CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: AN INVESTIGATION OF CRICK'S MODEL AND CITIZENSHIP COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE SUBJECT'S PURPOSE

WILLIAM FERGUS O'SULLIVAN

A thesis submitted to
The University of Gloucestershire
in accordance with the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Business, Education and Professional Studies

June 2014

<u>Abstract</u>

In 2002 the delivery of Citizenship Education, at Key Stages Three and Four, became compulsory in English Schools. The National Curriculum Order (QCA, 1999), which defined the nature of this new subject, drew heavily on the report by the Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy (The Crick Report) (QCA, 1998). This thesis examines Crick's model of citizenship education and the way that it is perceived by citizenship coordinators, those teachers most directly responsible for its delivery. The research methodology involved two major components; a literature based analysis of Crick's model and semi structured interviews with ten citizenship coordinators.

My findings relate to four key research questions. What underlying principles and philosophies exist regarding the purpose of citizenship education in a Liberal Democracy? Which principles and philosophies did the Crick Report adopt and how are these reflected in the National Curriculum subject of 'Citizenship Education'? What do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by theory and policy issues? And finally, Could a greater understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of Citizenship Education among citizenship coordinators, improve its provision?

With regard to the first two questions I argue that Crick established a sensible compromise position between competing conservative and progressive interpretations of the subject's purpose. With regard to the third, the interviews with citizenship coordinators indicate that whilst all showed progressive intentions for the subject the majority (80%) showed a lack of consistency in their approach, often demonstrating a much more conservative approach than they intended. I suggest that the reason for this is a combination of two factors; a lack of conceptual understanding and the impact of various policy pressures. Finally, addressing the fourth question, I argue that a clear understanding of the subject's philosophical underpinnings could have a positive impact on the problem, and make recommendations about how this may be achieve through adjustments to both government policy and schools' training programmes.

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of the University of Gloucestershire and is original except where indicated by specific reference in the text. No part of the thesis has been submitted as part of any other academic award. The thesis has not been presented to any other education institution in the United Kingdom or overseas.

Any views expressed in the thesis are those of the author and in no way represent those of the University.

Signed ……………………………………………
Date……………………………………………

Contents

Literature Analysis

Data Analysis

List of Tables

Introduction

<u>Citizenship and Civic Education</u>

The role that education plays in developing the relationship between young people and the democratic state in which they live may be described either as civic education or citizenship education, and often the terms will be used interchangeably. However, the choice of one term or the other when dealing with this area of education can be significant, and it is useful to explore the potential differences in interpretation, both for the purposes of clarification and because they illustrate how different educational establishments have focused upon the general area of the relationship between the individual and the state.

This thesis focuses on citizenship education because it is a distinct and relatively recently established compulsory element of the National Curriculum. As a result of the requirement for all state schools to provide citizenship education (QCA, 1999), the focus of discussion in this country over the last decade has been overwhelmingly on the content and delivery of 'citizenship' as a curriculum subject (Keating et al., 2010). It has also been overwhelmingly policy led, the subject emerging as, in part at least, a political response to two problems; a perceived apathy towards the political process amongst young people, and a perceived increase in anti-social behaviour (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.6). As such any understanding of the purpose of citizenship education tends to be confined within relatively narrow parameters, and its success judged accordingly. Its purpose is to solve the problems identified as policy priorities, and its outcomes are to be tested against perceived progress in these areas.

This approach is strongly evident within the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (C.E.L.S) the government commissioned assessment of the progress made in the nine years immediately following the introduction of the subject (2001-2010) (Keating et al., 2010).

In contrast to the relatively narrow focus of discussion in the UK, in the USA, where citizenship education is not a new curriculum subject which monopolizes attention, more consideration tends to be given to the underlying philosophical questions regarding the contribution of education to the relationship between the individual and the state. Discussion of civic education considers the role that the educational system as a whole plays in shaping this relationship and gives consideration to the purpose of education in this area, not from a policy perspective, but from a theoretical one, exploring key questions which lie at the heart of liberal democracy. To what extent is it acceptable for the state to inculcate its own values in its citizenry? Should it be promoting loyalty or autonomy, an acceptance of the status quo or a critical approach to it? These questions, which reflect a debate right at the heart of liberal democracy, are largely bypassed within the relatively recent discussions on citizenship education within the UK, precisely because the focus has been upon largely practical issues concerning getting a new subject up and running. Nevertheless they remain of vital importance, and, whilst it is entirely understandable that practical issues should take priority in the short term, I believe that these underlying questions can not be ignored if citizenship education is to make a meaningful contribution rather than simply be another short lived policy initiative.

A full discussion of citizenship education or civic education (the two terms can genuinely be used interchangeably in the wider sense of education that concerns itself with the individual/state relationship) must then go beyond the limits of 'Citizenship Education' the curriculum subject. Education has played a vital role in shaping the nature of our UK citizenship long before the term citizenship education was accepted as a legitimate element of the curriculum. Nevertheless an investigation of this new subject is clearly a natural place to begin any study of this area, and it will undoubtedly tell us something about the attitudes towards underlying philosophical questions that are not dealt with explicitly. To this end this study will examine the wider questions raised by, what might be called, civic education, through research concentrated around attitudes to the more narrowly defined curriculum subject of citizenship education.

Origins of this Research

The impetus for this research came from my own experiences preparing to teach Citizenship Education in a Gloucestershire secondary school. As primarily a politics teacher, I approached the new subject of citizenship with great enthusiasm, seeing it as having the potential to make a valuable contribution to students' general education. My own experience, over the previous ten years, was that there had been something of a decline in the political awareness of the pupils I was teaching, and, with concern focused nationally on issues such as the falling turnout of 18-24 year olds in general elections, I was aware that this subject had been created with the clear intention of addressing this problem (QCA, 1998 p.15).

As I continued my preparations for my first year of teaching the subject; reading the preparatory materials from various educational authorities and, perhaps more importantly, meeting colleagues, both within my own and other schools, it became clear that there were potentially two, quite distinct, approaches to citizenship education. One was to take a broadly conservative view of the subject (although it would rarely be described in such terms) and stress the importance of citizens understanding their civic duties, the importance of obeying the law and paying one's taxes, and to emphasize the importance of voting over other, more direct, forms of political participation. The other, which I had, perhaps naïvely, assumed would be the natural approach to the subject, was to look to encourage critical thinking and autonomy; to not only educate students about our political institutions, but to encourage each individual to question their role, as a citizen, in shaping their form and granting them both legitimacy and authority.

There was no question that the latter more progressive approach dominated the discussions that I had with other citizenship teachers about the potential for the subject. However, as talk gradually turned to National Curriculum Orders (QCA, 1999), inspection criteria and timetabling, and as the implementation of the subject was discussed in more detail with school Senior Management Teams (SMTs), I began to feel that there was a noticeable shift towards a more conservative interpretation of the subject. On a personal level this disappointed me; but was I entitled to feel that citizenship education was drifting in the 'wrong' direction? Furthermore, was there any real evidence to suggest that such a shift in emphasis was even taking place, beyond a vague sense of personal unease and some brief conversations with colleagues from other schools?

The starting point for my research was a desire to explore whether an awareness of the tension between progressive and conservative approaches to Citizenship Education was shared by my teaching colleagues in Gloucestershire, and on this basis I envisaged an interview based piece of qualitative research. However, before I began any interviews I wanted to carry out a literature based study which would allow me to develop my personal understanding of the different approaches to the subject. There were a number of reasons for this. Firstly, with both approaches sharing the albeit somewhat ill-defined aim of maintaining the health of liberal democracy, I wanted to compare their rationale and internal logic from an academic rather than a classroom perspective; secondly, since the Crick Report was designed to establish the essential nature of citizenship as a curriculum subject, and teachers' understanding of its purpose, I wanted to examine the report itself within the framework of the wider academic debate; thirdly, I wanted to be able to use my understanding of the academic perspectives on citizenship education to both develop the questions that I would put to my interviewees, and contextualize their responses. Finally, I was keen to include a new discussion of the tensions between a conservative and progressive approach to citizenship education in the light of the Crick's approach to this issue.

My own professional experience suggested the need for one further element to my research. I became aware that whatever my initial aspirations for the subject, and whatever understanding I gained from the Crick Report, much of my approach to the subject would in reality be shaped by more practical concerns, and, as far as the delivery of the subject in any individual school was concerned, it was likely that the Headteacher and management team would have at least as great an effect as Crick himself. Therefore

whilst my research would not be primarily concerned with policy it would have to examine the extent to which policy concerns impacted upon citizenship teachers' understanding of the subject's purpose.

<u>Research Questions</u>

The central purpose of this research is to examine the underlying principles and philosophies of Citizenship Education and to explore how these are perceived by citizenship coordinators. There are four key research questions:

1)   What underlying principles and philosophies exist regarding the purpose of citizenship education in a Liberal Democracy?

Although there are a wide variety of theories regarding citizenship education, in line with a wide variety of political systems, this research concerns itself with education within liberal democracies. Nevertheless there is considerable disagreement among liberals about the proper nature and extent of citizenship education. Chapter Three explores these different interpretations of the subject's purpose.

2)   Which principles and philosophies did the Crick Report adopt and how are these reflected in the National Curriculum subject of 'Citizenship Education'?

The Crick Report demonstrates an awareness of the competing liberal philosophies examined by the previous research question but also draws on the much older concept of civic republicanism. Given his central importance to citizenship education in this country Chapter Four examines the development of Crick's own theories regarding the subject, his attempt to integrate liberal and civic republican positions, and the development of his position over the course of three decades. Chapter Five then explores how the Crick Report combined his own theoretical approach with a significant degree

of political pragmatism to produce the basis for a compulsory curriculum subject that was acceptable across the party political spectrum. The connection between the Crick Report itself and the subject's implementation, particularly the issues associated with its 'light touch' approach are examined in Chapters Seven and Eight.

3)   What do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by theory and policy issues?

This research question has its origins in my own experience as a citizenship teacher. I became aware, before my formal research had begun, that several of my colleagues in other schools demonstrated a degree of inconsistency in their approach to the subject. Their stated intentions for citizenship education were clearly progressive but when they discussed their understanding of its purpose in greater detail their perspective was often much more conservative. My fieldwork research aimed to establish how common this disconnect was, and, when it did occur, whether it was a consequence of policy pressures (examined in Chapter Ten) or a limited understanding of the subject's theoretical underpinning (examined in Chapter Eleven).

4)   Could a greater understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of Citizenship Education among citizenship coordinators, improve its provision?

My final research question reflects a desire, not simply to make observations about the perceptions of citizenship education, but also to make a contribution to the future development of the subject. As an active citizenship teacher I have not been a neutral observer, but an advocate for the subject, and a firm believer in its potential to make a positive contribution to young peoples' education. Whilst I have always maintained a critical approach and looked to challenge my own assumptions, sometimes resulting in a

significant shift in my personal viewpoint (see Chapter Eight on OFSTED), my ultimate aim has been to make a positive contribution to the future development of the subject. This question examines whether a greater theoretical understanding of the philosophy behind citizenship education can help to minimize the impact of negative policy pressures, and the disconnect that often exists between theory and practice, leading to the recommendations found in the Chapter Thirteen.

Structure of the Thesis

As the research questions suggest, there are two major components to this thesis. An examination of the Crick Report informed by a theoretical study of the purpose of citizenship education in a liberal democracy, and, an interview based qualitative study of citizenship coordinators perceptions of the purpose of the new curriculum subject that the report established.

To begin the fieldwork research phase of the project having already completed much of the theoretical component had several advantages. It allowed me to develop a greater personal understanding of the underpinnings of the subject, which helped both to clarify my own thinking, and give me a greater degree of objectivity, as far as that is possible, when discussing approaches which differed significantly from my own. Questions regarding the underlying purpose of citizenship education have been somewhat neglected, in this country, in favour of a focus on policy issues. By beginning my research with an academic study of this area I aimed to present a fresh perspective which could then be explored through subsequent fieldwork. It also improved the questions that I prepared for my interviewees, and allowed me to link their insights to theoretical

positions with which they themselves were not necessarily familiar, but whose central tenets they clearly articulated.

The Theoretical Component

The theoretical element of this research was substantial. This is primarily because discussion regarding the underlying purpose of citizenship education in this country has been limited. As I expected, all of the interviewees that I spoke to had interesting viewpoints and insights on the subject but these were almost entirely personal and did not draw on any particular literature, beyond the vague generalizations of the official curriculum documents. My academic study allowed me to make important connections between their thoughts and a body of literature which dealt with the wider issues of civic education but was not focused on the specifics of citizenship education in this country. It also allowed me to examine why, in many cases, their aspirations for the subject were not necessarily reflected in their attitudes or approach in the classroom.

Citizenship education was a new subject to the National Curriculum when it was introduced into English schools in 2002, but it did not emerge in a vacuum, and related educational initiatives, and approaches from the preceding hundred years, are examined in Chapter One. As a new, and compulsory, part of the National Curriculum the vast majority of UK writing on citizenship education focused upon its implementation, discussed in Chapters Seven and Eight; for an examination of its underlying purpose, found in Chapter Three, I looked primarily to writing from the USA, particular focusing on the work of William Galston and Amy Gutmann. The major exception to this American focus was the work of Derek Heater and Bernard Crick, the co-founders of the

Politics Association, a professional body concerned principally with the teaching of A level politics, both of whom had a longstanding interest in citizenship education. The latter was tasked with providing the philosophical underpinnings for English citizenship education, his central contribution to the subject and its development are examined in Chapters Four and Five.

The Fieldwork Component

The fieldwork research focuses on actual practitioners; this is a key element of the thesis, since I was not aiming to come to a conclusion regarding the purpose of citizenship education, but rather to establish teachers' perceptions of purpose and how it is affected by, and affects, their implementation of the subject. Specifically I examined the views of school leaders in Gloucestershire, initially through a pilot study questionnaire for headteachers (the results of which are found in Chapter Nine), and then through in depth semi-structured interviews with ten citizenship coordinators from a variety of different types of secondary school. As well as reporting, analyzing and evaluating the various perspectives and approaches encountered (Chapters Ten, Eleven and Twelve), I look to make connections between these and the discussions in part one, aiming to contextualize them within the theoretical framework that I have already established, and examining how policy issues related to the implementation of the subject interact with questions of purpose.

I conclude by returning to the central question, of the progressive or conservative nature of the subject, which initially motivated the research, and make some suggestions about

the potential for developing the approach to its provision in the future (Chapter Thirteen).

Research Outcomes

My research aims to make a contribution in two key areas. Firstly it is unique in providing an academic study of the theoretical underpinning of citizenship education, and the ideas that shaped the Crick Report, from the perspective of a current classroom teacher. Secondly it examines not only the professed intentions of citizenship coordinators with regard to the purpose of the subject, but tests the consistency of their approach in order to gauge both their depth of understanding and their ability to resist various policy pressures which threaten to compromise their vision. It then goes on to recommend changes which could help to minimize the gap between theory and practice and help to protect teachers' progressive intentions for the subject.

1) The History of Citizenship Education

'Well strangely enough I do sometimes have parents who will sit at parents' evenings and say, " I did citizenship" and you are looking at people who, perhaps, 20, 30, 40 years ago, did an element. So it's not entirely new.' (Citizenship Coordinator, Abingdon Road)

The history of citizenship education in England, as a distinct curriculum subject, is a relatively short one. Citizenship was introduced as a cross curricular theme with the advent of the National Curriculum in 1990, but was largely ignored by schools (Hodgson, 2008 p.418). The majority only began to take it seriously when it became a compulsory element (OFSTED, 2002b) with clear QCA guidance on its content and delivery, and the expectation that their provision would be examined as part of any subsequent OFSTED inspections. Bernard Crick, in the report which laid the groundwork for citizenship's inclusion as a compulsory subject, made clear his belief that it should be seen as the introduction of a new subject, distinct from the 'dead safe, old rote learning (of) Civics,' (Crick, 2002a p.500), in fact he went further, suggesting that, rather than simply the introduction of a new subject, the development represented a significant potential change in the political culture of the country (QCA, 1998 p.7).

As well as giving an overview of developments concerning citizenship education in this country, this chapter will also examine key issues regarding the traditional reluctance of the political establishment to involve itself in this area, and, the reasons why campaigners for improvements in civic education finally began to make some real progress in the last decade of the twentieth century. It will conclude by considering the

impact of the 2010 Coalition on the subject and consider its position within the curriculum at the time of writing (2013).

The nature of citizenship itself is highly contested, and, while this research will limit itself to a broadly liberal democratic understanding of the relationship between the citizen and the state, even within this framework there are examples of strongly contrasting conservative and progressive viewpoints. These differing perspectives will be discussed in Chapter Three; the purpose of this chapter is to give a broad overview of the educational initiatives during the last century that could be reasonably described as forms of citizenship education or civic education, and to examine the circumstances that led to the creation of a National Curriculum subject called citizenship in the late 1990s.

Whilst it is clear that the citizenship education that began in schools across the England in 2002 was in many ways a new subject it would be unwise to consider it strictly in isolation, with no regard to earlier attempts to introduce some form of civic education, whether under the guise of "Civics", "British Constitution", or initiatives within the history curriculum. Although considerably narrower in scope than what is now known as citizenship education, these precursors undoubtedly contain certain common features and were often motivated by similar concerns.

It should also be acknowledged that the lack of any subject called citizenship does not necessarily mean that citizenship education was not taking place. At various points in the last one hundred and fifty years particular circumstances have provoked an upsurge of governmental interest in civic education as a potential solution to emerging problems,

such as the challenges of a dramatically increased franchise in the late nineteenth century, fear of totalitarian regimes in the 1930s, or, in its most recent incarnation, a response to alarming political apathy among young voters.

As well as examining what we might identify as the forerunners of citizenship education within schools, citizenship must also be considered within a wider political context. Citizenship has been a highly contested concept which has been utilized in support of a variety of competing viewpoints (McLaughlin, 1992 p.236). It has been invoked both to support the empowerment of the working class through enfranchisement and to minimize the effects of those changes; it has been used by Keynesians to defend the expansion of the welfare state and by Thatcherites to attack it and urge a return to rugged individualism; it has been used both to defend privilege and the class system and to attack it; to promote social justice and to oppose it; and it has motivated both internationalism and jingoism (Heater, 2004 p.298-303). These contrasting understandings of citizenship have been reflected, at various points within our history, in the educational policies of governments and schools themselves, indicating that, even when citizenship is not being taught as a subject, conceptions of citizenship help to shape what is being taught in our schools.

Kerr (2003a) argues that it is this lack of consensus over the meaning of citizenship, which he describes as a 'contested concept' that is largely responsible for it being excluded from the curriculum for so long. This is partly because without some agreement over the aim and content of a subject it is very difficult to establish a meaningful programme of study, but also because there has been an ongoing fear,

among politicians, that a rival interpretation may gain the upper hand, a concern most commonly expressed as a determination to avoid any element of political indoctrination in the classroom (Hodgson, 2008 p.418). It is not surprising, therefore, that it has often been easier for advances to be made in citizenship education during times of relative political consensus, in the sense of a lack of substantive ideological difference rather than the absence of party political disagreement, such as those found during Blair's premiership (Crick, 2000a p.78).

This chapter will attempt to place modern citizenship education, understood as the compulsory National Curriculum subject established by the Crick Report, within the context of developments in education within the last one hundred and fifty years (a period approximately aligned with the beginning of movements towards mass democracy with the 2nd Reform Act of 1867), which, while they may not have always utilized the term citizenship, were certainly concerned with the general ideas of civic education. This will involve, firstly, an examination of the various initiatives and organizations connected to citizenship education, and secondly, some discussion of the different perceptions of citizenship education which have been influential during this period. The substantive question of the differing conceptions of the purpose of citizenship education is a central issue within this piece of research and will therefore be dealt with by subsequent chapters, but before competing interpretations are discussed within a contemporary context, it is helpful to understand where and when they have been historically deployed. Finally an attempt will be made to contextualize the Crick Report, and subsequent developments, by examining the recent history of the subject and the period immediately preceding the establishment of his committee.

Citizenship Initiatives in English Education

Historically English state education was reluctant to involve itself in any form of civic education, primarily since it wished to avoid accusations of indoctrination (Hodgson, 2008 p.418). This was a fear that was shared across social, religious and political divides and manifested itself not simply in a suspicion of civic education but a wariness of state education itself. Derek Heater, the co-founder of the Politics Association whose work has often focused on citizenship issues, (Heater, 2001) contrasts this situation with France where state sponsored civic education had begun to be developed from the late nineteenth century onwards. Consequently developments in civic education tended to be the result of initiatives of individual schools, non-statutory reports, or pressure from independent educational campaign groups. This lack of any strong centralized guidance created a situation where, throughout the twentieth century, or at least until the arrival of the National Curriculum in 1988, various conceptions of citizenship co-existed and competed within the nations schools.

The development of citizenship in the late nineteenth century reflected the divergent interests of the schools themselves. The expanding franchise had persuaded some politicians that some political education for the masses was needed, but the emphasis was firmly on learning one's place within the system and understanding one's obligations to it (Lawton et al., 2005 p.9). Such social deference was largely promoted through the existing subjects of History and Geography, where an emphasis would be placed on the role of the 'good citizen' of the Empire. Meanwhile, (independent, fee paying) public schools interpreted citizenship education, although it may not have been referred to in those terms, as the need to develop and inspire the future public servants

and leaders of that Empire. An understanding of the political system formed a useful part of such an education, and, despite the lack of central co-ordination, the demand for textbooks saw the publication of 'The British Constitution and Government' by Herbert Watts in 1871, and several subsequent editions in the following decade.

