leighton, R., (2018). Formally equal, but not really: The second stage of an ongoing study into English school students' perceptions of the citizen. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 13(1). 31-44.
- Marshall, T.H. (1950) Citizenship and Social Class. In C. Pierson and F.G. Castles, (eds) *The Welfare State Reader* (pp30-39) Cambridge: Polity.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1973) *Selected Works* London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Nielsen, L. and Leighton, R., (2017). What are the gender, class and ethnicity of citizenship? A study of upper secondary school students' views on Citizenship Education in England and Sweden. *Confero: Essays on Education, Philosophy and Politics*.
- Nussbaum, M. (2000) *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Office for Economic Co-operation and Development (2018) *Foreign born population*. Retrieved from <https://data.oecd.org/migration/foreign-born-population.htm>
- Schutz, A. (1970). *Alfred Schutz on phenomenology and social relations* (Vol. 360). University of Chicago Press.
- Sen, A. (1993) Capability and well-being. In M. Nussbaum and A. Sen (Eds) *The Quality of Life* (pp30-53) Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, A., (1999). *Development as freedom*, New York: Knopff
- Walker, M., and Unterhalter, E. (2007). *Amartya Sen's capability approach and social justice in education*. New York: Springer.
- Yuval-Davis, N., (2011). *The politics of belonging: Intersectional contestations*. London: Sage.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Civil society: those social practices and institutions which operate outside the government and its agencies, apparently manifesting the interests and attitudes of the citizenry.

Collectivities: socially constructed categories such as family, gender, social class, ethnicity to which a person belongs or with which they identify.

Formal citizenship: the official version of the rights and responsibilities of citizens, found in government documents, legislation, and official pronouncements.

Human capabilities: the prerequisites conditional to being able to have full access to the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Intersectionality: everyone has simultaneous membership of several collectivities which interact with those of others.

Real citizenship: the lived experiences of citizens in relation to their rights and responsibilities, mediated by their collectivities.

Social Citizenship: the right to education, health care, and all other aspects of social welfare, as described by T.H. Marshall.

Social justice: a research perspective which emphasizes equality, fairness, and the democratic process with critical sensitivity to issues of advantage and disadvantage, choice and control, inclusion and exclusion, opportunities and barriers.