As the twentieth century began, the emphasis in schools remained strongly on promoting the right kind of moral characteristics amongst pupils. This was reflected in the name of one of the earliest campaigning groups to actively concern itself with citizenship, the Moral Instruction League, later renamed the Civics and Moral Education League. The primary concern continued to be that children should be prepared for their particular role in life and should accept their place within the system. The elementary school code of 1904 states:

> The purpose of the Public Elementary School is to form and strengthen the character and to develop the intelligence of the children entrusted to it, and to make the best use of the school years available, in assisting both girls and boys, according to their different needs, to fit themselves, practically as well as intellectually, for the work of life (Yoxall et al., 1904).

History continued to be seen as the best method of inculcating such values, with the inspiration expected to be drawn from the lives of great men and women, perhaps because, although the forces of trade unionism and the emerging Labour Party did represent a threat to the established political order, there remained relative political consensus around the values of British Imperial history. Although the Chartists had expressed concerns over the limited nature of working class education in 1848, the only formal opposition to such strongly prescriptive education came from the Social Democratic Federation which pushed, albeit rather ineffectively, for a curriculum which

did not encourage submission and obedience amongst the working class (Batho, 1990 p.92).

The emphasis on history as the primary source of civic education continued after the First World War, although there was some recognition that, in the light of such catastrophic events, some adjustments should be considered to its delivery. Batho (1990 p.93) identifies two works, Madley's 'History as a School of Citizenship' (1920) and the Board of Education pamphlet 'The Teaching of History' (1923) as suggesting that there should be an increased emphasis on both domestic and international citizenship and an awareness of the danger of patriotism drifting towards jingoism.

The establishment belief that democracy was best served by encouraging, amongst the mass electorate, a passive acceptance of democracy, and their role in it, was further challenged by the emergence of totalitarian regimes in the 1930s. There emerged the possibility that, with democracy under threat, a more active interpretation of citizenship, and a more direct engagement with democratic values, was a necessary element of civic education. The 1930s therefore saw the first nationally co-coordinated attempt to promote a form of citizenship education. Founded in 1934, the Association for Education in Citizenship (A.E.C) had as its 'underlying purpose… to use schools as a means of strengthening liberal democracy in the face of the worrying totalitarian threat from both fascist and communist wings' (Heater, 2001 p.106).

The A.E.C was a coalition of concerned educationalists and contained such key figures as Ernest Simon and William Beveridge. The key development that they wished to see

(one which was not in fact to occur until the acceptance of the Crick Report in the 1990s) was a shift from the indirect approach of promoting citizenship through general education to direct training for citizenship. This was made explicit in the introduction to the association's 1935 book 'Education for Citizenship in Schools' which stated:

> The decay of democracy abroad has led many people to the conclusion that, if those democratic institutions which we in this country agree are essential for the full development of the individual, are to be preserved, some systematic training in the duties of citizenship is necessary (Association for Education in Citizenship, 1936).

Despite the obvious concern with the growth of anti-democratic regimes in Europe and the pressure from the illustrious membership of the A.E.C. it is instructive to note that little was achieved during the 1930s in terms of bringing a clear and direct form of citizenship education into the school curriculum. The Spens Report, commissioned by the government in 1938 confirmed the official line that citizenship was best taught through indirect training, its committee reflecting the establishment view that, even in these difficult circumstances political bias must be kept out of education, and, suspicions that the A.E.C was a 'leftist pressure group' (Heater, 2001 p.107). Even attempts to show a more united political front by appointing Stanley Baldwin as President were unsuccessful in counteracting the overwhelming inclination that any possibility of political bias in education must be avoided, and simply led to disagreements within the A.E.C. itself (Batho, 1990 p.95).

This rejection of direct training for citizenship was reinforced by the Norwood Report of 1943 which, 'seemed to suggest that economics and political science were beyond the capacity of pupils under sixteen and that schools should concentrate on history and

geography' (Lawton et al., 2005 p.10). However, as with the First World War the Second caused a reassessment of the teaching, such as it was, of citizenship, in so far as it existed, even if it was not immediately influential on officialdom. In 'Social Studies and World Citizenship' (1943) Brimble and May explicitly rejected the idea of 'transfer of training', that clear thinking in academic subjects would necessarily lead to clear thinking in other areas of life, and argued that descriptive accounts of international institutions were not sufficient to provide the kind of education in international citizenship needed to prevent future conflicts (Batho, 1990 p.96).

There was a further attempt to promote the direct teaching of citizenship skills in 1945. Another short lived educational pressure group, The Council for Curriculum Reform, produced a report which recommended that social studies, with a strong element of both politics and economics, should become a compulsory subject. However, the report had little impact, (Lawton et al., 2005) and in 1949 the official position was reaffirmed by the Ministry of Education pamphlet 'Citizens Growing Up', although it hinted at a more progressive approach:

> There are forward-looking minds in every section of the teaching profession ready to reinterpret the old and simple virtues of humility, service, restraint and respect for personality. If the schools can encourage qualities of this kind in their pupils, we may fulfill the conditions of a healthy democratic society (Ministry of Education, 1949).

It went on to argue that the development of such qualities was best served by the 'permeation approach' where these values would be communicated through the study of existing academic subjects rather than through any new dedicated provision (Lawton, Cairns et al. 2005 p.10).

Batho (1990) and Davies (1999) argue that a general trend emerged within State education in the 1960s whereby the teaching of civics and citizenship, so far as it existed, became largely the province of the less academically able while the top streams and grammar school pupils were taught the rather dry subject of British Constitution in preparation for O or A level exams. At the same time, public schools (independent schools charging fees) continued to encourage the development of 'leadership qualities' and the development of any common understanding of citizenship, let alone a consistent approach within the curriculum, seemed very remote.

Generally with little interest from the government in any form of civic education throughout the 1960s and 1970s it was left to various voluntary groups to try and promote the importance of developing some form of civic education. Social Studies subjects became increasingly important and subjects such as sociology, economics and politics became increasingly popular in schools, promoted by the Association for Teaching the Social Sciences (ATSS). The Politics Association, founded in 1969, became active, although it had a rather narrow focus on the politics A level, and from 1974-77 the Hansard Society ran a 'Programme for Political Education' where Bernard Crick, whose later work on the purpose of citizenship is central to this research, made his first attempt to widen political education.

Although these initiatives helped to broaden the opportunities for study within the school curriculum, they were not really moving towards any form of citizenship education, in the sense of an agreed programme of general study for the development of civic skills and understanding. This was despite the fact that, both an upsurge in support

for the extreme right, in the shape of the National Front, and the lowering of the voting age (to 18) in 1970, had increased the importance of civic engagement, a fact acknowledged by Shirley Williams who as Education Minister in 1977 allocated responsibility for fostering political education in schools to a senior HMI (Heater, 2001 p.108). This however fell a long way short of actually bringing citizenship education within the curriculum.

Citizenship and the National Curriculum

The term citizenship finally reappeared, for the first time since 'Citizens Growing Up' (1949), in a government education document in 1988, with the arrival of the National Curriculum. Although at this stage a cross-curricular theme, it nevertheless represented an acceptance of the idea of some form of universal civic education for the first time. Its development from this point will be discussed later in the chapter, but it is worth noting that the use of the term 'citizenship', something absent from the majority of the initiatives mentioned so far, in many ways enabled progress that had previously not been possible because of a fear of 'political education', a term seen by its opponents as synonymous with 'political indoctrination'. Lawton (2005) argues persuasively that it was this fear that curtailed Crick's initial attempts at promoting civic education with the Political Literacy project which was bought to an end by the election of the Conservative government in 1979.

The Failure to Establish Citizenship as a Curriculum Subject

Before moving on to a discussion regarding the contrasting viewpoints of the history of citizenship education outlined above, it is worth giving some consideration to the

reasons behind the failure of citizenship to establish itself any kind of formal position within the curriculum before the 1980s. Batho (1990) seems to suggest that while elements of citizenship education have been present throughout the period discussed, most notably within the history curriculum, the ongoing concern of the educational establishment to avoid the discussion of controversial issues, and above all political bias, best accounts for its absence. Lawton (2005) argues that citizenship represented a 'high risk but low pay off' subject, with little status, but easily open to accusations of bias, that there was a shortage of good resources and good teachers, and that there was a lack of understanding about what citizenship teaching was for and could, or should, do. Heater largely agrees, suggesting that:

> In the absence of official encouragement, civic education has been a low priority in English schools, carrying virtually no possibility of professional advancement… For all the enthusiasm and expertise of voluntary organizations, education for citizenship remained a low-status pedagogical activity. (Heater, 2001 p.109)

I would argue that all of these factors were connected to the central problem that there was no common understanding of what citizenship education was, or of its purpose. We have seen that term itself was rarely used, and although a number of attempts to promote some form of education for participation in civil society have been discussed, it is clear that they have often had very different aims in mind, or have been targeted only at particular groups of pupils. As has already been noted, citizenship education has tended to make more progress during periods of broad political consensus. Any explanation of the historical failure to establish the subject within the curriculum must consider why the nature of the subject was so heavily contested.

Perspectives on the History of Citizenship Education in England

One of the principle criticisms of citizenship education identified by Frazer (2000 p.96) is that it can be seen as potentially reinforcing class divisions, and in particular that it is 'identified with a particular class identity, and a deferential attitude towards certain values (hierarchy, respectability and the like) which should be contested'. This viewpoint is strongly endorsed by Simon (1993 p.695), who argues that, the development of ideas connected with citizenship education in the nineteenth century was closely linked to the need to ameliorate the effect of the expanding franchise.

Effectively this argument suggests that different types of citizenship education existed in order to produce different types of citizens, with the divisions being drawn along class lines. Public schools prepared future leaders through the traditional subjects combined with character building participation in sports, combined cadet forces, and the prefect systems and internal hierarchies of boarding schools. Endowed and later grammar schools educated an emerging middle class to believe that they had sufficient stake in the status quo that they should play a supporting role in its maintenance. At the same time the mass of schools aimed to produce citizens who knew their place in the social order and maintain a deference that would ensure that they did not use their democratic power unwisely. Whilst socialist and labour movements existed which would naturally challenge such divisions, at this point in time they were not focusing upon education as a primary issue.

Although he does not accept such direct connections between the expansion of the franchise and specific educational initiatives Heater (2001 p.114) is largely supportive of

Simon's analysis regarding the influence of the class system on citizenship education, pointing out that as late as 1949 the Ministry for Education was still stressing the virtue of submissiveness. He does however suggest that the later part of the twentieth century did see some improvement, particularly with the growth of the social studies movement which offered some challenge to the status quo. Worst served, he argues, as far as citizenship education was concerned, were the pupils of grammar schools who, 'had neither the education for public service of the public school pupils nor the basic civics of the elementary/central/secondary modern school' where more space within the curriculum allowed for greater flexibility.

Both commentators suggest that the attempts of the A.E.C. in the 1930s to promote some form of direct citizenship can be regarded as the most significant attempt to introduce a form of citizenship education that was not class dependent. The fact that this was largely unsuccessful reinforces the argument that, without strong central support, such civic education as exists, tends to reflect the ethos of the institution that delivers it, rather than any shared conception of citizenship (Heater, 2007). Putting aside for a moment the fear of government led indoctrination, the fact that the National Curriculum for the first time provided a degree of centralized control, and therefore the ability to coordinate some common form of civic education, was a cause for cautious optimism for Simon. Crucially, however, the National Curriculum was not to be enforceable in independent schools and therefore this crucial division within citizenship education remained in place.

Alongside divisions relating to class, coherent citizenship education has also been hampered historically by political disagreement regarding the concept of citizenship. T. H. Marshall, writing in 1950 produced an analysis of citizenship which remains relevant today; in fact it formed a key component of the Crick Report. However, as well developed as it was, it was unsuccessful in resolving political tensions surrounding the interpretation of citizenship. Marshall argued that modern citizenship was composed of three distinct forms of rights, civil, political and social. Civil rights, largely developed in the eighteenth century are the rights necessary for individual freedom, such as liberty, freedom of speech, justice and property rights. Political rights, which developed in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, are principally the right to vote and to stand for political office. Social rights, which were being strongly developed by the Labour government in the immediate post war period, were much more open ended but included:

> A range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society' (Marshall, 1950 p.149).

Marshall's view of citizenship was an important element within the Keynesian post war consensus (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994 p.354), because his social rights aimed to resolve some of the tension between the equality that was implied by citizenship with the inequality that capitalism tends to produce. He believed that the social rights, provided by the welfare state, could civilize capitalism by making social justice an essential component of citizenship. This perspective might be criticized for being overly optimistic about the neutrality of the state, particularly in view of the previous discussion about the development of a 'leadership class'. However, it did represent a

view of citizenship that was fully in line with the consensus politics of the time, whether the Social Democracy of the Labour Party or the Managed Capitalism of the Conservatives, and, crucially, therefore, could have formed the basis of a programme of direct citizenship teaching without falling foul of accusations of political bias. However, as I have already noted there was no appetite for such a policy on either side of the political divide.

Although Marshall's view of citizenship remained influential, the post war political consensus that allowed bi-partisan understanding of citizenship, and therefore the potential for a relatively uncontroversial government led programme of citizenship education, was relatively short lived. By the mid nineteen seventies the ideology of the New Right was emerging, represented in Britain by Margaret Thatcher, who 'sought to counter and reverse the development of social citizenship by returning to the traditional liberal idea of free markets and limited government' (Biesta and Lawy, 2006 p.68).

The Thatcherite project aimed to redefine the relationship between the individual and the state by emphasizing market rights rather than social rights, drawing on traditional liberalism's emphasis on property rights and in doing so redefined citizenship as a civilizing element to capitalism that depended not upon state intervention but the voluntary actions of the civic minded individual. Faulks (1998 p.128) defined this 'active citizenship' as 'a mixture of self-help and voluntarism whereby competition and rigour of market relations would supposedly be ''civilized'' by concern for one's community and country'.

Thatcher explicitly rejected the social citizenship of Marshall, as it had developed in the post-war era, arguing that it was an impediment to Britain's competitiveness in the world economy (Biesta and Lawy, 2006 p.69). Naturally the left was reluctant to accept such a redefinition of citizenship and consequently any attempt to introduce a cohesive programme of citizenship education would be likely to have had one side or the other, or possibly both, crying foul on the basis of political bias.

New Labour: New Consensus on Citizenship Education

Although the arrival of John Major as Prime Minister in 1990 saw a more sympathetic approach towards citizenship, which included its incorporation as a cross-curricular theme in the newly introduced National Curriculum, it was only with the arrival of 'New Labour' in 1997 that a significant element of cross party consensus was restored, enabling the relatively recent, much more dramatic, developments in citizenship education to take place, the discussion of which form the final part of this chapter. Despite utilising communitarian ideas, which emphasised the importance of community as a moral and political force in shaping individuals interactions with society and each other, New Labour largely accepted the individualistic interpretation of the role of the citizen that Thatcher had bequeathed them (Biesta and Lawy, 2006 p.70). They no longer saw social rights as a means to move towards a more equal society of citizens. Rather they accepted the Thatcherite emphasis on individual rights but aimed to ally it with a greater sense of responsibility and obligation. Hence the phrase 'Rights and Responsibilities'; both a mantra for government spokesmen, and a guiding principle for the programme of citizenship education they began to develop. The Conservatives, weak from massive electoral defeat and themselves becoming somewhat wary of the excessive

individualism of the 1980s offered little opposition. For some this meant New Labour offered little more than 'Thatcherism with a smiley face'.

Whilst this development may have been bad for political diversity, and, some would argue, even democracy, it certainly made the introduction of a centrally coordinated form of citizenship education a much more realistic proposition. I would suggest that, with the parties sharing a concern over the increasing youth apathy, demonstrated by the electoral turnout figures, and the barriers of fundamentally differing conceptions of citizenship removed, the situation was created whereby Crick could put forward proposals for the compulsory teaching of citizenship without fear of the kind of knee jerk opposition to any form of political education that had existed in the past. The fear that one side or the other would misuse citizenship education as a form of political indoctrination was both less well founded, and trumped by the major parties' shared concern over the declining legitimacy of all politicians as young people increasing disengaged from politics (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.7). Whilst such an opportunity had been missed in the early days of the post war consensus, this time a combination of greater government interest and a committed individual prepared to champion its value meant that genuine progress could be made.

David Kerr, an academic who served as a professional officer to the committee and worked closely with Crick on the drafting of his report, accepts that a degree of political consensus was a necessary condition for the development of a compulsory element of citizenship within the curriculum, admitting, 'many of the past approaches of policy makers have foundered because of a lack of consensus on definition and approach'

(Kerr, 2003a p.2). He also recognizes that discussions about citizenship education always exist within the context of wider political debate about the changing nature of citizenship in modern society. However, the emergence of something of a party political consensus on economic and social policy in the late 1990s does not fully explain how it became possible to introduce citizenship education as a curriculum subject when, despite pressure from a variety of sources such as the A.E.C. and the Hansard Society, it had not proved possible in the past. Two factors which might also be mentioned are the increased use of the term 'citizenship', something which had been conspicuous by its absence from much of the time period discussed, within political discourse from the 1980s onwards (Kerr, 2003a p.3), and the emergence of citizenship as a potentially 'safer' alternative to some of the more overtly political education of the 1980s.

Developments that Led Towards the Establishment of Compulsory Citizenship Education in the 1990s

As has been mentioned above the term 'active citizenship' began to be used in the 1980s, most noticeably by Home Secretary Douglas Hurd, as a means of encouraging individual activism and volunteerism in order to reduce reliance on the 'Nanny State'. Whilst the Labour Party were at pains to point out that this was a corruption of the term merely designed as cover for public spending cuts, it was noticeable that David Blunkett was forced to concede that 'as a platitude it has much to recommend it'(Heater, 1991 p.143). Hence, although the political consensus of the 1990s was some way off, an increased acceptance of the positive nature of the term was helping to lay some ground work. At the same time, an increased interest in constitutional reform, particularly

promoted by Charter 88, a pressure group explicitly committed to a new constitutional settlement, focused attention on the idea of British citizenship.

Heater also argues that citizenship education to some extent came to be seen as a relatively safe alternative to some of the much more radical political education that was taking place in schools on an ad hoc basis:

> The 1980s saw… attempts to introduce more radical political education, focused on such issues as the nuclear bomb, gender, development, and race. (Hodgson, 2008 p.418)

> In the 1980s, however, the teaching of controversial political issues was provoking considerable nervous hostility on the right of the political spectrum. Fear of teacher bias and classroom indoctrination, a perennial concern, was magnified by the development of Peace Studies… As a result of these worries, there was incorporated into the 1986 Education Act a specific prohibition against promoting "partisan political views in the teaching of any subject in the school." (Heater, 1991 p.149)

While the fear of such approaches in the classroom was sometimes rejected as right wing conspiracy theorizing, there is no doubt that in the polarized political climate of the 1980s the classroom became more of a political battleground. In this context, Heater argues, there was an attempt to trump 'bad' non-conformist political education with 'good', stabilizing, citizenship education. Although initially attractive to the Tory right it is clear that the rapidly reforming Labour Party of the 1990s did not find this idea unattractive. Such acceptance has led some critics to argue that the real battle over citizenship is 'between different sections of the Right who wish either to promote the moral aspects (duty, responsibility, and often national identity) of citizenship or those who wish to emphasise the market model which stresses the needs of entrepreneurs and the benefits of enterprise' (Davies, 1999 p.131).

What is clear is that when the Conservative Government introduced citizenship in 1990, albeit in a limited form as a cross curricular theme within the new National Curriculum, it was not simply uncontroversial, it was actively supported by the Labour Party. Jack Straw, Shadow Education Minister remarked, 'I hold the view that citizenship should be taught in every school, to every child, in a systematic way.' (Heater, 1991 p.150). Although the impact of citizenship as a cross curricular theme was limited, all of the cross curricular themes suffered from the pressures of trying to co-exist with the new priorities of teaching and assessment introduced by the National Curriculum, citizenship particularly so, it did create a situation where a broad consensus on the desirability of citizenship teaching in schools was in place. When this was combined with the political will brought to the table by the arrival of David Blunkett as Education Minister, himself a former student of Crick, a place for citizenship education within the compulsory National Curriculum became a realistic possibility. This was further enhanced by a growing sense of unease amongst politicians at the increasing levels of political apathy demonstrated by the poor turnout of young voters in the 1997 election (Phelps, 2004).

Despite many factors being in his favour Crick was still careful not to alienate any support and attempted to gain backing for his proposals across the political spectrum. The 'rights and responsibilities' rhetoric of New Labour was present but his report also consciously echoed Conservative ideas of citizenship from the 1980s (Kerr, 2003a p.3). His work built on that of T.H. Marshall, but the absence of any discussion of social rights was indicative of its emphasis on more conservative elements, particularly the ability of citizenship and capitalism to happily co-exist.

Although there had been periodic attempts to develop some form of citizenship education throughout the period, often motivated by crises such as the AEC's response to totalitarian politics in the 1930s, the circumstances that Crick was able to exploit represented a fairly unique combination of factors, including a broad political consensus on the meaning of citizenship, a minor crisis of political apathy among young voters and the strong political will of a minister with a personal interest in the area, that allowed him to be successful, at least in so far as getting the subject onto the curriculum, where others had failed.

The Future of Citizenship Education: The 2010 Coalition

This research is primarily concerned with the response of school leaders to citizenship education as outlined by the National Curriculum documents of 1999 and 2007, which were drawn up as a direct response to the Crick Report. When I first began this study, despite various problems associated with citizenship's implementation (which are discussed in Chapters Seven and Eight) the outlook for the subject was relatively positive. In 2008, I was appointed to a citizenship teaching position, and the ambitions of my school for the subject, and those of my new colleagues in other local schools, led me to hope that it could make a significant contribution to contemporary education. Over the course of the next six years it became clear that my optimism was somewhat misplaced, and, as I write an additional section to bring this chapter's historical overview up to date, the position of the subject looks somewhat precarious.

The arrival of the Conservative–Liberal Democrat government in 2010 was always likely to have a significant impact on Citizenship Education, as the Labour Party, who

had introduced the subject, were returned to opposition after thirteen years in government, and the new coalition looked to make its mark on education policy. The early signs for the subject were not good. In January 2011 the Department for Education (which had reverted, perhaps significantly, to its most traditional title) launched a wide scale review of the National Curriculum, and the Citizenship Foundation (2011) expressed concerns that citizenship was one of the subjects faced with the possibility of losing its compulsory status. This fear appeared to be well founded when the expert review panel report suggested that, while important, citizenship should not retain its status as a foundation subject (Department for Education, 2011b p.24).

This reclassification as part of the Basic Curriculum would have meant that schools would still have been expected to cover it; but how they did, and how much importance they gave it, would have been up to them. For many advocates of citizenship education this was worryingly reminiscent of the status it had initially had within the National Curriculum as a cross-curricular theme (under the Conservative Government of Margaret Thatcher), where provision had been both inconsistent and extremely limited (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.19). Convinced that the advice, from both OFSTED (OFSTED, 2010), and the National Foundation for Educational Research (Keating et al., 2010), that citizenship was best delivered as a discrete subject was correct, the Citizenship Foundation and Democratic Life Campaign began an extended period of lobbying to protect the subject's status (Democratic Life, 2011).

The campaigners appeared to have been successful when, in January 2013, Secretary of State Michael Gove announced, in response to a question from David Blunkett, 'I can absolutely and with pleasure confirm that citizenship will remain a programme of study at key stages 3 and 4. I look forward to working with him to ensure that this valuable subject is even better taught in more of our schools' (HC Deb, 2013). However, this did not represent the end of teachers' concerns. Initial drafts for the new National Curriculum were released in February of 2013 but it was felt, by some observers, that some key aspects of the subject had been lost in the new programmes of study. Personal Finance had replaced any discussion of wider economic issues, there was an absence of any explicit reference to human rights, and active citizenship had been too closely identified with volunteering (Kerr, 2013 p.12-13).

In September 2013, the Citizenship Foundation declared 'Victory! The citizenship curriculum is improved!' (Citizenship Foundation, 2013) and were delighted to announce that many of the improvements they had been seeking had been included. Most notably:

- explicit reference to human rights and the United Nations
- more prominent references to democracy, public institutions and the role of voluntary groups in society
- stronger references to active citizenship, rather than simply 'volunteering'
- financial education widened to include how public money is raised and spent (Citizenship Foundation, 2013)

Whilst I certainly consider these welcome developments, as my research draws to a close in 2014 I do not share their optimism for the future of the subject, at least not in the short term. The reason for this is simple; battling over the contents of the National

Curriculum is in many ways a side issue. For the empirical component of my research I visited ten schools to interview citizenship coordinators and nine of them already had academy status and were therefore no longer bound by the National Curriculum. In some cases (see Chapter Ten) this had already led to the subject's marginalization. Whilst the national debate is an important one, it is in danger of becoming largely academic if local school policy does not support the subject 'on the ground'. Currently the statutory requirement to teach the 2007 syllabus has been put on hold whilst schools have been given a year to prepare for the introduction of the new order in September 2014 (Department for Education, 2013d); by the time a legal requirement to teach citizenship returns the number of schools affected may be very small, in my sample it will probably be zero.

Since my research was carried out with reference to the 1999 and 2007 versions of the National Curriculum, and took place in the summers of 2011 and 2012, I will not return to the issue of these most recent changes in citizenship education until my concluding chapter, although there are aspects of my discussions with citizenship coordinators that hint at the beginning of some of the developments outlined above.

2) Methodology

Research Questions

This thesis aims to explore the idea that, even within a liberal democracy, there is considerable disagreement regarding the purpose of citizenship education; that it can be a progressive force, encouraging critical thinking and challenging political authority, or a conservative one, reinforcing the status quo and maintaining the existing political order. Specifically it examines the extent to which these competing perceptions of purpose influence the Crick Report, and by extension the curriculum subject of 'Citizenship Education', and the citizenship coordinators who are most directly responsible for the subject's delivery.

The research has four inter-related research questions;

1) *What underlying principles and philosophies exist regarding the purpose of citizenship education in a Liberal Democracy?*

2) *Which principles and philosophies did the Crick Report adopt and how are these reflected in the National Curriculum subject of 'Citizenship Education'?*

3) *What do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by theory and policy issues?*

4) *Could a greater understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of Citizenship Education among citizenship coordinators, improve its provision?*

The first question aims to provide an examination of the different perceptions of the purpose of citizenship education found within a liberal democracy: Should it aim to simply inculcate the values necessary for the continued existence of the state, or should it encourage challenges to the status quo? Should it promote only minimal liberal values and confine itself to the private sphere, or endorse a more comprehensive liberalism? Should it encourage the development of autonomy and critical thinking, or should it reject the active promotion of values which threaten diversity and toleration?

The second question examines how the different positions discussed in the first influenced the Crick Report, and his success in resolving the tensions between the progressive and conservative approaches to the subject. It also explores the influence of Crick's personal views on citizenship education and his use of theory from outside the liberal tradition. Finally it asks how successfully the theory of the report was translated into educational policy, specifically concerning itself with the 'light touch' approach to the subject's implementation.

The first two research questions are explored in the first half of the thesis through an extended and critical review of the relevant literature which involves; an examination of the perspectives of various liberal commentators (Chapter Three), an examination of Crick's own work and its critics (Chapter Four), an examination of the Crick Report itself and its critics (Chapter Five), an examination of citizenship education policy documents and their critics (Chapters, Six, Seven and Eight).

The third question aims to describe and analyse citizenship coordinators' perceptions of the purpose of citizenship education. It aims to contextualize their responses within the theoretical framework established by the first part of the thesis, and to examine the consistency of their beliefs regarding purpose by exploring the component parts of the curriculum and their response to real world citizenship issues such as the Iraq War protests. Where inconsistency does exist it attempts to determine whether, a lack of conceptual understanding, or policy pressures, are responsible. This question forms the basis of the fieldwork component of the research; an interview based qualitative study, the methodology of which is discussed below.

The final research question draws on the responses to the third to ask how provision of the subject might be improved: Is there a need for improved understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of citizenship education? Could such an understanding help to mitigate the negative impact of certain policy pressures? The conclusion of the thesis (Chapter Thirteen) makes a number of suggestions as to how a clearer understanding of the subject's purpose might strengthen its delivery and place within the school curriculum.

Research Framework

As I have outlined above, the first part of my thesis, dealing with the first two research questions, is a literature based academic study. This theoretical component of the research will establish that there are several contradictory interpretations regarding both the purpose and underlying philosophy of citizenship education. For this reason, when it came to my fieldwork research, I choose to adopt a qualitative approach within a broadly

interpretive framework. The variety of conceptual approaches underpinning the subject makes quantitative methods not only unsuitable but potentially dangerous, since two individuals can give exactly the same answer to a question and mean very different things. This means that the opportunity to follow up any questions and tease out the meaning behind any statement, is particularly important (Sarantakos, 1998 p.44). It also suggests that any positivistic search for some objective truth about citizenship will be fruitless, not only because contrary views will always be held about its nature, but also because it is itself, a continually evolving idea, which changes as the relationship between individual and state changes over time.

Ontology and Epistemology

My research is best described as being based upon idealist assumptions with regard to ontology, and constructivist assumptions with regard to epistemology. Idealism suggests that reality consists of representations that are the creation of the human mind, and that social reality consists of shared interpretations (Blaikie, 2010p.93). The starting point for my research was that different individuals *perceived* the purpose of citizenship in different ways, and the intention was to explore and contrast these different understandings rather than to attempt to establish one that was 'correct'. Since states themselves, as well as the theories of citizenship that describe their relationships with individuals, are human constructions, it would be inappropriate to attempt to establish any kind of objective facts about them (Sarantakos, 1998 p.44). They represent a shared way of looking at the operation of society.

Constructionism sees everyday knowledge as the outcome of people making sense of the world and social scientific knowledge as researchers reinterpreting and formalizing this knowledge. It also acknowledges that the standpoint of the researcher will inevitably impact research as no one is capable of observing the external world unencumbered by concepts, theories, background knowledge and past experience (Blaikie, 2010 p.95). Whilst I was determined to limit the impact of my own prejudices on the research, and during its course my opinions shifted significantly with regard to some key issues, I was always aware that my status as an active citizenship teacher would play an important part in both the conduct and interpretation of the study.

An Interpretive Study

Given the discussion above it was clear that my research would be best situated within an interpretative, rather than a more positivistic framework. It would attempt to understand actions and meanings rather than causes, involve the researcher personally rather than be conducted from 'outside', concern itself with perceptions feelings, ideas, thoughts and actions rather than things which could be quantified and counted, and it would examine emergent patterns rather than variables that had been decided on in advance (Cohen et al., 2007 p.33), (Thomas, 2009).

Broadly speaking such an approach would be regarded as subjective rather than objective. However there are important central concepts, such as rights and duties for example, that have had significant historical importance in the political development of states and societies. Although ultimately accepted as widely shared subjective values, these concepts will be understood as having a 'real' existence in the sense that both they,

and their effects, can be observed, and to some extent measured. As discussed in Chapter Three, citizenship education in this country must be understood within the, commonly understood, parameters of a functioning liberal democracy. This research therefore aims to establish the relative strengths of existing, and competing, conceptions of citizenship education within that framework, whilst accepting that these are ultimately subjective, rather than questioning the meaning of the central concepts of citizenship itself.

In terms of epistemology, my assumption is that useful observations can be made about the effect that different perceptions of the purpose of citizenship have upon its implementation as a curriculum subject, and my intention was to achieve this through the gathering of empirical evidence. This link between purpose and policy is explored in Chapters Seven and Eight. At the same time the ontological considerations already discussed mean that any conclusions drawn will necessarily be tentative, and will certainly not make any claims towards establishing objective fact, rather they will be regarded as a form of 'provisional knowledge' (Thomas, 2009 p.89). The intention of the research is to make an informed contribution to the ongoing debate about the future direction of citizenship education, or if not 'citizenship', which is under threat as a curriculum subject (see Chapter One), then future forms of civic education within schools, and to highlight the need for more consideration about its essential purpose and philosophical underpinnings.

The acceptance that it is not possible to make definitive ontological statements, about the essential nature of citizenship, since it is ultimately defined by the relationship between citizens and their state, does not necessarily make it unreasonable to make

normative claims about what citizenship education should do. Chapters Four and Five examine how Crick aimed to establish a compromise between competing conceptions of citizenship and establish an educational framework within which different viewpoints could co-exist. We do not need to have a definitive definition of what citizenship is for us to believe that discussion of the various concepts with which it is concerned can be of considerable educational benefit. This thesis will ultimately aim to make suggestions, based upon my research, about the way to maximize this benefit in schools. The only perspective from which the value of this exercise might be genuinely called into question is a hard line interpretation of Galston's position (see Chapter Three) which sees the only purpose of civic education as inculcating loyalty and obedience to the state (Galston, 1989). However such an interpretation arguably falls outside the realms of 'education' as it would normally be understood, disregarding, as it does, any use of critical faculties, and rather than essentially proposing a programme of instruction and nothing more.

A Qualitative Study

Given the interpretative nature of my research it was appropriate to adopt a qualitative methodology. I was interested in understanding the perceptions of citizenship coordinators rather than explaining them, in building a theory rather than testing one, in playing an active rather than a passive role in the research and employing a dynamic flexible approach rather than a static inflexible one (Sarantakos, 1998 p.35). My own experience as a citizenship teacher had made me aware that a quantitative approach would have great difficulty in capturing the complexity of an individual's understanding of the central concepts of citizenship education. I had personal experience of

conversations with individuals whose views on the subject were ostensibly progressive but who gradually revealed a very conservative approach to many of the subject's key concepts. Any research would need to address the question of perception of purpose from several different perspectives, using different key concepts and real world examples to effectively make multiple passes with the same basic underlying question. There would be a danger in a quantitative approach that it would fail to distinguish between appearance and essence and would force upon the respondents opinions or intentions which they might not otherwise have expressed (Sarantakos, 1998 p.43).

I concluded that a cross sectional survey based upon semi-structured interviews would provide the most effective way of investigating my research questions. Given the fact that the sample would be relatively small and the research would be based upon a series of one off interviews there were limitations to this approach, however I was confident that it could provide a useful 'snapshot' of perceptions and attitudes towards the subject. Furthermore, I felt that a semi structured interview would allow me to strike an effective balance in any discussion, drawing on my dual roles as an academic researcher, and a fellow citizenship teacher. This dual perspective could potentially allow for an interview with greater depth than one which was purely academic or professionally based.

Given the considerations outlined above, this project has not been overly concerned with the kind of strict issues of reliability and validity that would be a feature of a more positivistic piece of work. However, since the aim is to make a meaningful contribution to the discussion, and ongoing development, of citizenship education, it is important that there is some kind of generalisability to the research; otherwise it risks being simply an

anecdotal account of the viewpoints of a relatively small number of individuals. When planning the research I heeded the advice of Schofield (1990 p.200), that it is important in qualitative research to provide a clear, detailed, and in depth description so that others can decide the extent to which findings are generalisable. Equally, although drawing on a fairly small local sample, careful consideration was given to attempting to ensure a good variety in terms of the characteristics of participants' schools.

Cohen's (2007) discussion of validity and reliability with regard to interviews was drawn upon when preparing the research design, and I aimed to avoid some of the potential pitfalls highlighted. Whilst a lack of understanding on the part of the interviewee, regarding the basic language and concepts associated with citizenship education, was unlikely given the discussion was between two professionals doing similar jobs, the risk of bias being introduced through a projection of my own views was much more serious (Cohen et al., 2007 p.150). As I work in the field it is inevitable that I hold certain opinions regarding citizenship education. A clear acknowledgement of my own positionality, and a careful determination to avoid leading the interviewees' responses, was regarded as the best form of protection with regard to this problem, but it must be acknowledged that in no sense can an elimination of my own bias be guaranteed. My intention is to draw only tentative conclusions but believe that these will be of wider interest to those working in this area and will make a useful contribution to any discussion regarding the future of the subject.

<u>The Pilot Study</u>

Whilst working on the literature based research that makes up the first part of this thesis, I decided that it would be useful to carry out a pilot study into school leaders' attitudes towards the purpose of citizenship education. My hope was that the pilot would serve a number of purposes; enable initial contact to be made with potential future participants in the study, help to ascertain the likely level of cooperation in the substantive research, and provide some useful contextual information about the provision of citizenship education in the county (Cohen et al., 2007 p.341-342). I would then use this information to help shape the questions for the semi-structured interviews that would later form the bulk of the research.

Although the primary research would involve interviews with schools' citizenship coordinators, I decided that the pilot would focus on headteachers. This had the benefit of providing much of the contextual information mentioned above, whilst at the same time giving the opportunity for the pilot study to provide evidence of the attitudes of a different type of school leader. This would give the pilot study significantly more value than simply a dry run for the main research. I was also aware that getting participants for my research would not necessarily be easy, and, that approaching citizenship coordinators via headteachers, who were already aware of the project, might improve my chances of recruiting interviewees.

Since the basis of the pilot was to be collecting information from headteachers, I decided that it was appropriate to make the initial approach through their local professional association, the Gloucestershire Association of Secondary Headteachers (GASH). My

intention was to request permission to attend a meeting of the organisation and give a brief explanation of my research, followed by an invitation for them to complete a short mixed questionnaire. I hoped that by attending in person, I would be able to give some background to the project, as well as reassurance that it would not be making any judgements about the standard of citizenship provision in their schools; rather it was to be an exploratory piece of research, concerned with the nature of their attitude towards the subject. I considered this to be important, since a degree of sensitivity towards investigation of this area was probably to be expected, in light of the criticisms that many schools nationally have faced with regard to provision of the subject (OFSTED, 2005). A face to face meeting would also have the benefit of allowing me to encourage participation in the research by sharing my intention to provide an in-service education and training (INSET) session, outlining the finding of the research, to participating schools, and to explain what I saw as the benefits of the my study, bringing together academic research and professional practice.

My initial approach to the chair of GASH was met with a very positive response. I was invited to attend an upcoming meeting and assigned a ten minute slot to make a brief presentation and distribute my questionnaire. I was pleasantly surprised at this outcome, since my professional experience had led me to expect some reluctance at the mention of the term citizenship. My new found optimism was somewhat short lived however, when, having prepared my presentation and questionnaires, I was contacted the night before the meeting and informed that I would not be able to attend due to the objections of some members who felt it would set an unwise precedent. The suggestion was made that my questionnaire could be distributed by email, but, fearing that this would result in a very

poor return rate, I pressed for a compromise, and with the help of my own school's Headteacher I was able to have them delivered, and filled in, during 'any other business'. Ultimately, despite not being able to attend in person, the completion rate of the questionnaires was good and they provided some useful information.

Although the lack of a face to face meeting meant I was unable offer either, the reassurance about, or incentives for, participation in the research, the process arguably provided a degree of confirmation to my initial theory that some headteachers would show considerable suspicion towards any mention of citizenship. It is of course only speculation, but, given my personal experience as a citizenship teacher and the anecdotal evidence of those I know from other schools, my feeling is that the last minute withdrawal of my invitation was less to do with procedural matters, than a reluctance on the part of some members of GASH to have even a short amount of time spent on discussion of a subject area in which they were not comfortable; either with their personal knowledge or the provision within their schools. Frustratingly, it was precisely such concerns that I wished to reassure them about through a personal approach. With regard to future research design this immediately raised two issues, firstly, as I suspected, that an ongoing effort would be required to ensure that it was understood that I was not interested in making any judgements regarding standards of provision, but was rather concerned with questions of underlying purpose, and secondly, that while schools who are most confident about their provision with regard to existing OFSTED criteria may be the most willing participants, care should be made to try and involve a wide cross section of schools since OFSTED's criteria arguably already contain several

assumptions about the nature and purpose of citizenship. Both of these considerations went on to form an important part of my ultimate research design.

The Pilot Study - Questionnaire

Given the potential reluctance anticipated of the participants, it was important that the questionnaire was as accessible as possible and that it could realistically be completed in three to five minutes. Although the substantive research project would concern itself with the purpose of citizenship education, the scope for exploring this within a questionnaire was extremely limited so the questions were for the most part concerned with the current provision, rather than the perception, of citizenship. The majority of questions were of a 'closed' nature and a significant number of simple factual enquiries were included, particularly in the early part of the survey, partly to avoid immediately alienating potential respondents, and partly because, although not directly relevant to the questions being explored in the substantive study, they would provide some useful contextual information about provision of the subject within the county.

Careful consideration was given to the design of the questionnaire to try and make it as easy to complete as possible. The content was divided into four colour coded sections, across one A4 sheet, breaking up the questions into manageable chunks and hopefully presenting the material in as visually engaging way as possible. The categories of questions were; personnel, curriculum, citizenship and pupil voice, and citizenship and purpose. The first three were, for reasons discussed above, largely concerned with factual information, while the fourth, placed where it was least threatening and hopefully most likely to encourage some engagement, asked three questions which attempted to, in

a very limited form, explore some idea of the perceptions that would be explored in the substantive study. Respondents were invited to identify themselves and their schools, but not until the end of the survey, so as not to discourage respondents from beginning the questionnaire but rather giving them the option of completing it and then leaving it anonymous.

The Pilot Study - Response

There are forty secondary school headteachers in Gloucestershire and therefore potentially forty respondents at a GASH meeting. Through local contacts I am aware that not every headteacher attends every meeting, in fact I am aware of several who were not at the meeting at which my questionnaire was presented. However, I have no way of knowing the attendance at the meeting in question, as GASH were not prepared to reveal this. Twenty questionnaires were completed and it has been implied to me that this was a high response rate from those present, I have no particular reason to doubt this and given the option of anonymity, and the fact that it was allocated a discrete time slot it seems unlikely that many would choose to ignore the questionnaire altogether. It is not possible to claim that the twenty responses necessarily give a representative sample of views of Gloucestershire headteachers, but at the same time there is no particular reason to suggest that, either the attendance that day at GASH, or the questionnaire completion, was particularly unrepresentative.

Of those who did respond eleven identified themselves while nine chose to remain anonymous. In view of the reluctance, outlined above, of some members to have questions about citizenship raised at all, this is not surprising. It does add to the

impression that for many headteachers, citizenship is a subject which they are not particularly comfortable discussing.

How Did the Pilot Study Inform the Fieldwork Research?

The detailed data gained from the questionnaire can be found in Chapter Ten but a number of issues arose from the pilot study that were to inform my research design for the fieldwork:

- It strongly suggested that my suspicion that a significant number of headteachers would be reluctant to discuss citizenship provision in their schools is correct. In light of this, two issues were raised with regard to the substantive research. Firstly, I recognised a degree of persistence would be necessary to obtain a sufficient number of participants and, secondly, any approach to headteachers needed to be carefully thought out and presented so as to minimize any perception that their provision of citizenship was being 'tested' or 'inspected'. The initial request for involvement of their school needed to make it clear that this research was concerned with the underlying questions regarding the nature of civic education in a liberal democracy, and was not therefore interested in making any judgements about the success or otherwise of their school in meeting any pre-existing criteria for the successful provision of citizenship education.

- Whilst the temptation might have existed to pursue interviews with those who have responded most positively to the pilot study, care needed to be taken that this did not lead to a narrow sample with viewpoints that were relatively homogenous. A somewhat negative response to current orthodoxy regarding citizenship education could not be taken as an indication that the respondent

regards citizenship, or civic education, as inherently worthless. In fact it may well be that their views would reflect a frustration with current thinking that is rooted in strong feelings regarding the purpose and provision of the subject. Care needed to be taken to pursue interviews in schools with a variety of viewpoints, and, where possible, some attempt needed to be made to persuade those reluctant to talk about citizenship that they might well be interested in discussing the wider educational questions that underlie issues of civic education.

- The responses to the pilot study confirmed that there were a variety of approaches to citizenship provision, varying from a commitment to discrete lessons, delivered by specialist staff and culminating in examinations, through to cross curricular or PSHE based delivery. Although not necessarily directly relating to the perception of the subject held by the headteacher, it would be advantageous to include schools with a variety of approaches within the research sample.

- Pupil voice was regarded as a strong element of citizenship education by almost all schools, despite not being formally aligned to citizenship within the National Curriculum Orders. The interview design needed, therefore, to accommodate discussion of initiatives within this area as a key element of any investigation into the perception of the underlying purpose of citizenship education.

- The section of the questionnaire that asked for initial responses regarding the purpose of citizenship suggested that these are strongly influenced by the rhetoric of the political/educational establishment, hence the strong showing in terms of identification with phrases such as 'rights and responsibilities' and 'social

cohesion'. Care needed to be taken in the interview design to ensure that it was possible to elicit responses which go beyond a simple restatement of the orthodoxy of either political pronouncements or educational literature. This appeared to confirm that the intention to use a semi structured interview format was an appropriate one since it would allow for a nuanced discussion of the issues involved and the opportunity to use follow up questions to establish the underlying thinking behind the initial responses of the interviewee.

- In contrast to the enthusiasm to embrace the phrases mentioned above, that have their origins within the political arena, there was a clear reluctance to acknowledge the essentially political nature of citizenship education with very few respondents identifying political literacy or participation as key purposes, despite the fact that the need to combat the political apathy of young people was one of the most prominent factors in the commissioning of the Crick report. This, perhaps, reflected the ongoing fear, regarding the provision of citizenship education in this country; that efforts should be made to avoid dealing with areas of potential political controversy (for examples of this, such as the concern over 'Peace Studies' in the 1980s, see Chapter One). Care needed to be taken to ensure that interviewees were able to feel comfortable engaging in political discussion, which engages with issues regarding the nature of education within a liberal democracy, without feeling that it needed to be in any way party political.

Research Design

The need to obtain good quality qualitative material, and the experience of the pilot project, confirmed my decision that the basis for the research should be interviews with

schools' citizenship coordinators. It was clear from the pilot project that most headteachers were not closely involved with the particular nature of citizenship provision in their schools, although they naturally had a significant impact on the school's overall ethos. This suggested that it would be of more value to interview the member of staff who had been given the leadership position with direct responsibility for citizenship. While 'citizenship coordinator' was not a position that would be found in every school, the compulsory status of the subject within the National Curriculum meant that some form of equivalent, albeit often as an element of a wider role, would be found in all institutions.

My intention was to interview the citizenship coordinator at each school, so that their understandings, roles and influence could be compared and contrasted. Semi-structured interviews were selected as the most appropriate means of data collection, since they allowed for a clear focus on the issues raised by the introduction of citizenship education into the curriculum, whilst at the same time allowing the flexibility to explore the individual's understanding of key terms and concepts (Sarantakos, 1998 p.246; Thomas, 2009 p.164). The ability to examine the nature of the particular interpretation that the interviewee had, with regard to the components of the formal curriculum, is what lies at the heart of this research. The interviews were expected to be of about thirty minutes duration and were digitally recorded.

The primary data source, for this project, is the interviews themselves but it was also helpful to examine any relevant school policy documents such as departmental handbooks, schemes of work and timetable allocations, as these provided useful

contextualisation. In view of the obvious discomfort, which, I felt, had been apparent in the pilot study, when it came to discussion of citizenship in certain schools (as evidenced by the withdrawal of my invitation to the Gloucestershire Association of Headteachers meeting discussed), I did not request copies of these documents as there was a danger that it would have made my research appear closer in nature to some form of inspection. However, most participants were happy to make them available during the interview and I recorded any useful information in my research diary.

Although the research was primarily concerned with the way that citizenship is understood, rather than its implementation, the two are clearly connected. Therefore school policy was discussed in the interviews, and other evidence considered where useful, particularly when it shed light on the relationship between theory and practice. The only formal documents that were obtained were all recent OFSTED reports (discussed in Chapter Thirteen) which were freely available on the internet without the need to make inquiries at the individual institutions. However document interrogation was not considered as an entirely separate form of data requiring separate analysis, but rather used in conjunction with interview data to give contextual support.

Research Diary

In addition to the audio record of the interviews, I maintained a research diary throughout the course of the project. This allowed me to reflect upon the development of my ideas as the research progressed, and was also invaluable in helping to connect the early conceptual part of the research, which examined the underlying philosophy of citizenship education and the potential for different understandings of its purpose, with

the later fieldwork (Thomas, 2009 p.166). Although primarily a personal resource to ensure that I kept track of my thoughts and observations as the research progressed, in many ways the research diary became a key resource as it tracked a journey from practice to theory and back to practice. As a working citizenship teacher I began this project by deepening my own knowledge of the theoretical basis and underlying philosophy of the subject. I was then able to apply what I had learned, both in my own teaching and in my fieldwork research which focused more generally on the actual practice of citizenship education in schools.

Research Design - Data Analysis

To a degree, the nature of the data analysis was always going to be partly determined by the experience of the interviews and by the material obtained. However, within the broadly established research framework, I did give considerable thought to this area before I embarked on the research itself; primarily to ensure that my approach to data collection did not rule out any forms of analysis that I might later wish to pursue. As mentioned above, the work on the literature had established a broad typology of attitudes to citizenship education; this was sometimes helpful when used within the interviews as a broad frame of reference but I was aware of the need to exercise caution and ensure that connections were not made too readily, and wished to avoid guiding interviewees down particular pathways.

Since this research is situated squarely within an interpretative, qualitative, paradigm, I aimed to avoid analytical methods which give more positivistic weight to any conclusions. Even a grounded theory approach, I felt, might be too restrictive, having in

mind Thomas and James (2006 p.791) who argued that 'if researchers… pick up and run with grounded theory, they risk losing the best of qualitative inquiry.' My research does not aim to establish any objective facts; rather, given that there is already major quantitative analysis as part of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS), it aims to explore in greater depth some of the underlying conceptual issues that affect how citizenship has developed as a curriculum subject. The intention is not to form definitive judgments but stimulate debate.

Although often associated with grounded theory the constant comparative method, or at least the close re-reading associated with it, can be applied to results analysis with less emphasis on developing an inductive theory, and more on developing broad themes and mapping the interconnections between them (Thomas, 2009 p.198). I felt this approach had the potential to make good use of the literature based work which I had already carried out and would function alongside the broad typography already mentioned. Ultimately any analysis had to look to establish similarities and differences, both between the various school leaders' perceptions of citizenship education, and between the leaders' positions and those of the literature on the same themes.

It was also expected that a certain amount of analysis would take place through 'thick description' of elements of the interviews. Since part of the theoretical component of this research concerned itself with the disparity that sometimes exists between what is said about citizenship education and what is actually intended, it seemed clear that it might be necessary to interpret some interviewees' responses within the wider context of both the rest of the interview, and the facts about citizenship provision in their school.

Of course I was aware that in such circumstances it becomes particularly important to acknowledge the subjectivity of such commentary and the issue of positionality.

I was also aware that it was important that a piece of work which aims to broadly categorize viewpoints in a particular area does not become too generic. As a teacher myself, I was keen that the views of practitioners should be clearly given voice within this research. Calvert and Cleminshaw, throughout their research on the implementation of citizenship, illustrate perfectly, how relatively small scale research can make a valuable contribution, by broadly categorizing a variety of positions, whilst at the same time making judicious use of direct quotations in order to give a strong sense of the voice of the participants (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003; Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005).

Triangulation and Positionality

I was aware that the use of existing research would be important, not so much for verification of any particular findings, but for providing a variety of viewpoints that allow a wider understanding of the issues involved than would be possible with my small research sample. Triangulation serves the dual purpose of both offering potential corroborative evidence for the research findings, or alternative explanations that may challenge my assumptions as a professional, and those made by the structure of the research project itself (Cohen et al., 2007 p.144). The opportunity for triangulation within individual institutions was limited, although as previously mentioned, their OFSTED reports were collected so a certain amount of cross referencing with the interviews could take place, where reference had been made to citizenship (not always a

given). More widely, my findings could be compared with other research; both small scale, such as that of Calvert and Clemitshaw (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003; Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005), and larger scale, such as the work of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) (Keating et al., 2010). Chapters Seven and Eight examined policy issues in some detail and the analysis in Chapter Ten attempts to connect this theoretical research with the findings of my fieldwork.

Whilst the temptation existed, particularly given my current status as a citizenship teacher, to view particular responses in a way that made them sit comfortably within my worldview, I was aware that it would be much more useful, not to mention intellectually rigorous, to acknowledge that they may be interpreted in contrary ways. With this in mind it was appropriate to consider the issue of positionality. As a working professional within the field it was inevitable that I entered this research with some pre-conceptions regarding citizenship education, its purpose and its successful delivery. Whilst this was openly acknowledged, and was not inconsistent with the interpretative approach of the study, I was not interested in simply confirming my own prejudices and hoped that drawing upon existing research would help me maintain an approach which was open minded and rigorous.

Ethical Considerations

Since the project is concerned with school leaders there were no ethical questions that related to working directly with children, although as a working teacher I already have enhanced CRB clearance, and I avoided carrying out research in my own workplace to avoid any conflict of interest between my professional duties and my research.

The main ethical issue was, therefore, ensuring that proper informed consent was received from the participants, and that their anonymity, and that of their institution is maintained (Sarantakos 1998, p.20-25). The background and purpose of the research was carefully explained to the interviewees and they were, hopefully, reassured that this was a piece of work which deals with the conceptual understanding of citizenship rather than testing their provision against any kind of objective standard. This approach had the dual function of ensuring properly informed consent, and putting them at their ease to maximize the effectiveness of the interview. They were all reminded that they have the right to withdraw from the study at any point, and I left my contact details to allow them to ask any questions that might have occurred to them at a later date.

All data collected is securely stored in digital form and is password protected. Perhaps most importantly an awareness has been maintained that extra caution is required to ensure anonymity when giving information about an institution from a small sample, within a relatively small geographical area and where the researcher has a professional role in the community.

The intention has always been for the research to make a positive contribution to any debate about the subject; hopefully, by promoting a greater understanding of the subject but also, within the limited scope of the sample size, providing a platform for the voicing the views of working citizenship teachers.

Interview Sample and Access to Schools

My original intention when it came to selecting interviewees was to try and get a representative selection of Gloucestershire schools. It would:

- Aim to include schools from the major towns and cities (urban), the smaller towns and villages (semi-urban) and the countryside (rural).

- Recognise that selection remains an important feature of education in the county by including both selective and comprehensive schools.

- Acknowledge recent changes in education policy by including both new academy schools and more traditional maintained schools.

- Acknowledge the existence of single sex schools in the county by including at least one example.

- Aim to include examples of schools both with and without post 16 provision.

The pilot study had given an indication of the attitude of certain schools towards the provision of citizenship, but I did not approach schools on the basis of these responses as I wanted to avoid the danger of prejudging the responses of any particular interviewee, and, ultimately, I was aware that the potential existed for the responses of individual citizenship coordinators to be significantly different from those of their headteachers.

My research design involved collecting interviews with ten citizenship coordinators. Having compiled a list of all forty of Gloucestershire's state secondary schools I selected an initial ten to contact that provided a reasonable cross section with regard to the factors mentioned above. One particular school was made an automatic choice for the sample

because it was one of a small number of schools in the country which had had a subject specific inspection for citizenship and I hoped that an interview with their coordinator would allow for some interesting cross referencing.

Rather than approach the citizenship coordinators directly, my initial approach to the schools was made to the headteacher, on the basis that their permission would be required anyway, and that the explanation of the nature of my research was better presented first hand. My initial letter made clear my intention to examine the purpose of the subject and not make any judgements regarding the quality of provision (the need for this was suggested by my pilot study), my status as a current member of staff within a Gloucestershire school, and my wish to minimize any disruption by conducting the interviews in gained time during the summer exam period. I also made mention of my previous dealings with the Gloucestershire Association of Secondary Headteachers (GASH), and my association with the University of Gloucestershire (with which many of the schools enjoy a good ongoing working relationship), in the hope that this would offer some reassurance to the headteachers that I could be trusted and was not intending to produce anything damaging to their school. Finally I made clear that the anonymity of all individual and institutional participants would be maintained, and that they would have the right to withdraw their consent at any point.

I included, with the letter, a summary of the main questions I wished to pursue in the interview. This had the dual function of allowing the Head to see exactly what I was interested in discussing, hopefully thereby adding to the reassurances given in my letter, and allowing them to pass it on to possible interviewees who would then have some

time, prior to our meeting, to consider their responses. Since my research design was based around semi-structured interviews this list contained ten 'headline' questions for each of the main areas I wished to explore.

Of the initial ten schools I emailed, I quickly received positive responses from five. I generally had two types of response, one from the Heads themselves, copying in the relevant coordinator, and suggesting that a meeting was set up, or a reply from coordinators who had simply had the material passed onto them by Heads who left the matter of their participation entirely up to the individual. While this probably reflected the different management styles of Heads I don't think any real inferences can be made about their feeling on citizenship.

Having been pleasantly surprised by the initial response I was then slightly disappointed to hear nothing from the remaining schools. I had already considered my follow up strategy, and put this into action, following my emails with identical printed material, for headteachers who might prefer written communication, and then after about a week making a follow up phone call. This was not successful in gaining any further participants; it did however lead to some interesting observations in my research diary, where I recorded how much the culture of schools seemed to have changed. I was surprised at how difficult it had become to make contact with headteachers, websites offered only generic 'admin@school' type email addresses, requests on the telephone to be put through to the headteacher were, in almost all cases refused, messages were taken and conversations had with PAs, but direct conversation was apparently not an option. This differs markedly from my previous experience, and while it may simply reflect the

increased workload, and need to protect the time of school leaders, I felt it worthy of note in light of the emphasis that citizenship puts on the connection between schools and the communities of which they are part, particularly when considered in the light of some of the physical changes to schools which became apparent when I began my visits, and to which I will return later in this chapter.

I attempted to find like for like replacements, in terms of maintaining my cross sectional approach to the sample, for the five non participants, and carried out the same email and follow up letter procedure. This yielded a further volunteer but it was beginning to become obvious that while I would ideally wish to choose the composition of my sample, it would in fact simply be a challenge getting ten participant schools within the county. Setting aside the controlled sample approach I emailed the remaining schools in the county and was able to secure another three interviewees, with the final volunteer being recruited through a recommendation from one of the other coordinators.

Although I was unable to exercise complete control over the sample I was able to achieve a reasonably good cross section of different Gloucestershire schools, as can be seen in the table on page 247. In light of the previous reluctance of some headteachers to even fill in my pilot study questionnaire, the securing of ten interviews was a relief and an indication that there were at least some schools that were prepared to discuss their citizenship provision. It did of course mean that the sample was effectively self selecting, and it is reasonable to assume that those schools who engaged with citizenship only minimally, or regarded it as an unnecessary nuisance were not keen to invite

someone in to discuss this viewpoint. It is important to bear in mind this characteristic of the sample when considering the results.

The Interviews

Having already prepared the key questions for the interviews, which had been shared with the potential participants in my original email, before I met any of my interviewees I compiled a list of sub-questions and follow up enquiries to make sure that, although the interview would feel as much as possible like an organic conversation, it would cover all the areas in which I was interested. I then conducted a trial interview with a friendly citizenship coordinator, who was not to be part of the sample, and who was prepared to give me some feedback on my approach. This led to me making some minor alterations, most notably softening the questions about familiarity with particular government reports, which my test subject considered might be a little intimidating in their original form. This was a further reminder, should it have been needed after the pilot study, that citizenship was an area where schools' confidence could be fragile and their responses guarded. It was therefore important that I did all I could to put the interviewee at their ease (Cohen et al., 2007 p.361)

Generally the interview process was much more pleasurable than anticipated. Most interviewees were excited to discuss their subject with a fellow practitioner, and keen to make the most of an opportunity to discuss an area of the school curriculum which can often feel marginalized. It was notable that there was a strong level of commitment to the subject even with a high degree of uncertainty existing over its future.

On arrival at their school I asked each interviewee if there was somewhere quiet that we could talk uninterrupted, and if they would permit me to record the conversation; in only one case did this prove a problem. The somewhat self selecting nature of the sample meant that almost all participants were keen to share their knowledge, experience and perceptions of the subject, and most had clearly familiarized themselves with some of my questions in advance, had prepared their thoughts and, in some cases, collected useful supporting documentation. They were generous with their time, many making available considerably longer than the thirty minutes requested. Only one interviewee seemed a reluctant participant, perhaps having been 'volunteered' by their headteacher whom I had originally approached. This individual refused to be recorded, despite all the assurances regarding anonymity, and gave only very limited responses to my questions. As this was the penultimate interview I carried out, it mainly served to show me how fortunate I had been with my other volunteerers, but it was also a reminder that much of the documentary evidence I had examined when researching the policy chapters had given an impression of schools being somewhat defensive and suspicious when the subject of citizenship was raised.

The other general observation made during my visits to the ten participant schools does not directly concern citizenship education, but is interesting in terms of the general context within which it operates, particularly given its emphasis on community education. I was surprised, having not visited many schools except my own over the last six years, at the increased sense of isolation that had been created by greatly enhanced security measures. In almost all cases I encountered high fences, locked doors and entry phones, recording of car number plates and issuing of plastic visitor passes to be

displayed at all time. Individually these can all be defended as sensible security measures, but, together with the lack of direct access by phone or email to school leaders that I mentioned earlier, arguably creates an impression of something of a 'siege mentality'. Whilst individuals were almost always friendly and welcoming, the message that their institutions seemed to send out to the surrounding community was one of isolationism and suspicion. However necessary these changes might be (and my personal feeling is that they are probably more of a response to an increasingly litigious culture than any genuine increase in fears for the security of pupils), what is clear is that Crick's vision of active citizens within schools, integrating with their local community, must be considerably more difficult to achieve within this context.

Producing Transcriptions

I recorded the conversations digitally as MP3 files. Originally my intention had been to carry out analysis of the interviews by using NVIVO coding software to directly tag and code sections of the audio files themselves. I experimented with this process with some success; however, ultimately I decided to transcribe the interviews in full. There were several reasons for this; firstly, I had established a large database of tagged and cross referenced PDF documents using the QICCA software (a document management system freely available on the web) and producing text versions of the interviews allowed complete integration with the, previously analyzed, theoretical material, secondly, I had established a successful working method with QICCA with which I was happy, and the time saving of avoiding transcription would more than likely have been less significant than the time needed to become fully versed in the use of NVIVO, finally the strengths of NVIVO in terms of highly detailed coding based work were not really necessary for

my intended method, where analysis of the data was to be carried out by repeated close reading, with less emphasis on developing specific inductive theory, and more on developing broad themes and mapping the interconnections between them (Cohen et al 2007, p.493).

The transcriptions that I used for my analysis were produced by a two stage process. A completely verbatim transcription of the audio files was produced using Dragon Naturally Speaking dictation software to save time. These versions with all their mistakes, hesitations and repetitions were then edited to an 'intelligent verbatim' form where some of these elements were removed or corrected to improve readability whilst maintaining the language and phraseology of the interviewee. The interviews were also divided into headed sections for ease of analysis. Any comments made humorously or sarcastically were noted in order to preserve the original intention of the interviewee and to aid any later attempts at 'thick description'. The transcriptions were then added to the audio files within NVIVO, not because it was to be a primary analytical tool, but, because it provided a reliable way to cross reference the text and audio versions of the interviews, so that the 'feel' of any particular section of text could easily be checked by accessing the original recording; again with the possibility of the need for 'thick description' in mind as well as Cohen's warnings about the potential pitfalls of data loss during transcription (Cohen et al., 2007 p.365). Finally, the edited transcriptions were added to my QICCA library ready for analysis.

Data Analysis - Analyzing the Interviews

Given the interpretive nature of my study I chose to use a constant comparative method as the basis for my data analysis. As Thomas (2009) points out, at its most basic this simply involves a *constant* rereading or reviewing of material with the intention of *comparing* each element, phrase, sentence or paragraph. Given the fact that the precise method of analysis should be partly determined by the interviews themselves (Schmidt, 2004 p.253) I did not want to take an 'off the shelf' format, but designed a multi-stage approach which drew on a variety of similar approaches (Sarantakos, 1998p.345);(Schmidt, 2004); (Thomas, 2009p.199).

The first stage was to read all of the interview transcripts, interview notes and relevant research diary entries. As I did this I made a note of potential themes and methods of grouping the data, it was a rough list based upon first impressions, but one observation immediately seemed significant. I would want to make connections within the data in two main ways; firstly, comparing the responses of the all the citizenship coordinators (CCs) to similar issues or questions, giving an insight into the variety of approaches or perceptions across the group, and secondly comparing the responses of individual CCs to different questions within the same interview, to assess the degree of consistency in their responses.

The combination of the structure of the interview schedule (Appendix 5) and my initial notes on the interviews allowed me to divide the transcripts into four main areas of interest, each containing three or four key themes. These can be seen in the table below.

Table 1: Key Themes for Analysis

Policy and Implementation	Discrete Status and the Link to PSHE
	Citizenship Coordinators and Citizenship Departments
	Timetable Allocation
	Assessment
General Views on the Purpose of Citizenship Education	How Would You Defend Citizenship Education to a Sceptical Colleague?
	Views on Crick - Traditionalism or Progressivism?
	Citizenship and the Iraq War
Detailed Discussion of Key Elements of the Crick Report	Social and Moral Responsibility
	Community Involvement
	Political Literacy
	Active Citizenship
Other Significant Issues	The Ajegbo Report
	Integration of Citizenship and Student Voice
	The Potential for Student Voice to Undermine Citizenship
	OFSTED Reports

Having imported copies of my interview data into Qiqqa, in order to preserve the originals in their raw form, I began to work through the transcripts for a second time. I used Qiqqa'a ability to assign a searchable tag to individual sections of text to identify responses that were linked to each theme. At the end of this process it was therefore possible to generate reports which contained all of the responses (across all of the interviews) concerned with a particular theme, allowing for easy comparison between individual CCs. Whilst carrying out this process I also gave further thought to developing a framework for comparison within individual interviews.

Working through the transcripts for the third time I tagged responses with regard to the perception of purpose they demonstrated towards citizenship education; either progressive, conservative, or unclear. This was to engage directly with my third research question:

> *What do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by theory and policy issues?*

Reports could now be generated which cross-referenced thematic areas with questions of perception of purpose.

There was one thematic area where perception of purpose was not really relevant, that of policy and implementation. In order to address this, these sections were re-read, and responses tagged in line with the findings of chapters seven and eight as examples of either best practice, or areas linked to some of the problems identified in those chapters.

Rereading of the transcripts made it clear that progressive or conservative perceptions of purpose, with regard to particular thematic, areas could potentially originate from two different sources; conceptual understanding or policy pressure. Each transcript therefore had responses tagged, with regard to this issue. This therefore allowed the generation of reports which cross referenced thematic areas, perceptions of purpose and potential factors affecting perceptions of purpose.

The Policy and Implementation thematic area was also reread and responses tagged in relation to the emotional response of the CC to the policy issues in their school. The process of rereading and tagging the interviews is summarized in the table below:

Table 2: Tagging Map for Transcript Analysis

Item	Middle	Coding
Policy and Implementation	Policy broadly in line with OFSTED/QCA/CELS best practice	CC is happy with policy
Discrete Status and the Link to PSHE		CC is unhappy with policy
Citizenship Coordinators and Citizenship Departments		CC does not express strong feeling on policy
Timetable Allocation	Policy shows evidence of problems identified in Chapters 7 and 8	CC is happy with policy
Assessment		CC is unhappy with policy
		CC does not express strong feeling on policy
General Views on the Purpose of Citizenship Education		Response determined by conceptual understanding
How Would You Defend Citizenship Education to a Sceptical Colleague?	Evidence of Progressive Perception of Purpose	Response determined by policy pressure
Views on Crick - Traditionalism or Progressivism?		Response determined by conceptual and policy issues
Citizenship and the Iraq War		Response determined by conceptual understanding
Detailed Discussion of Key Elements of the Crick Report	Evidence of Conservative Perception of Purpose	Response determined by policy pressure
Social and Moral Responsibility		Response determined by conceptual and policy issues
Community Involvement		Response determined by conceptual understanding
Political Literacy		Response determined by policy pressure
Active Citizenship		Response determined by conceptual and policy issues
Other Significant Issues		Response determined by conceptual understanding
The Ajegbo Report	Evidence of Unclear or Inconsistent Perception of Purpose	Response determined by policy pressure
Integration of Citizenship and Student Voice		Response determined by conceptual and policy issues
The Potential for Student Voice to Undermine Citizenship		
OFSTED Reports		

Once this process of tagging was complete it was possible to group together responses to each theme in terms of the interviewees' perceptions of purpose and the factors that may have affected their perceptions. This formed the basis of the result analysis in Chapters Eleven and Twelve. Individual quotations were then selected as being a particularly good representation of a general perspective that had been identified A similar approach was applied to the policy analysis in Chapter Ten.

Alongside this cross cutting analysis, which compared the responses of all the CCs to individual issues, it was also possible, with the tagging complete, to generate a report on an individual CC and assess the consistency of their responses with regard to perceptions of purpose. If a degree of inconsistency was observed it was then possible to investigate whether this was primarily due to conceptual understanding or policy issues. Such investigation forms the basis of several observations in the concluding chapter.

Reflections on the Data Collection

All in all I was relatively happy with the data collection process. The work completed on the theoretical component of my research was extremely helpful in providing a framework for the interviews and meant that, having already explored a variety of interpretations regarding the purpose of citizenship education, I was able to maintain a degree of neutrality in my questioning which might have been more difficult given my own feelings at the outset of the research.

By exploring a combination of classroom practice, and a variety of theoretical questions and scenarios, the research design proved effective in establishing the citizenship

coordinators' sense of the underlying purpose of the subject, even in cases where the individual professed to have given the matter little thought beyond trying to deliver the syllabus amongst a variety of other priorities. Real world examples, such as the questions regarding student protests and the Iraq war, allowed interviewees to engage with the issues at the heart of this research without having to deal with too much abstract theory.

Perhaps the most significant weakness in the research is the fact that my sample was, as I mentioned earlier, to a degree self selecting; therefore my results arguably reflect a certain bias, rooted in the fact that these were interviewees who wanted to talk about citizenship, and therefore, it might reasonably be assumed, felt some enthusiasm for the subject. However, ultimately this was probably a positive as, although a genuine cross-sectional sample might have made for a more accurate picture of the health of citizenship education in the county, the responses of those who did not value the subject would be unlikely to have given very much insight into questions of its underlying purpose; beyond the assertion that it doesn't really have one.

3) Citizenship Education in a Liberal Democracy

'Personally, as a philosopher and philosophy teacher, I think enquiring minds is most important, but if I think about the schemes of work and what we teach them, I think we are...perhaps, accidentally… kind of moulding students.' (Citizenship Coordinator, Bedford Road)

Having outlined the various initiatives associated with citizenship education in this country over the course of the last century, and briefly considered the historical development of citizenship education, it is necessary to place recent developments, specifically the Crick Report and subsequent National Curriculum Order, into context. More importantly, however, given the focus of this thesis, it is necessary to consider the theoretical position and purpose of the subject within a modern liberal democracy. This chapter will therefore examine my first research question; *what underlying principles and philosophies exist regarding the purpose of citizenship education in a Liberal Democracy?*

While historical ideas on citizenship have undoubtedly helped to shape the thinking behind the modern curriculum, the central problem that any contemporary programme of citizenship education faces is attempting to deal with the unique challenges that arise from tensions within liberal democracy itself and this is therefore my primary focus. Nevertheless, since Crick, whose report formed the basis of the citizenship curriculum in English schools, makes considerable use of the Ancient Greek concept of civic republicanism, it is important that this tradition, and the nature of its relationship to liberal democracy, is understood.

Civic Republican and Liberal Forms of Citizenship

Heater (1999 p.4) defines the essential difference between the civic republican and liberal forms of citizenship as being that the former emphasizes duty while the latter emphasizes rights. In these terms liberal citizenship is seen as essentially passive. Whilst this may be a reasonable characterization of liberal citizenship in certain historical terms it is much harder to apply it to a healthy modern liberal democracy where participation is encouraged not only though regular elections but also through a pluralistic embrace of the media, pressure groups and other forms of campaigning. Even when modern democracies are not functioning as they should, perhaps with low levels of political engagement or poor voting turnout, this is recognized as a problem, precisely because the ideal of a liberal democracy is an informed participating voter.

Nevertheless, the degree to which, and nature of, the participation in government that should be encouraged, is a problematic issue for liberals; one that forms the basis of much of the discussion below. The reality is that many western democracies do face crises of turnout in elections and general participation, particularly amongst the young. It is therefore easy to see the attraction of the civic republican tradition to Crick. Both he and Heater argue that liberal citizenship has, in many people's minds, become closely associated with a form of neo-liberal politics that sees individuals as highly individualistic and self interested property-right holders, functioning within a capitalist economy. The need for civic participation in the running of the state is minimal, because that state itself is relatively minimal and does not need to concern itself with the social rights of its citizens. The suggestion is that, with participation low and self interested individualism the norm:

> The alternative to the liberal tradition, namely the civic republican style of citizenship, which is based on civil and political ideals, might have pertinent lessons from which we can learn (Heater, 1999 p.43).

In his introduction to Heater's book on Citizenship Crick suggests that civic republicanism is the specific belief that 'countries that enjoy constitutional government, representative government or democracy depend upon a high degree of active participation by inhabitants who see themselves as active citizens, not simply good subjects' (Crick in Foreword to Heater, 2004). This emphasis on active participation is clearly attractive when considering a programme of citizenship education to deal with some of the problems of a liberal democratic state. However, I will suggest, whilst such participation is not a requirement of *all* liberal interpretations of citizenship, it is certainly strongly encouraged by those, such as Gutmann, who do see it as an important part of a healthy liberal democracy.

Whilst the participation element might be seen as positive there are elements of the civic republican tradition which might cause more concern within a modern democracy. In fact civic republicanism has rarely been associated with modern representative democracy, more unusually it has been suspicious of trusting the judgement of the uneducated masses:

> How can a blind multitude, which often does not know what it wants, because it seldom knows what is good for it, undertake by itself an enterprise as vast and difficult as a system of legislation? . . . The general will is always rightful, but the judgement which guides it is not always enlightened (Rousseau, 2002 II 6).

Civic republicanism has often been linked with forms of elitism where citizenship, and therefore participation has been restricted, most commonly by property ownership

(Heater, 1999 p.58). Furthermore, even among those who are encouraged to participate, within the civic republican framework, the nature of their participation would often not be recognised as worthwhile by liberal critics. Rousseau encouraged an unquestioning patriotic loyalty to the republic from its citizens, and, whilst participation was a civic virtue, critical analysis of its policies was not:

> The whole republican tradition is based upon the premise that citizens recognize and understand what their duties are and have a sense of moral obligation instilled into them to discharge these responsibilities. Indeed individuals were barely worthy of the title of citizen if they avoided performing their appointed duties (Heater, 1999 p.64).

The obvious way for these duties and values to be inculcated was through education, and, as such, concern for education has always played an important part in civic republican thinking. However it has generally been a form of education that would be regarded as uncomfortably close to indoctrination by most modern teachers (see Chapter Eleven). Aristotle suggested that that 'The citizens of a state should always be educated to suit the constitution of their state' (Aristotle, 1948 1337aII), but also that 'Political science is not a proper study for the young' (Aristotle, 1955 1.3). In other words education should produce good compliant citizens who obey the law and fulfill their duties, but should not encourage them to question the nature, or organization, or legitimacy of the state itself. Rousseau also emphasised the requirement of, first parents, and then the public school system, to ensure the appropriate attitude of children towards the state and its values (Heater, 1999 p.66)

Ultimately, as attractive as the emphasis on participation and the virtues of good citizenship are, a civic republican outlook has major limitations when it comes to a

modern liberal democracy. Civic republicanism addresses one problem of modern liberal democracy, a lack of participation, but might be considered harmful if it promotes a very loyal form of participation which offers little in the way of autonomy, or a genuinely critical approach to the values of the state. Rousseau's 'General Will' was supposed to offer a compromise between virtuous loyalty to the state and individual freedom but as Heater notes:

> Rousseau insisted that obedience to the General Will was the way to true freedom and that anyone who disobeyed it shall be 'forced to be free'. If insistence on civic virtue had come to this, it was fortunate that the revolutionary era also opened up the alternative, liberal concept of citizenship (Heater, 1999 p.51).

In many ways a comparison of the merits of civic republican and liberal forms of citizenship is moot. We live in a liberal democracy and therefore if we are to educate our pupils in citizenship, it must be in liberal democratic citizenship. At the heart of the liberal democratic state is a somewhat uneasy compromise, between, on the one hand, a commitment to individual rights, freedom and autonomy, and, on the other, collective participation in representative government and the qualified application of majoritarianism. There is tremendous scope within this framework for alternative interpretations and differences of emphasis. Many of these are discussed later in this chapter. Civic republicanism has an important contribution to make regarding participation and civic duty, and can play a valuable role in such a debate. In fact, as I suggested earlier, many of the values that Crick wishes to bring to liberal democratic citizenship from the civic republican tradition are already stressed, albeit in a slightly different form, by liberals such as Gutmann who see them as essential elements of a healthy democracy.

This chapter will go on to examine why citizenship education raises particular problems for liberal democracy in comparison with other forms of polity. It will then explore why, despite these challenges, the majority of liberal commentators agree that some form of citizenship education is necessary, and will outline the contrasting positions that liberals of different hues take up with regard to dealing with various ideological tensions. Finally it will tentatively draw some conclusions regarding the legitimate contents and scope of citizenship education within a liberal democracy.

Why Citizenship Education is Comparatively Problematic for a Liberal Democracy

Whether historically, or in the contemporary world, most non-democratic states have a relatively uncomplicated relationship with citizenship education, at least in principle. Essentially this is because there is no attempt to maintain any balance between two competing elements of citizenship education; preparation for ruling, and preparation for being ruled (Carr, 2008). The overwhelming interest of the non-democratic, or indeed civic republican, state is in producing compliant citizens who willingly, and, wherever possible, unquestioningly, accept the authority of the state. Although in reality such states have usually faced opponents with very different ideas who ensure that citizenship remains 'an essentially contested concept' the reality of actual disagreement about the nature of citizenship should not detract from the fact that they know exactly how they would like their citizens to be educated to think and behave, even if they are not able to achieve it. Galston comments:

> In most times and places, the necessity and appropriateness of civic education has been accepted without question. It has been taken for granted that young people must be shaped into citizens and that public institutions have both the right and the responsibility to take the lead (Galston, 1989 p.89)

Liberal democratic states, by contrast, must take seriously both of the elements identified by Carr; the people must be educated as rulers as well as ruled, and the value that liberals place on rationality requires that citizens must be encouraged to choose to support the state, rather than simply be indoctrinated. In addition any education provided by the liberal state will inevitably have to deal with the tensions within liberalism itself, most notably between the desire to maximize individual freedom whilst at the same time maintaining wider liberal values. The state is expected to be neutral, its role limited, and, in contrast to civic republicanism, its authority does not automatically trump other authorities, such as family or religious groups, within its boundaries (Galston, 2008 p.103).

Brighouse (1998 p.719) highlights these central concerns with regard to citizenship education in a liberal state. Firstly, he suggests that, 'Something is puzzling about the idea that liberal states may regulate the educational curriculum by mandating a civic education aimed at inculcating the values on which liberalism is based and behaviours which sustain it'. He argues that the danger is that the liberal notion of consent, upon which the legitimacy of the political system rests, is undermined if that consent is not freely given but is rather 'manufactured' through the educational process. In other words, the mere existence of citizenship education may undermine the authority of the state by creating a process where political consent is manufactured rather than freely given.

Secondly, he identifies a problem that causes disputes between liberals who are convinced of the necessity of civic education. It concerns the idea that 'the state should take an explicit hand in trying to form the ways of life that children come to adopt, by mandating the promotion of autonomy in the education curriculum' (Brighouse, 1998 p.719) Some liberals, he suggests, regard this as essential, whereas others see it as an impermissible attempt to impose a particular conception of the 'good life'. This problem regarding the correct scope of liberal education, often centering on autonomy, but also concerning other liberal values that go beyond the basic requirements of negative freedom (protection of only the most basic individual rights by the state), is the central concern of this chapter as it is a cause of widespread dispute amongst liberals and has a major impact on the contents of the citizenship education that they support.

The first question is a less serious concern in terms of citizenship education, although it raises a genuine problem of legitimacy that will be discussed later in the chapter, because the overwhelming consensus amongst liberals, allowing for the major differences they have about its form, is an acceptance of the need for it to sustain the liberal state itself. In other words there is a recognition that there is little point in being so committed to a particular element of liberalism that your position makes any form of liberal democratic government impossible. Macedo makes this point forcibly:

> Liberalism makes the protection of individual freedom its central aim, and it is not as demanding with respect to civic virtue as some other forms of government, such as the republican ideals described by Plato and Rousseau. Nevertheless, sensible liberals will allow that freedom may be constrained in various ways to help promote a stable system of decent and orderly freedom. Among the reasonable constraints are measures that help insure that citizens are educated toward liberal values and virtues. Liberals need to think about political education in order to plan for their own survival. (Macedo, 1996 p.240)

Why Citizenship Education is Necessary in a Liberal Democracy

Drawing a distinction between philosophical education, involving the rational pursuit of truth, and civic education, education within and on behalf of a particular political order, Galston (2008) is clear that the ideal situation would be one where every individual in a liberal democracy came to accept the values necessary for its operation and continued survival through insight they gained from rational inquiry. However, he regards this as extremely unlikely to happen; partly because there are major theoretical issues within liberalism that cannot be regarded as settled from a philosophical point of view, and, partly because, on a practical level, few individuals will embrace these issues on a rational level and are more likely to be engaged by rhetoric. For Galston, the purpose of civic education is not the pursuit of truth, but the formation of individuals who can conduct their lives within, and support, their political community (Galston, 2008 p.100).

Whilst this might not be the most attractive defence of the need for civic education, based, as it is, more upon pragmatism than principle, it is significant that Galston, who Parry (2003) identifies as a proponent of realist rather than participatory democracy, is clear that it is a requirement for a stable liberal state. This acceptance, which is common to many liberals shows a certain sympathy for the civic republican insistence that citizens must be educated to support the values of the state. Despite his reluctance to allow the state to promote comprehensive liberal values, and his belief that the democratic role for the majority of citizens will be restricted to 'selecting their representatives wisely' and 'assessing them soberly', rather than engaging in any kind of active participation, he accepts that a limited form of civic education is necessary in order for this function to be properly fulfilled.

This contrasts with a tradition within classical liberalism that argued that education for citizenship was not necessary, since the stability of the liberal state could be maintained through institutional checks and balances, and therefore to impose it was an unjustified restriction of individual freedom (Kymlicka and Norman, 1994 p.359).

This viewpoint is echoed by the modern neo-liberals, whose rejection of civic duty in favour of a minimal self regulating state, protecting only the basic rights of citizens, prompted Heater and Crick to invoke some of the values of civic republicanism. However, it is agreed by the majority of modern liberal commentators, whose belief in positive freedom and commitment to individual development implies a wider role for the state, that such a view is unrealistic, and that if liberal democracy is to maintain itself it must educate the next generation of citizens in the values necessary for liberal democracy (Enslin et al., 2001 p.115).

This is particularly true in modern liberal democracies where pre-democratic loyalties and deference are increasingly being consigned to history. States such as the UK for many years retained a loyalty that had its roots in a subject/monarchy relationship rather than a civic loyalty to the institutions of the state. Increasing emphasis within modern liberal states on individualism has undermined the sense of collective good, and where it does exist it tends to be focused on a limited group rather than the public good (Callan, 2008).

Galston's acceptance of the need for citizenship education is a reluctant one, which expresses concerns over the potential for its illiberal use. However, Gutmann (1989

p.75) argues that, although citizenship education does to some extent compromise the strict neutrality of the liberal state, its opponents often present the argument as a false dichotomy where it is suggested that there is a choice between children's freedom of choice to pursue the widest possible range of options and education for the public good. She suggests that it is incorrect to formulate this as a choice, and that the question is not whether to maximize freedom or inculcate virtue, but which freedoms and which virtues, and how the two can be combined?

The point of agreement then, amongst most modern liberal commentators on citizenship education, is that the there are a number of virtues that are necessary for the health of liberal democracy and to ensure it is able to maintain its existence into the future (Kymlicka, 2008 p.130). The problem is that they have very different interpretations regarding the nature and extent of these virtues and consequently have very different ideas about the legitimate purposes and desirable content of any programme of citizenship education.

Tensions within Liberal Citizenship Education

The central problem, when considering the values that should be promoted by citizenship education, is how to ensure that they are substantial enough to satisfy the communal demands of citizenship but at the same time compatible with liberal concerns regarding the development of critical rationality and protection of diversity. Common to all liberalism is the wish to maintain a relatively thin conception of the good, in other words liberals do not wish to promote one view of the good life over another. Citizens' freedom should be maximized so that they can pursue their own ends within a system of

justice that protects their basic rights and freedoms. However, although the state must be neutral on matters of private good, it has a non-neutral commitment to the basic principles of justice involved in the notion of the good in public terms. On the basis of this it must aim to achieve a balance between cohesiveness and diversity (McLaughlin, 1992). It is this balance, and the type of civic education necessary to achieve it, which is often in dispute.

The differences in approach are captured in the broad distinction between maximal and minimal forms of citizenship education (McLaughlin, 1992). Minimal citizenship education is concerned primarily with the provision of information, to enable understanding of the various institutions of the state and political mechanisms, and the development of fairly limited virtues relating to basic support for the liberal state. There is no attempt to encourage wider political understanding, with regard perhaps to the underlying nature of the political system, or to promote the value of more active democratic participation and critical reflection. Such an understanding corresponds reasonably well to Galston's position, maintaining, as he does, that its ability to maintain support for the political community is the primary test for citizenship education and that encouraging greater rational enquiry can, in fact, undermine such support.

A maximal form of citizenship education, by contrast, is more comprehensive and aims to encourage a much greater critical understanding, and develop a set of dispositions and virtues which would naturally lead to a much more active form of democratic participation. Whilst ultimately still maintaining a version of the liberal 'thin conception of the good', this approach shows a much greater willingness to suggest that there are

100

certain values that all citizens should hold, and virtues they should possess, that go beyond tacit support for the state and basic tolerance of views different to their own. This is notwithstanding the fact that they should still be free to pursue their own conception of the good in their private spheres. Gutmann's position, which is discussed below may be considered to fall into this category.

Examples of both minimal and maximal approaches will be explored in the sections below, but it may be useful to anticipate an area where problems may arise. Callan (1991) suggests that citizenship education can have both centripetal (unifying) and centrifugal (diversifying) effects on society. It must avoid the potential for these to become excessive and, either, create too great a homogeneity of belief, through indoctrination or illicit moulding, or fail to secure a core of public values and therefore contribute to society's disintegration. Since the forms of civic education that we are concerned with are largely focused on a disputed set of public virtues it is the former that is probably the greater danger, although with markedly different potential effects:

> Both minimalist and maximalist interpretations of 'education for citizenship' are controversial. Minimalist interpretations… are open to accusations of uncritical socialisation, not least into the unexamined political values which they often embody. On the other hand, maximalist interpretations, given the range of controversial questions which they open up, are in danger of presupposing a substantive set of 'public virtues' which may exceed the principled consensus that exists or can be achieved (McLaughlin, 1992 p.241).

Galston, Gutmann and Autonomy

The central difference between Galston's minimal and Gutmann's maximal interpretation of citizenship education concern the promotion of autonomy, the ability of a rational individual to make independent decisions free from external control or

influence. They agree that a certain ability to scrutinize leaders is necessary but Galston strongly argues that liberal freedom entails the right to live an unexamined as well as an examined life, and therefore citizenship education must not promote critical reasoning to the point where it promotes autonomy as a virtue. To do this would be to undermine the diversity of the liberal state by promoting a particular conception of 'the good', thereby undermining groups, such as those with strong religious convictions, who do not regard autonomy as a positive value and wish their children to accept a higher truth or show obedience to a higher authority. By contrast Gutmann sees autonomy not only as a legitimate public virtue; she argues that it is a basic requirement of liberal democratic citizenship, and, although strictly speaking this violates the liberal neutrality of the state with regard to promotion of a particular conception of 'the good', in this case it is permissible because in itself it enhances individual freedom. It also implies an importance attached to being an active, and critically aware, participant in the democratic process. Nevertheless such a viewpoint must involve an understanding of public good that contains autonomy but is not so prescriptive that it undermines diversity.

As a working teacher I am aware that almost all of my colleagues would instinctively recoil from Galston's position, because current educational practice, at least in theory, places a strong emphasis on the need for pupils to be independent learners and critical thinkers. However his position is more nuanced than it might first appear, and it might be argued that a similar line of thinking was found in most of the historical examples of citizenship education discussed in Chapter One. The positions of Galston and Gutmann are examined below not with the intention of finding a 'correct' purpose for citizenship

education, or because they represent definitive writing on the subject; rather they are two contrasting perspectives, representative of the tension within citizenship education that must be managed by teachers and policy makers.

The first might be regarded broadly as a 'conservative' viewpoint in the sense that, while squarely within the liberal tradition it emphasizes the need for education to produce 'good citizens' who will obey the law, pay their tax and uphold the basic values necessary to maintain the liberal state. It does not oppose critical thinking, indeed it would celebrate it, but it cannot tolerate education forcing critical thinking on pupils through the promotion of autonomy in the classroom as this undermines the liberal commitment to diversity. The second, broadly 'progressive' viewpoint sees critically thinking individuals as a prerequisite for successful liberal democracy and is prepared to promote this even at the expense of a certain amount of diversity and potential instability that it might cause, through protest or direct action, for the liberal state. From this perspective 'active citizens' are more important than 'good citizens'.

Galston

Galston (2008) makes the argument that the state should limit itself to civic education that maintains its own stability. He suggests that the obligation of the state to its citizens is to preserve the conditions in which they can pursue their ways of life, and therefore, it must find ways to sustain itself. This makes permissibility a minimal form of citizenship education, involving the cultivation of loyalty and civic virtue. As mentioned above he believes that the purpose of citizenship education should not be to encourage a

103

democratic engagement that involves critical analysis, rather it should form individuals who can conduct their lives within and support their political community.

It is tempting to regard this as little more than the sanctioning of state indoctrination for the purpose of maintaining the status quo especially when he makes statements such as, 'Nor… does civic education stand in opposition to its political community. On the contrary, it fails - fundamentally - if it does not support and strengthen that community' (Galston, 2008 p.99). However, it is clear that he does not expect unquestioning obedience from citizens and that having the necessary political knowledge and inclination to make judgments about leaders and their policies is an essential element of citizenship in a liberal state. Indeed he strongly advocates both political participation (Galston, 2004) and its promotion as a virtue within a programme of citizenship education (Galston, 1989). Here we can see clear parallels with the requirements of civic republicanism. At the same time this is understood essentially as an overseeing role and not one that requires active democratic participation or specialist political knowledge. He argues, 'Competent democratic citizens need not be policy experts, but there is a level of basic knowledge below which the ability to make full and reasoned range of civic judgments is impaired' (Galston, 2001 p.218).

The list of virtues that Galston identifies as necessary for the liberal state would be accepted as relatively uncontroversial by most liberal proponents of citizenship education:

> … the willingness to fight on behalf of one's country; the settled disposition to obey the law; and loyalty… the developed capacity to understand, to accept, and to act on the core principles of one's society… independence, tolerance, and

respect for individual excellences and accomplishments… the disposition to respect the rights of others, the capacity to evaluate the talents, character, and performance of public officials, and the ability to moderate public desires in the face of public limits.. And the developed capacity to engage in public discourse and to test public policies against our deeper convictions is highly desirable for all members of the liberal community (Galston, 1989 p93)

However, although accepting of the need for an element of critical thinking to contribute to the public virtue of public discourse Galston is clear that this must not spill over into the wider promotion of autonomy. The encouragement of autonomy is not a requirement of this minimal civic education, in fact, he argues, it may run contrary to it. Galston (1995) believes that there is a conflict between autonomy, 'commitment to rational examination of self, others and social practices', and diversity, 'differences among individuals and groups over the nature of the good life, sources of moral authority, reason versus faith and the like' (Galston, 1995). Describing his position, he states:

A standard liberal view (or hope) is that these two principles go together and complement one another: the exercise of autonomy yields diversity, while the fact of diversity protects and nourishes autonomy. By contrast, my much less optimistic and harmonistic view is that these principles do not always, perhaps even do not usually, cohere; that in practice, they point in quite different directions in currently disputed areas such as education, rights of association, and the free exercise of religion. Indeed, many such disputes can be understood as a conflict between these two principles (Galston, 1995 p521).

Such a conflict is likely to arise when the state actively promotes autonomy, through civic education, directly challenging the values of groups within society who do not accept this as the basis for their association.

As well as undermining diversity within the liberal state Galston also argues that those, such as Gutmann, who wish to include autonomy as an essential element of democratic

participation, and therefore of citizenship education, create a number of additional problems. Failure to fully protect the 'private sphere', where one may pursue ones own conception of the good without state interference, indicates a lack of protection of minorities within the liberal state (Galston, 1989; Galston, 2008). While a strong emphasis on autonomously motivated democratic engagement also fails to make a proper distinction between momentary public whim and settled public will, undermining one of the essential principles of liberal constitutionalism as well as putting too much emphasis on participation and not enough on the need to select and evaluate representatives (Galston, 1989; Galston, 2008).

Gutmann

If Galston's view on civic education is that it should be used primarily to inculcate the virtues necessary for the protection and continuation of the liberal state, Gutmann wants it to be considerably more wide ranging. Her claim is that the democratic ideal of sharing political sovereignty requires both behaviour which is in accordance with political authority, and critical thinking about authority (Brighouse, 1998). She agrees with Galston that it is reasonable to use education to persuade children 'to accept ways of life that are consistent with sharing the rights and responsibilities in a democratic society' (Gutmann, 1995 p.578), but she maintains that they must also evaluate these values in a critical way. Civic education, then, is supposed to strike a balance, educating children about the political system and encouraging them to respect its institutions, whilst at the same time giving them the tools to maintain a critical approach towards it.

The position outlined above does not seem that far removed from Galston's, however, the skills associated with autonomy are, for Gutmann, a requirement of civic education since they are necessary for the kind of effective participation in political debate and discussion that is needed in a healthy liberal democracy. She argues that, 'It is probably impossible to teach children the skills of democratic citizenship in a diverse society without at the same time teaching them many of the virtues and skills of individuality or autonomy'(Gutmann, 1995 p.563).

This view is sometimes regarded as controversial because it seems to sacrifice the political neutrality of the liberal state. Rather than using laws to create a 'space' in which people can live according to their personal beliefs with minimum state intervention, citizenship education actively promotes autonomy and critical thinking as the right sort of qualities that an individual should have. It is this that Galston objects to, arguing that it damages diversity and is prejudiced against groups who hold alternative value systems that prioritise, for example, obedience to elders or scripture over autonomy.

Central to Gutmann's approach to civic education is the idea of 'conscious social reproduction', that the liberal democratic state should not simply be protected through maintenance of the status quo, each new generation must *choose* to uphold democratic values and remake and develop the state accordingly. Citizenship education must inculcate the values necessary for this to happen and autonomy will be a key element:

> For a society to reproduce itself consciously, it must be non-repressive. It must not restrict rational consideration of different ways of life. Instead it must cultivate the kind of character and the kind of intellect that enables people to

choose rationally (some would say 'autonomously') among different ways of life (Gutmann, 1989 p.77)

In addition to being non-repressive a democratic society must also be non-discriminatory in order to ensure, or at least encourage, everybody's participation (Gutmann, 1999). At the heart of her thinking is the idea that democracy must refresh rather than replicate itself. This emphasis on participation is a long way from the rather limited view of liberal citizenship that Heater (1999 p.4) outlines as 'loosely committed relationship with the state', in fact it might be seen as a rather more demanding form of participation than is required by civic republicanism since it must be a form of *critical* engagement.

The issue of autonomy is also raised by the question of mutual respect, which Galston and other proponents of a more minimal form of citizenship education are prepared to accept as a necessary virtue to ensure the tolerance required of citizens in a liberal democratic state. In this context, mutual respect, Gutmann argues, is not simply a synonym for toleration, or refraining from coercing those with whom we disagree. It suggests that an opposing view has been examined and evaluated with a reasonably open mind. It requires that we not only respect the other people in society, but that we take their ideas seriously as possible alternatives to our own. Such an examination of other beliefs, it is argued, is only possible if we have developed the necessary skills to question and evaluate our own, and other peoples, values and beliefs. It is for this reason that Gutmann suggests that developing the skills of autonomy is a necessary part of citizenship education, even for minimalists:

Political reflection cannot be neatly differentiated from the skills involved in evaluating one's own way of life… It is probably impossible to teach children the skills of democratic citizenship in a diverse society without at the same time

teaching them many of the virtues and skills of individuality or autonomy (Gutmann, 1995 p.563).

Ultimately the democratic education that she proposes allows both a cohesive community and rational choice to be pursued as proper ends, but neither to the exclusion of the other. It does not maintain strict neutrality on ways of life but is neutral between all that allow conscious social reproduction and is unashamed at promoting the examined life as preferable to the non-examined life as this is necessary for democracy (Gutmann, 1989; Gutmann, 1999).

Galston and Gutmann

For the purposes of this research it is useful to contrast the 'conservative' position of Galston with the more 'progressive' outlook of Gutmann as this creates two points of reference which are useful when examining the views of the citizenship coordinators interviewed in my fieldwork. Nevertheless it is important to be clear that they are both liberals who ultimately agree about far more than they disagree. Both are clear, in contrast to the position taken by many classical liberals, that civic education is necessary within a liberal democracy, both would, in an ideal world, encourage critical thinking and political participation, and both wish to see a diverse and tolerant society. Gutmann herself acknowledges that their positions are not dramatically different, 'Galston defends a civic minimum that generally converges with the principles of democratic education. He defends teaching those virtues that are necessary to make liberal democracy work fairly, which is a high standard, not really a "minimal" one' (Gutmann, 1999 p.298)

The differences between Galston and Gutmann become much more apparent when they are discussing the compromises necessary in the real world, as opposed to an abstract liberal ideal. In many ways a realist, whilst theoretically in favour of encouraging participation, Galston is concerned that it must not be at the expense of undermining the essential liberal values of the state and is prepared to accept a situation where the majority of citizens confine their role to selecting and assessing the performance of their representatives (Galston, 1989 p.98). He also interprets a liberal commitment to tolerance as a responsibility to ensure the protection of diversity and therefore rejects the promotion of autonomy as an element of civic education and defends the right to an 'unexamined life'. His personal sympathies seem similar to Gutmann's, what he rejects is the legitimacy of imposing them through education.

> At the heart of much modern liberal democratic thought is a (sometimes tacit) commitment to the Socratic proposition that the unexamined life is an unworthy life, that individual freedom is incompatible with ways of life guided by unquestioned authority or unswerving faith. As philosophic conclusions these commitments have much to recommend them. The question, though, is whether the liberal state is justified in building them into its system of public education. (Galston, 1989 p.99)

Gutamnn argues both that Galston's position is not as minimal as he would wish it to appear, and that he should have more courage in openly promoting the value of critical thinking and autonomy. For Gutmann you can not protect liberal democracy by simply inculcating its basic values and promoting a very limited form of participation through voting. If democracy is to be healthy in must involve a critical engagement with political authority and 'conscious social reproduction', an ongoing remaking of democracy which ensures its legitimacy. The promotion of autonomy is central in establishing these critical thinking skills. Furthermore such critical thinking should not be regarded as a

threat to diversity and tolerance but as a vital component. Tolerance, she argues, is more than simply forbearance, and implies a critical engagement with other views that promotes mutual understanding and respect (Gutmann, 1995). Ultimately whilst both Galston and Gutmann believe in the ideal of the examined over the unexamined life, only Gutmann is prepared to use education to actively promote it.

Comprehensive and Political Liberalism

The debate over the question of the promotion of autonomy, as well as the wider contrast between maximal and minimal forms of civic education is reflected in the distinction that Rawls (1993) makes between comprehensive and political liberalism. He accepts that in a modern democracy there will be many incompatible but reasonable doctrines that disagree about what constitutes a good life. Since it is not possible to broker an agreement about what represents a genuinely good life, the role of the liberal state is to maintain a system in which different viewpoints can peacefully co-exist. The liberal state must not therefore concern itself with comprehensive values or promote a particular conception of a worthwhile life. Rather it must create an 'overlapping consensus' of essential political values, including justice and fairness that makes such co-existence possible. In terms of citizenship education this suggests that a 'Rawlsian… citizenship curriculum ought to give priority… to the inculcation of political values such as tolerance and compromise over any comprehensive values held by individuals' (Halliday, 1999 p.46)

Macedo (1995) supports Rawls, suggesting that political liberalism allows private beliefs to be maintained but not extended to the public sphere and therefore avoid the 'deeply

partisan' approach of comprehensive liberals who fail to show proper concern for liberal diversity. It shows respect for the wide variety of comprehensive viewpoints found in society, provided they acknowledge liberal public principles. In answer to the accusation that political liberalism relies on reason, a liberal comprehensive value, to establish its overlapping consensus (Halliday, 1999) he accepts that the civil toleration required is not itself neutral but it does prevent political power being used to impose any comprehensive ideals.

Gutmann's suggestion is that as far as civic education is concerned the differences between comprehensive and political liberalism are not as great as they might first appear. Political liberalism should in theory offer the kind of protection of diversity that Galston believes to be so important. However, Gutmann points out that political liberalism is reliant on mutual respect, and a sense of fairness, as basic political virtues, without which even the minimalist understanding of equality of opportunity is unachievable. This mutual respect, as has been suggested above, is, according to Gutmann, necessarily tied to autonomous thinking. Parry (2003 p.41) suggests that Rawls himself is aware that maintaining the strict neutrality of political liberalism within a scheme of citizenship education is practically impossible. Macedo (1995 p.476) also admits that the values necessary to sustain the political liberalism of the state will probably spill over into other spheres of life. However, he believes that the question of intention is important and that the approach of political liberalism will ensure greater restraint and therefore ultimately better protection of diversity.

Gutmann, by contrast is unapologetic about promoting the value of autonomy, believing that it is an essential element of citizens' democratic education and that it does not lead to a slippery slope where the state enforces a whole set of comprehensive moral liberal values. Furthermore she rejects the idea that her democratic education represents a threat to diversity:

> Teaching toleration, mutual respect, and deliberation does not homogenize children or deny the value of genuine differences that are associated with diverse ways of individual and communal life. Quite the contrary, teaching these civic virtues supports the widest range of social diversity that is consistent with the ongoing pursuit of liberal democratic justice (Gutmann, 1995 p.579).

Other Significant Viewpoints on the Maximal/Minimal, Autonomy/Diversity, Comprehensive/Political Question

Kymlicka (2008) is happy to accept that only a minimal level of citizenship is required when there are no threats to justice but argues that certain virtues are always required. He does not include autonomy among the set of virtues that he identifies as necessary for liberal democratic citizenship. However two of the most important virtues, he accepts, will inevitably lead to its promotion (Kymlicka, 2003). Firstly the requirement for public reason which will be necessary for all those who wish to actively participate in democratic decision making and secondly, the requirement of civility, which applies to all members of society, regardless of their inclination towards participation. He regards Galston's suggestion that such virtues could be confined to the public sphere as unrealistic and takes the view that any citizenship education which is serious about promoting the virtues required by liberal democracy, will at least to an extent promote the value of autonomy.

He does however make the important point that in reality, even in many liberal democratic states, citizenship education has often discouraged rather than encouraged autonomy. It has been used to promote an unreflective patriotism that glorifies the past and entrenches the political status quo (Kymlicka, 2008). The different forms of education for citizenship found in the Independent and State schools that were discussed in the Chapter One are a good example. This is an important reminder that whilst an academic debate may be conducted over the legitimate contents of citizenship education in a liberal state, practical politics may see it determined by other factors altogether.

McLaughlin (1992 p.244) suggests that it is more helpful to view maximal and minimal ideas of citizenship education as positions on a continuum, rather than as distinct positions. His preference is to steer a middle course in an attempt to avoid the worst excesses of the more extreme positions. Callan (2008) takes a similar position. He is critical of Galston's view of citizenship education labeling it pejoratively as 'sentimental' due to its tendency to promote an unquestioning and potentially undeserved loyalty to the state. He argues that critical reason can support the civic virtues that Galton regards as a necessary support to the state. Crucially the two approaches need to be balanced; unthinking loyalty will damage the institutions supported but a purely critical position will fail to support them at all. It suggests a third way between dangerous sentimentality towards the past and corrosive cynicism, and is optimistic that citizenship education can be both critical and engage us with politics in a meaningful way.

Both Enslin (2001) and Parry (2003) see deliberative democracy as a way of resolving the clash between the values of diversity and autonomy. Enslin argues that in a society where all are encouraged to contribute to public debate it is not necessary to limit public reason to purely political matters, as Rawls would suggest, since a shared understanding of the nature of deliberative democracy protects individual rights. Autonomy is a necessary part of the engaging with the process but pressure is not being put upon individuals to adopt the virtue of autonomy in private. For Enslin the operation of deliberative democracy suggests that not only are tolerance and autonomy compatible but the former is required for the latter.

What is notable from this brief review of commentators is that the positions they take up are generally closer to Gutmann's than to Galston's. All envisage autonomy playing some role in citizenship education, even Rawls admitting that its promotion will be a likely by-product of his education for political liberalism. With this is mind I would suggest that the key question is not the desirability of autonomous critical thinking but the extent to which it is openly promoted as a positive value.

Rejection of a Virtue Based Approach to Liberal Citizenship Education

Before concluding it is useful to note that, although this chapter has been focused on the majority of liberal theorists who, regardless of their other disagreements, both defend the principle of liberal citizenship education and base their approach around a discussion of the virtues that it should promote, there are alternative viewpoints.

Brighouse, whose concern for the legitimacy of the liberal state was noted earlier, believes that the vast majority of proposals for citizenship education cause significant problems in this area. He argues that it is only permissible when students are encouraged to question the civic values they are being taught and that this opportunity must be created by separate autonomy *facilitating* education (*promotion* of autonomy is rejected as damaging to diversity) (Brighouse, 1998). The most serious problem here would appear to be that in avoiding the problems that he ascribes to all other forms of citizenship education there is a danger that he undermines its essential purpose, the protection of the liberal state, which makes it rather redundant.

More interestingly Haydon (2003) suggests that it may be better to avoid the language of virtue altogether, since it has a tendency to provoke ideological conflict, and instead establish certain norms of behaviour which represent the expectation that liberal citizens have of each other. In other words we should concentrate more on the way people live rather than the sort of person they are, after all our legal system enforces norms not virtues. He would like to see the language of virtue confined to moral education, where that occurs, and for the various aims of citizenship education to be based upon a set of norms that cannot be theoretically interpreted to make them incompatible with one another. The problem with this approach, I believe, is that the norms would simply represent a description of the working compromise within any particular liberal society; there would be little scope for development and growth. Such a superficial approach may also sit uneasily with the idea of citizenship education, with little scope for discussion and debate citizenship instruction might be regarded as a more suitable term.

<u>'Living with Tension' and the Acceptance of Autonomy</u>

It seems clear that the tension between autonomy and diversity within liberalism creates

a problem for citizenship education in the liberal state. It is also the case that the

majority of liberal commentators believe that this tension can not be resolved in one

direction or the other but rather some form of compromise should be found. Gutmann

suggests that we embrace the tension and recognize that it is an essential characteristic

of liberalism to face the need to uphold apparently conflicting values:

> Two of the most distinctive features of democratic education are its simultaneous refusal to dissolve the tensions between individual freedom and civic virtue in a potent philosophical solution, and its insistence on finding a principled rather than simply pragmatic way of living with the tensions. Living with tensions is not easy, nor is it without sacrifices in freedom and virtue. But the alternatives to democratic education that promise an escape from these tensions and sacrifices are far worse (Gutmann, 1989 p.88).

That such tensions should exist within citizenship education does not seem inappropriate

when it is educating citizens who will encounter these tensions in their society.

Given the acceptance that the promotion of autonomy will play some part in citizenship

education, inadvertently as in the case of Rawls, or as a central feature in the case of

Gutmann, the issue becomes one of extent. The most full blooded defence of autonomy

comes from Levinson (1999) who argues that it is a central liberal value and that threats

to certain types of diversity are not in themselves illiberal. She suggests that the correct

position for the liberal state is to recognize autonomy as good but not discriminate

against those who do not, and they in turn must accept that it should be valued by the

state but not in their own lives. Therefore the development of the capacity for

independent critical thinking should be a key part of citizenship education as it is a value

that stands alongside others as necessary for the support of the liberal state.

Crick is clearly sympathetic to this viewpoint, and consistently argued that the kind of critical thinking implied by this active promotion of autonomy is a necessary component of education for citizens in a liberal democracy. However it is also the case that he recognised the need for a balance between the more conservative approach represented by Galston, with its primary concern for the stability of the liberal state, and the more progressive approach advocated by Gutmann, with its greater focus on maintaining the legitimacy of the liberal state through active and critical participation.

Incorporating Elements of Civic Republicanism into Liberal Democratic Citizenship

Whilst there are some who maintain that civic republican and liberal citizenship are fundamentally incompatible (Ignatieff, 1995) I would suggest that it is clear that if we move beyond a very limited form of classical/neo-liberal citizenship we find a certain amount of common ground; whether it is Galston's concern for maintaining loyalty to the state, or Gutmann's insistence on the importance of participation. Since liberal citizenship involves an ongoing compromise between maintaining the rights of the individual and the needs of collective representative government, it is natural that it will be open to different forms of interpretation. Elements of civic republicanism can be used to bring emphasis to particular elements within this liberal democratic compromise.

Dagger (1997) goes as far as to argue that autonomy, virtue and rights can co-exist in a form of liberal republicanism. While such full on integration of the two traditions may be difficult to accept, it is much easier to see how Crick is able to introduce elements of civic republicanism into his programme for citizenship education, since in practical

terms many of its virtues, that he wishes to see in young citizens, are also essential elements of the kind of liberal democratic education advocated by the likes of Gutmann.

As a teacher I have generally found that students cope well with the idea that there are competing priorities that create a tension at the heart of liberal democracy; and that it is certainly possible to combine the promotion of 'good' citizenship, in terms of obeying the law and paying taxes, with a critical approach towards political authority. However, in an individual classroom setting it is possible to tailor your approach to the particular students and circumstances involved, capturing the nature of this compromise in a national policy document is a considerably more difficult challenge. Bernard Crick's success in meeting this challenge is discussed in the following two chapters.

4) Crick and Citizenship Education

'I know that my lecturers talked about him being one of the, kind of, founding fathers, if you like, of citizenship education. And with a bit of a New Labour bent... And I don't know whether or not I've totally taken on his view of what it was, but from what I remember, I think he was saying, it's not about necessarily being didactic, "we expect you to do this"...a sort of worthy, noble citizen... I think he was talking about trying to open up opportunities and get people to think critically.' (Citizenship Coordinator, Ivybridge Road)

Discourse regarding civic education generally, and citizenship education specifically, has tended to concentrate on policy issues regarding the implementation of any curriculum programme, or its ability to help to tackle specific problems such as political apathy or social cohesion, rather than its underlying philosophy. This is evident from the relatively infrequent inclusion of British voices in the previous chapter.

This focus on policy can be observed from the Association for Education in Citizenship (A.E.C) initiatives in the 1930s through to the work, between 2001 and 2010, of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (C.E.L.S). The late Professor Bernard Crick represents the most significant exception to this rule. His work is crucial to an understanding of citizenship education in this country, not only for the obvious reason that the report produced by his committee defined the terms of the order that made it a compulsory part of the National Curriculum, but also because his academic work engaged consistently with the question of the correct role that a citizen should play within the modern state, and the form of education necessary to produce citizens able and willing to fulfil such a role. My second research question focuses on the Crick Report and is addressed directly in the next chapter. However, in order to fully

understand the Report it is necessary to examine Crick's pre-existing work on citizenship and the development of his views over time.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Crick was the natural choice to be invited by the New Labour government to lead the committee investigating the incorporation of citizenship as a compulsory subject within the National Curriculum. This was partly because of his links with David Blunkett, his former student, who was the Education Secretary at the time, but also because he had consistently spoken of the need for a greater focus on civic education since his involvement in the 'political literacy' project in the 1970s (Frazer, 2000). His presence on the committee helped to ensure that citizenship was seen as more than simply a part of New Labour's political project, linked, as it was, to the party's rights and responsibilities agenda and constitutional reform, as well as the wider issue of civic renewal (Pykett, 2007), or a knee jerk reaction to falling turnout and a perceived problem of political apathy amongst young people. Crick was clear about the reasons why citizenship found itself on the political agenda:

> A new consensus that Citizenship should be taught and learnt has come about as part of a general questioning whether our old institutions served the purpose of our citizens - the population seen as an electorate - as well as worries about the alienation of young people from public values. Low voting turnout among the young is only one measure of this. Only 30% of those under 25 voted in the last election. High levels of crime and anti-social behaviour among young people are found in inner city schools. To my mind, even more significant, is the low level of active participation of young people in voluntary bodies, even if they join (Crick, 2002a p.496).

It provided him with an opportunity to promote his view that citizenship education was vital in order to ensure an active and participatory form of citizenship, embodied by the idea of 'civic republicanism'; this, he believed, was necessary, not only for the

successful operation of liberal democracy, as Gutmann argues, but to maintain the existence of political government itself. His concern was not for politics in its everyday sense of policy debate and electioneering, or even ideology, but in protecting the underlying idea that conflicting views should be both tolerated, and effectively managed through a process of consideration and compromise. At the same time he combined this ongoing commitment to the promotion of a greater level of civic engagement amongst the citizenry, and, by extension, its development and promotion amongst the young through education, with a pragmatic approach to policy making which aimed to maximize support for his committee's report by drawing upon ideas from across the political spectrum, most notably incorporating some of the, somewhat ill-defined, elements of the 'active citizenship' promoted by the Thatcher government of the 1980s (Faulks, 1998 p.127).

Given Crick's central role in the development of citizenship as a subject it is important to explore his perception of the nature and purpose of civic education, in order to fully understand the recommendations contained in his committee's report. Only once this has been done can the relationship between the report and the perceptions of those responsible for its implementation in schools be properly understood.

Crick was clear that the question of purpose, and its philosophical underpinnings, must be of central importance. David Kerr who assisted him with the production of the final report comments:

> The challenge can be met, in part, by setting out a clear definition of citizenship education and of its benefits to pupils, teachers, schools and society. This is vital in order to underline the distinctiveness of the area and to enable sharper links to

be made to other curriculum aspects and areas. The final report has gone a long way to provide such clarity and distinctiveness… (Kerr, 1999 p.280)

Whether such an assertion is justified is a point of some contention, and one which will be explored later in this chapter, but there is little doubt regarding the intention.

This chapter will aim to examine Crick's understanding of liberal democracy and, of politics itself; contrasting the priority he ascribes to the latter with the tendency of other commentators on civic education, such as those discussed in Chapter Two, to use the former as their starting point. It will explore his position regarding the importance of autonomy within citizenship education, and attempt to place his views on its legitimate purpose within the context of the continuum from Galston to Gutmann. Perhaps most importantly, it will consider where his committee's report sits on the question of the purpose of citizenship education and consider how both political realities, and his own changing views, affected this. I will suggest that, although keen to emphasize the strong participatory elements of civic republicanism, Crick's views on citizenship in fact sit comfortably with liberals such as Gutmann who see ongoing participation by autonomous individuals as a key component of a healthy democracy. I will also argue that the Crick Report does in many ways reflect the approach that Crick championed in the 1970s, albeit less forcefully, but does so within a framework that is structured in such a way as to be deliberately open to a wide variety of interpretations.

Crick is clear that there is a central question regarding whether citizenship education should have a predominantly conservative or progressive purpose, but aims for a

compromise where the most important elements of both approaches can coexist without undermining each other:

> Traditionalism stressed an ideal of good citizenship (obeying the law without question, giving up one's seat to elders in buses and trains) and progressivism stressed an ideal of active citizenship (trying to change unjust laws, trying to democratise voluntary bodies, even the occasional demo and aggressive non-violent protest)… both are needed in sensible combination (Crick, 2002a p.496)

To describe this approach as a compromise is not to suggest that it is a weak middle way, but rather to acknowledge Crick's assertion that both conservative and progressive viewpoints have merits, but also dangers if they are carried to extremes. It is a compromise, I would suggest, in the best sense of the word; it aims to simultaneously maximize the benefits, while minimizing the problems, inherent in each approach. This compromise also aims to capture some of the benefits that civic republican approach offers to the state, such as support for its institutions and key values, without some of the potential disadvantages, such as unthinking and uncritical obedience. Heater (2004 p.346) describes it as the balance that needs to be struck between support for, and criticism of, the government; between loyalty and political stability on one hand, and critical awareness of faults on the other. The success of this 'compromise' and its subsequent interpretation by policy makers is at the heart of this research and the interviews found in Chapter Eleven.

Crick, Politics and Democracy

It is initially difficult to position Crick within the context of the various interpretations of the proper role of citizenship within a liberal democracy, as discussed in the previous chapter. This is because the viewpoints that were explored took the existence of a liberal democratic state, with a compromise existing between popular representative

government and the protection of individual freedom, as their starting point in any discussion. In many ways this is natural since the states they were concerning themselves with are widely acknowledged to have well established forms of liberal democratic government. However, Crick was consistently considerably more suspicious of democracy than many of his peers; he felt that the nature of this liberal democratic compromise needed more examination, and argued that much discussion, which ostensibly centred on the proper role of the citizen in a democracy, was in fact concerned not with democracy but with 'politics' itself (Crick, 2000b p.194).

He acknowledged that his committee's report made relatively little reference to democracy and admitted to actively steering them away from discussion relating to the term believing it would not be helpful to the task at hand (Crick, 2007a, p. p.236). Not only this, he suggested that in addition to it being a mistake to confuse democracy with politics it also fails to recognise the danger that the former might represent to the latter:

> There are those who would tell us that democracy is the true form of politics. Some would even say that it is politics, or that it is clearly and always a form of government, value, or activity superior to mere politics. But politics needs to be defended even against democracy, certainly in the sense that any clear and practical idea needs defending against something vague and imprecise. We will argue that while democracy as a social movement must exist in nearly all modern forms of political rule, yet, if taken alone and as a matter of principle, it is the destruction of politics (Crick, 1993 p.56).

Liberals of course acknowledge the threat that democracy may pose in the form of the simple majoritarianism of the 'rule of the mob', or the 'tyranny of the majority', but believe it is balanced within the liberal democratic compromise by the emphasis on individual rights and constitutionalism. Crick's reservations are in some ways similar, but he does not see them in terms of an imbalance within liberal democracy, but rather

as the potential for democracy to undermine political rule. Without understanding the distinction that Crick makes here it is difficult to understand the basis for his approach to citizenship.

For Crick politics is prior to democracy in two senses; firstly historically, with electoral representation, liberty, rights and democracy itself almost always established as a subsequent achievement of a society that has already established order and constraint within its territory (Crick, 1993 p.26), and secondly, logically, with the existence of democracy depending upon the order and stability that political rule brings (Crick, 2000b, p. p.199). He gives a definition of politics as:

> The activity by which differing interests within a given unit of rule are conciliated by giving them a share in power in proportion to their importance to the welfare and survival of the whole community. And, to complete the formal definition, a political system that is that type of government where politics proves successful in ensuring reasonable stability and order (Crick, 1993, p. p.21).

It is a structured process of conciliation and compromise which allows competing interests to peacefully co-exist. This process is compatible with democracy but is not dependent upon it; non democratic forms of government can be political provided they allow a process of opposition and conflict resolution within a pluralistic framework (McCowan, 2006 p.59). This definition suggests the active involvement of the citizenry but not necessarily its direct participation in the selection of government through the electoral process. With this in mind it is easier to appreciate Crick's fondness for civic republicanism, with its emphasis on participation but not necessarily democracy.

The reason that Crick felt moved to offer advice about the protection of politics against democracy was his concern that democracy is not necessarily tied to popular government and a free citizenry (Crick, 1993 p.59). He points to the concerns of the American Founding Fathers who limited the impact of democracy on their constitution by having both the President and the Senate indirectly elected, with the intention of protecting good government from the impact of simple majoritarianism. While he accepts that such a paternalistic approach is impossible to sustain in the modern world, hence the subsequent changes to the political system of the USA, he argues that the tension continues to exist within liberal democracies. He identifies a process whereby concentrations of power which demonstrate a tendency towards a lack of true political rule are justified by an appeal to majoritarian popular sovereignty. Robespierre is offered as an example of how an attempt to establish a 'general will' can be a move towards autocratic rule, and Crick suggests that sovereignty itself can be regarded as anti-political because it invests absolute power in one institution (Crick, 1993 p.61).

Crick's belief is that Aristotle provides us with a useful model for the interaction of politics and democracy. Primarily a civic republican, Aristotle saw democracy as an element of mixed government, or polity; dangerous on its own, with a tendency towards tyranny, but a necessity to ensure that those governing govern in the interests of all:

> Such a government combined the aristocratic principle and the democratic; good government is a matter of experience, skill, and knowledge - not just opinion, but is subject to the consent of the governed. If there is no democratic element, a state will be oligarchic or despotic; if democracy alone prevails, the result is anarchy - the opportunity of demagogues to become despots. Democracy, then, is to be appreciated not as a principle of government on its own, but as a political principle, or an element within politics (Crick, 1993 p.71)

It could, of course, be argued that this is not dissimilar to the compromise, between popular sovereignty and constitutional government, that most commentators already regard as being at the heart of liberal democracy, although they would see it in terms of restraining the majoritarian tendencies of democracy rather than democracy itself. Much then depends on the role envisaged for the citizen within that compromise, something that will be considered in the next section. However, it is clear that Crick believes the distinction is important, perhaps because he believes the kind of active involvement required from citizens can be more successfully linked to the necessity for participation in politics, through the concept of civic republicanism, rather than democratic duty, which too often is regarded as being fulfilled simply by participation in a ballot. Crick sees democratic participation as relatively infrequent with a tendency to aggregate opinion into a single received view; therefore it must be one element of an active citizen's wider participation in politics. He states, 'Democracy is one element in politics; if it seeks to be everything, it destroys politics, turning "harmony into mere unison", reducing "a theme to a single beat"' (Crick, 1993 p.73).

Key to this is Crick's concern that active citizens should be dynamic individual thinkers rather than a mob open to manipulation (Turner, 2009 p.293). In reality the expectations he has of active citizens are similar to those that Gutmann (1989 p.77-78) has of democratic citizens, and to a certain extent the distinction may be considered largely semantic. While Crick wants the active participation required by civic republicanism he does not want the unquestioning loyalty to the state that is implied by its more extreme forms. In fact Turner (2009 p.291) argues that what Crick is actually doing is constructing a theory of democracy. Nevertheless, whilst much of the contemporary

discussion around the issue of citizenship education focused on education for democracy, Crick stuck steadfastly to his guns and his committee's report bases its advocacy of greater participation around an ideal of civic republicanism. This makes reference to the Aristotelian idea of politics, with citizens making a direct contribution to the policy making process, although he conveniently bypasses both the limited nature of Ancient Greek citizenship and the expectation that participation would be supportive rather than critical in its nature. For Crick this seems to be a way of emphasising that participation should not be confined simply to the aggregated opinion that democratic voting represents. However, its is clear that the kind of democratic participation advocated by Gutmann goes well beyond simple voting, and to all intents and purposes they agree about the role an active citizen should be playing in a modern democratic state.

One final point, which should be made with regard to democracy and Crick's avoidance of the term, is that there is some evidence that his reluctance may be connected to the fact that liberal democracy is increasingly regarded as a term which is inextricably linked to the free market. In this context liberal democracy can be regarded as an ideological approach which contrasts starkly with 'political' government (Crick, 2007a p.237) and Crick, clear in his view that human relations should not be determined entirely by market forces, argues that residual political restraint has been an important factor in limiting their effects (Crick, 2000b p.202). Whilst other commentators, such as Heater, share his concerns, they are not prepared to cede the term liberal democracy to the free marketeers and will argue that in fact the values of liberal democracy can

include a commitment to social justice that suggest an altogether more egalitarian approach.

Crick: Participation, Autonomy and Civic Education

In the previous chapter a contrast was drawn between the positions of Galston and Gutmann regarding the proper purpose of civic education. Whilst both agreed that it was necessary to establish the basic values required to guarantee the continued existence of the liberal state there was a divergence of views over two major issues, the level of participation required within the liberal democratic state, and the desirability of a critical approach to the values of the state and the promotion of autonomous critical thinking. Crick shows a degree of sympathy to both viewpoints, although I would argue his position is ultimately considerably closer to Gutmann's than Galston's, and the tension that this creates was a key issue that I explored with the citizenship coordinators I interviewed (see Chapter Eleven).

Galston and Crick clearly share a concern for the protection of underlying political values. Galston (2008 p.103) argues that whilst most historical forms of government have tacitly accepted the ultimate supremacy of Aristotelian politics, where maintenance of the underlying constitution takes precedence over everyday debate and policy making, the emphasis on individual rights within liberal democracy leads to them being much more frequently challenged. His overwhelming concern with the need for the preservation of the state, although it has been accused of making his educational philosophy uncomfortably close to indoctrination, is similar to Crick's belief that the

maintenance of basic political values must take precedence over democracy (Crick, 1999 p.338).

That said Crick agrees with Gutmann regarding the dangers of the process of maintaining loyalty to the state being carried too far, after all, as Pike (2007 p.472) points out, 'The extent to which state sponsored values are promoted might indicate the degree to which students are respected as citizens or treated as subjects'.

Despite some common ground on the maintenance of basic political order, there is a marked difference between Galston and Crick over the question of participation. As we have already seen, Crick believes the active participation of the civic republican is an essential component of maintaining the 'political state', whilst Galston argues, from a realist perspective, that participation, beyond the 'sober assessment of representatives' is neither likely nor desirable. The kind of passive democracy that is accepted by Galston is, in Crick's view a danger to politics; only an active participatory democracy can ensure that political values are being protected. Crick draws a clear distinction between the active 'good citizen' and the passive 'good subject', arguing that there is a civic duty for citizens to exercise their democratic rights, and that democracy is about reasoned public debate not simply the counting of opinions (Mclaughlin, 2000 p.551).

Crick's position, that active participation is necessary, not so much as a democratic value, but as a necessary part of the civic republican commitment to politics, aligns him for practical purposes much more closely with Gutmann, although the logic behind their position differs slightly. For Crick, participation guarantees the protection of 'politics'

against the potential dangers of democracy, whereas for Gutmann, it is about ensuring that we have 'real' democracy rather than simple majoritarianism.

Galston argues that within a liberal state, in the name of diversity, one should have a right to live an 'unexamined life', and therefore civic education must not promote critical thinking to the point where it promotes autonomy. Once again this would seem to run the risk of citizens becoming passive subjects. While accepting the need to inculcate the basic values of the state, both Gutmann and Crick believe critical thinking and autonomy should be promoted in order to prevent such a passive acceptance of its values. For Gutmann such an approach is important because, although it potentially violates liberal neutrality, it promotes individual freedom, whereas for Crick, it is necessary to encourage the type of civic engagement which maintains 'political' rule. Crick will not accept the kind of minimal civic education favoured by Galston, which aims to simply cultivate loyalty and civic virtue, and to an extent agrees with Callan's criticism (Callan, 2008) of this as 'sentimental', promoting an unquestioning and underserved loyalty to the state:

> If one lives in a society where relevant truths cannot be told publicly about how government is conducted or what politics is about, then political education is impossible…If the full truth is too difficult to grasp, or is simply unknown, then conventional fictions (what may strictly speaking be, at worst, lies, or at best evasions) should never be put forward, either for mistaken social or moral reasons or simply to have simpler models (Crick, 1999 p.347).

Crick's major revision of traditional civic republicanism is his belief that participation and loyalty to the state are not meaningful unless they have an element of critical thinking. Heater outlines the problem:

> Both the ideal of citizenship and the ethics of the teaching profession shun indoctrination. In the former case it is contrary to the exercise of autonomous

judgement, which is one of its basic tenets. In the latter, it is an abuse of the discipline and authority which the teacher wields over those in his charge (Heater, 2004 p.347).

Two complementary solutions are suggested to the potential problem of indoctrination. The first is that citizenship education should confine itself to the inculcation of key civic values such as justice, fairness and freedom around which there is a widely held consensus whilst avoiding any 'indoctrination' associated with the promotion of a particular ideological perspective. The second is that autonomy should be promoted as a means of ensuring indoctrination cannot take place. 'The very heart of citizenship education is to provide young citizens with precisely that capacity to think for themselves' (Heater, 2004 p.247). The ultimate similarity between the positions of Crick and Gutmann is illustrated by the fact that they both employ variations of these two solutions.

Gutmann's theory of conscious social reproduction requires each generation to choose to uphold democratic values and make and remake the state accordingly (Gutmann, 1999 p.77) and autonomous choice is a key component of that. The idea that a key value of democracy is that it must be constantly reassessed goes a long way to addressing Crick's fears about the potential problems of a passive majority who can be mobilized for anti-political purposes. In many ways, the protection that Crick aims to achieve, by insisting on the primacy of political values that are prior to democracy, Gutmann is aiming to achieve, by shaping the nature of liberal democracy itself, through the process of ensuring that democratic education encourages the necessary critical thinking.

Crick makes a clear distinction between liberal and republican traditions of citizenship:

> Historically there have been two main ideas of civil liberties and of the kind of citizenship appropriate to each of them: the one, sometimes called 'liberal', that civil liberties are a framework of law to protect individuals against the state; and the other, sometimes called republican, that civil liberties are the positive means by which citizens may influence affairs of state (Crick, 2000b p.97).

Whilst this may allow Crick to define his republican conception of citizenship in opposition to Galston's liberalism, in which good government in maintained by the existence of a constitutional framework rather than an active citizenry, it does not distinguish him greatly from Gutmann's democratic liberalism, within which an active and critical approach to the state and an ongoing process of attempting to influence its policy making are key requirements.

The common ground between Gutmann and Crick can also be seen with regard to the elements that need to be contained within a programme of civic education, at least one that goes beyond the simple inculcation of values favoured by Galston:

> The very project of a free citizenship education, as distinct from a would-be indoctrinating one, whether ideological or simply patriotic, must be based on a limited number of presuppositions that we called in the 1978 Hansard report… procedural values: Freedom, Toleration, Fairness, Respect for Truth, Respect for Reasoning. Different substantive values are to be discussed, rarely resolved; but such discussions must be based on clear presuppositions for procedure (Crick, 1999 p.343)

The procedural values that he identifies are similar to the essential democratic values that Gutmann argues are necessary for conscious social reproduction. This is particularly true with regard to the value placed upon toleration and mutual respect. Gutmann sees autonomous thinking as a crucial element of toleration since the ability to critically evaluate our own ideas and belief is a prerequisite for a reasoned and respectful evaluation of the beliefs of others. Crick (1999 p.345) concurs, suggesting that someone

who is politically literate will hold their own (autonomous) views but will also hold them in such as way as to be tolerant to the views of others.

The distinction that Crick draws between procedural values and substantive values is in many ways analogous to the distinction between political and comprehensive liberalism made by Rawls. The values of Rawls' 'overlapping consensus' are similar to Crick's procedural ones and again the major difference is that one sees them as protecting the basic structure of the liberal state while the other sees them as necessary to ensure 'political rule'. Also, while Rawls would ideally like to maintain neutrality between competing conceptions of the good life, although as we have seen he accepts that this is very difficult in reality, Crick does not consider neutrality itself to be necessary, as long as his procedural values remain in place (Crick, 1999 p.344).

Whilst neither Gutmann nor, especially, Rawls, would be likely to accept such a clear rejection of neutrality, to a considerable extent they are all pulling in the same direction. They agree that the State has the right to promote the values that are essential to ensure its continued existence, so that it may maintain a framework within which competing conceptions of the good life can exist, and their proponents pursue them actively, but with due respect and consideration for competing conceptions. Furthermore, both Gutmann and Crick would agree that such a state can only properly be maintained by an active approach to citizenship, whether this is through the conscious social reproduction of liberal democracy by the educated citizen, or the protection of politics by the efforts of the civic republican.

The Development of Crick's Position Over Time

As has already been noted, Crick had been a longstanding advocate of the need for some form of citizenship education by the time he was appointed to head the Advisory Group on Citizenship in 1997. Whilst the general themes discussed in the previous chapter are consistently present within his work on the subject, there are some important shifts in emphasis which highlight both changes in his own thinking and the need to adapt to changing political circumstance. Early in this chapter, reference was made to Crick's identification of a central issue within citizenship, the tension between a conservative or progressive approach to the subject, one that aims to reinforce or challenge the status quo, and his wish to find a suitable compromise between the two. To a certain extent an examination of his work over time suggests a shift in the nature of this compromise, alongside the general political landscape, in a more conservative direction.

McCowan (2006 p.58) suggests that political education advocated by the Crick Report was considerably more conservative than his position in the 1970s, showing a greater concern for combining traditionalist and progressive ideals of good citizenship, and allowing 'political literacy' to be sidelined by 'social and moral responsibility' and 'community involvement'.

Writing in 1978, when reporting on his work with the Hansard Society, Crick identified three possible aims for, what he then referred to as, political education:

> (a) The purely and properly conserving level of knowing how our present system of government works, and knowing the beliefs that are thought to be part of it.
> (b) The liberal or participatory level of development of the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary for an active citizenship.
> (c) Beyond both of these there lies the more contentious area of considering possible changes of direction of government or of alternative systems (Crick, 2000b p.59)

Although correctly identifying the third option as the most contentious interpretation, with its implications that it could involve major changes to the political status quo, Crick was clear that this was a legitimate part of political education, although it must be accompanied by consideration of the previous two, which rather than being competitive approaches in fact function best as complementary. In a paper based upon his address to the Politics Association in 1992, he appears to maintain this approach albeit with slightly more reservation. He calls for citizenship education to encourage the challenging of bad laws and is critical of a paternalistic approach, citing the Speaker's Commission as an example, which teaches substantive values as essentially a form of indoctrination (Crick, 2000b p.106). In addition, he does not believe that more active citizenship will necessarily make life easier for our political masters:

> I don't think we should sound solemn and say that with more political education democracy will work better. Who knows? Some exercise of civil liberties may destabilize some governments. Tough (Crick, 1999 p.104).

However, it is less clear at this stage that his belief remains that the political system itself is a proper target for reassessment through the process of citizenship education.

By 2000, following the release of his committee's report in 1998, Crick appears to be giving significantly more emphasis to the community orientated elements of citizenship, and has gone quiet on the more confrontational aspects of political literacy:

> In the 1970s some of us were trying to promote programmes in schools with the object of enhancing what was cleverly called 'political literacy' - the knowledge, skills and values needed to be an informed, active and responsible citizen. But, in hindsight, that was too narrowly political - or could encourage a narrowing sense of what counted as political (Crick, 2000a p.78).

His focus remained on active civic republicanism, and he continued to suggest the necessity to make a distinction between the law and justice, but any sense of evaluating

the worth of the political system itself had gone. Consequently the Crick Report has been criticised for promoting a view of citizenship education as simply community involvement, usually in a volunteer capacity, with no possibility of critiquing and changing the current political order (McCowan, 2006 p.64). Gamarnikow and Green see in Crick's work a shift, from rights to responsibilities, and from social justice to theories of social capital. They also suggest that Crick has weakened his definition of political literacy shifting from a critical to a largely instrumental emphasis (Gamarnikow and Green, 1999 p.118).

The suggestion is that debates regarding individual contentious issues are a proper part of citizenship education but it is not permissible to encourage analysis of any possible underlying systemic issues which might contribute to them. This leads to the conclusion that while the form of citizenship in the report is progressive in so far as it focuses on empowerment through participation, civic engagement and democratization it is ultimately rather conservative due its failure to engage with any meaningful analysis of the political status quo. It was certainly noticeable that while there were differing opinions amongst my interviewees regarding the extent to which citizenship education should engage directly with controversial issues (see Chapter Eleven), none of them mentioned a role for the subject in promoting questioning of the underlying nature of the political system.

The question then must be considered as to whether Crick had a change of heart regarding this central question of political literacy or whether he was simply responding to the prevailing mood and the political realities of producing a report which would be

acceptable across the political spectrum. Kerr sees the formulation of citizenship education within the Crick report as offering a compromise approach which takes the longstanding version of British citizenship espoused by T.H. Marshall and includes elements of the Conservative notion of 'active citizenship' from the 1980s and the priorities of New Labour's communitarianism in the 1990s.

Crick's primary concern was that individuals should be politically engaged; without this active element of civic republicanism he feared for the underlying 'political' nature of our government and saw the potential for democracy to threaten rather than empower. His views align closely with Gutmann's in this respect and they share a belief that education within a liberal democracy must involve critical reflection on the values of that democracy itself. This belief is not entirely absent from the Crick Report but it is downplayed amongst an overwhelming emphasis on community involvement and responsibilities of active citizens (something which certainly did feature prominently with the regards to the priorities of the coordinators who I interviewed). The danger here is that the report is influenced by civic republicanism in terms of an emphasis on civic duty, without promoting the kind of critical participation that prevents its tendency towards the indoctrination of the values of the state.

It seems likely to me that, having pursued the introduction of citizenship education for thirty years, Crick was prepared to compromise heavily, along the lines outlined above by Kerr, in order to secure its status as a compulsory subject within the National Curriculum. As a lifelong socialist, the absence of an opportunity to place greater emphasis on social justice or encouragement to consider some of the potential systemic

failings of free market capitalism would have been disappointing, but the prize of a curriculum based encouragement to greater political activism was still worth having. It also seems probable, I would suggest, that to an extent the report was regarded as a 'bridgehead', an attempt to establish citizenship education that could subsequently be built upon and developed.

The Opportunities and Dangers of a Light Touch Approach

The Crick Report was deliberately vague about the actual implementation of its ideas about citizenship education, to the point where it did not even specify whether the subject was best taught discreetly or through cross-curricular cooperation. The thinking behind this was, ostensibly, that it was more important to focus on outcomes than methods and that teachers would be given the freedom to teach the subject in the most appropriate way for their students. However, this may also be seen as creating an element of space within which some of the more radical elements of citizenship education, to which Crick had shown himself sympathetic in the past, could be explored. The extent to which this has happened is discussed in the interviews in Chapter Eleven.

I believe that the problem, however, with this somewhat open ended approach is that it equally allows for a more conservative approach to be applied and there is some evidence that suggests that school policy makers tend to move in what they perceive as the safest direction, thereby sidelining not only the more progressive elements of Crick's thinking but also the emphasis on autonomy and critical thinking.

A similar danger exists in his determination to utilize the concept of civic republicanism. Whilst emphasising this alternative to liberal citizenship was a means of stressing the importance of active participation, such participation can easily be seen primarily in terms of citizens fulfilling their civic duties and supporting the values of the state. The commitment to autonomous critical thinking, as a key value of citizenship education, is clearly shared by Crick, but is not necessarily strongly communicated in his report. This has led some schools to interpret active citizenship primarily as a form of enhanced community action or charity work (see interviews in Chapter Eleven).

The extent to which these more conservative interpretations occurred will be explored in the next chapter which will take a more detailed look at the Crick Report, and its critics, and will consider the research that exists regarding its implementation.

5) The Crick Report

'I think initially the Crick report was something I was aware of but didn't really bother too much about.' (Citizenship Coordinator, Abingdon Road)

'When I did my PGCE, my focus was The Crick Report... I did that as my whole school focus thing... But when I came to start the PD [Personal Development] programme... I didn't refer to it all, to be honest.' (Citizenship Coordinator, Horsham Road)

The previous chapter concluded with the suggestion that Crick's public commitment to citizenship education as a force for challenging the status quo had notably dimmed over the course of the three decades during which he campaigned for its introduction. Whether this reflected a genuine shift in his position, or was merely a strategic move designed to smooth the path for the subject's incorporation into the National Curriculum (QCA, 1999) is in many ways a moot point; what is significant, for this research, is the influence that the views within the report exerted upon the subsequent order, and the teachers who were charged with implementing it.

My second research question asks; *which principles and philosophies did the Crick Report adopt and how are these reflected in the National Curriculum subject of 'Citizenship Education'?* This chapter will seek to examine the Crick Report in more detail and consider the position that it takes regarding the purpose of citizenship education, since, as he himself pointed out, the National Curriculum Order followed its recommendations to a close degree, and the two documents together, directly or indirectly, have provided the basis of most teachers' understanding of the subject (Crick, 2000a p.81). It is important to remember that, at the time of its initial introduction, there were very few, if any, subject specialists (certainly none with a citizenship PGCE), and

that the coordinators responsible for the introduction of the subject were expected to take their lead from these two documents. My own experience, and those of the coordinators I interviewed, was that there was relatively little time available for a wider exploration of the theoretical role of citizenship education. Of course this does not mean that teachers will not have had personal opinions and beliefs regarding the purpose of the subject, merely that their exposure to competing academic sources is likely to have been limited. One of the purposes of my research will be to examine how these personal viewpoints, examples of which can be found in the interview data in Chapters Ten, Eleven and Twelve, fit within the wider debate regarding the subject, and establish the extent to which the Crick Report, or aspects of it, are dominant within the perceptions of purpose held by subject leaders.

In addition to examining the Crick Report's position on the purpose of citizenship, the second section of this chapter will look at some of the criticisms of the report and consider how these have affected the subsequent development of the subject. In particular it will consider the accusations that the report failed to engage successfully with issues of race, and therefore promoted an understanding of citizenship that was too narrow and limited.

The Crick Report and the Purpose of Citizenship Education

The Report aims, from its introduction onwards, at a combination of the radical and the reassuringly familiar. In the preface comes the often quoted intention that, 'We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally' (QCA, 1998 p.7), but this is soon followed up by historically focused references to

Aristotle and T.H. Marshall. Above all the tone of the document is one of practicality, a determination that it should not be excessively academic, but should be able to provide a workable blueprint for the introduction of a new subject. This does, perhaps, reflect Crick's desire that this attempt should succeed, where previous initiatives, such as the political literacy programme of the 1970s (discussed in Chapter One) had failed, and his willingness to tone down his own, broadly left wing views, and devise an understanding of citizenship education acceptable across the political spectrum. The report must also be seen in the context of its time, when lack of political engagement amongst the young, most notably reflected in falling party membership and election turnout, was seen as the major concern to be tackled (Pearce and Spencer, 1999 p.220; Faulks, 2006a). While for Crick it meant much more; in some senses the emphasis on active citizenship can be seen primarily as an attempt by politicians to ensure that the legitimacy of their democratic mandate was not undermined by falling turnout; and the sceptical might suggest that this was as active as they required citizens to be.

Although the report may have referred back to Aristotle and Marshall, this in itself would not necessarily make for a conservative interpretation of citizenship. Crick's ideal of an active civic republican, involved with politics on an ongoing basis, directly and indirectly shaping the laws and decisions of the state, as part of a highly educated 'citizens democracy' (QCA, 1998 p.9) is a radical notion in an age where political participation is generally declining. It also shows a commitment to a version of citizenship which combines the enthusiasm for direct participation of the civic republican with the commitment to autonomous critical thinking of the more demanding liberals such as Gutmann.

Heater (1999 p.165) suggests that the Crick Report aims for a compromise between the civic republican perspective, which prioritizes the public good and civic duty over personal development, and the liberal concern for autonomy, diversity and democracy. Crick needs elements of both to support his vision of active and critical participants in a healthy democracy. The report aims to look for a workable form of citizenship education, which acknowledges the different traditions but does not slavishly adhere to one particular model. 'Reconciliation is only possible if we shift our sights from the hardened positions of idealistic theory to the softer compromises of reality' (Heater, 1999 p.157). Acknowledging that citizenship education in England has been approached with 'extreme, almost unique casualness' (Heater, 1999 p.175), Heater praises Crick's committee for its pragmatic approach.

The distinction that Crick draws between politics and democracy (Crick, 2000b p.194), discussed in the previous chapter, is not really present within the report; in fact it makes clear that its focus is 'citizenship and effective participation in a democracy'. However the implications of his viewpoint are reflected by the strong emphasis placed on the importance of the participation of a free and well informed citizenry. It is this that protects against the potential pitfalls of democracy in much the same way as Gutmann's 'Democratic Education' and conscious social reproduction.

Marshall is seen as a key influence in the development of citizenship in Britain and the report acknowledges this noting that:

> The report of the Commission on Citizenship, appointed by the then Speaker of the House of Commons, 'Encouraging Citizenship' (1990), did well to adopt as a starting point the understanding of citizenship found in the late T.H. Marshall's

book, *Citizenship* (1950). He saw three elements: the civil, the political and the social. Discussing the first element, the commission rightly put greater stress on the reciprocity between rights and duties; and, more than Marshall, on welfare being not just provision by the state but also what people can do for each other in voluntary groups and organisations, whether local or national. Both of these it saw as a duty it called 'active citizenship', but it had less to say about Marshall's second element. Perhaps it took political citizenship for granted (which, historically, it has never been safe to do). Civic spirit, citizens' charters and voluntary activity in the community are of crucial importance, but individuals must be helped and prepared to shape the terms of such engagements by political understanding and action. (QCA, 1998 p.10)

Marshall's influence can be seen in the three strand structure of Crick's recommendations and in the emphasis placed on voluntary and community action. However the above quote also illustrates Crick's acceptance of new political realities, both a very different type of Labour government and the need to maintain the support of the Conservatives and make citizenship education as bi-partisan an issue as possible. The emphasis on responsibilities as well as rights with regard to the civil element seems to connect directly with the rhetoric of New Labour who brought a communitarian element into play as part of an attempt to deal with anti-social behaviour. More significantly though, where Marshall had explicitly linked social rights to the development of the welfare state, which he saw as the ultimate achievement of a historical expansion of rights (Biesta and Lawy, 2006 p.66), Crick is prepared to downplay welfare rights in favour of an increased emphasis on community action and volunteering (some of the potential problems with this can be seen in the attitudes of many of my interviewees in Chapter Eleven).

It is clear Crick does not worry excessively about accusations that the report promotes a particular perception of the good with regard to the social element of citizenship

(Olssen, 2004 p181), a major concern of more minimalist liberals such as Galston. The report makes the bold statement that, 'We firmly believe that volunteering and community involvement are necessary conditions of civil society and democracy' (QCA, 1998 p.10). This assertion is obviously strongly influenced by civic republicanism and would be strongly refuted by liberals who argue that, while there should always be a right to participate in the political process, there should also be a right, in any free society, to non-participation (Kymlicka, 2008). Even here, however, as in the earlier quote concerning Marshall, Crick makes it clear that political understanding and engagement remain crucial, arguing, 'While volunteering and voluntary service are necessary conditions for full citizenship in a democracy, they are not sufficient conditions. Local communities are, indeed, not isolated from the state and public policy' (QCA, 1998 p.10).

In other words engagement with your local community is a requirement of citizenship, but, however worthy your contribution to the local community, there remains a need for you to engage with national politics, and policy making, if you are to be the type of active citizen that Crick wishes to see. He is not aiming to create a nation of quiet, obedient, tax paying, community minded volunteers.

This brings us to one of the central questions of this research; should citizenship education be a progressive force encouraging critical thinking and a challenge to the status quo, or should it offer a conservative reinforcement of the values and attitudes necessary for the state to sustain itself? The previous chapter suggested that while, like most sensible commentators, Crick sees the necessity of a compromise between these

two elements, the nature of the compromise he envisaged became increasingly conservative as time passed and political circumstances changed.

The report engages with this issue, although on both occasions by quoting approvingly from others' work:

> Besides understanding, citizenship education should foster respect for law, justice, democracy and nurture common good at the same time as encouraging independence of thought. It should develop skills of reflection, enquiry and debate (Submission by the Citizenship Foundation quoted in QCA, 1998 p.11).

> Citizenship education must give people confidence to claim their rights and challenge the status quo while, at the same time, make plain that with rights come obligations. It should foster respect for law, justice and democracy. It should nurture concern for the common good at the same time as it encourages independence of thought (Lord Chancellor in an address to the Citizenship Foundation at the Law Society (27 January 1998) QCA, 1998 p.61).

I would suggest that the fact that this issue is tackled indirectly, through the words of others, is quite informative. Crick appears to wish to retain an awareness of this tension within citizenship education but, in light of the fact that he is preparing proposals to form the basis of a government's National Curriculum and consciously looking to maintain bi-partisan support, he does not wish to make potential inflammatory statements which might associate citizenship with some of the much more overtly political teaching initiatives of the 1980s. While the quotations above may hardly be described as provocative, the suggestion that it is the role of teachers to encourage students to give critical consideration to the underlying nature of their society is a controversial one. This unease, particularly from the right, regarding political education, was discussed in Chapter One, with particular reference to some of the more controversial educational initiatives of the 1980s, such as 'Peace Studies'. A concern to

avoid any accusations of indoctrination is apparent in the responses of some interviewees in Chapter Eleven.

So, whilst the question of citizenship and its relationship to the status quo is mentioned within the report it is effectively marginalized. The most important elements of the report in practical terms, those most directly relating to its implementation as a subject, such as the table of essential elements (or learning outcomes) reproduced below, make no mention of it.

Table 3: Essential Elements (Learning Outcomes) Included in the Crick Report (QCA, 1998 p.44)

Fig 1   Overview of essential elements to be reached by the end of compulsory schooling

Key Concepts	Values and Dispositions	Skills and Aptitudes	Knowledge and Understanding
■ democracy and autocracy ■ co-operation and conflict ■ equality and diversity ■ fairness, justice, the rule of law, rules, law and human rights ■ freedom and order ■ individual and community ■ power and authority ■ rights and responsibilities	■ concern for the common good ■ belief in human dignity and equality ■ concern to resolve conflicts ■ a disposition to work with and for others with sympathetic understanding ■ proclivity to act responsibly: that is care for others and oneself; premeditation and calculation about the effect actions are likely to have on others; and acceptance of responsibility for unforeseen or unfortunate consequences ■ practice of tolerance ■ judging and acting by a moral code ■ courage to defend a point of view ■ willingness to be open to changing one's opinions and attitudes in the light of discussion and evidence ■ individual initiative and effort ■ civility and respect for the rule of law ■ determination to act justly ■ commitment to equal opportunities and gender equality ■ commitment to active citizenship ■ commitment to voluntary service ■ concern for human rights ■ concern for the environment	■ ability to make a reasoned argument both verbally and in writing ■ ability to co-operate and work effectively with others ■ ability to consider and appreciate the experience and perspective of others ■ ability to tolerate other view points ■ ability to develop a problem-solving approach ■ ability to use modern media and technology critically to gather information ■ a critical approach to evidence put before one and ability to look for fresh evidence ■ ability to recognise forms of manipulation and persuasion ■ ability to identify, respond to and influence social, moral and political challenges and situations	■ topical and contemporary issues and events at local, national, EU, Commonwealth and international levels ■ the nature of democratic communities, including how they function and change ■ the interdependence of individuals and local and voluntary communities ■ the nature of diversity, dissent and social conflict ■ legal and moral rights and responsibilities of individuals and communities ■ the nature of social, moral and political challenges faced by individuals and communities ■ Britain's parliamentary political and legal systems at local, national, European, Commonwealth and international level, including how they function and change ■ the nature of political and voluntary action in communities ■ the rights and responsibilities of citizens as consumers, employees, employers and family and community members ■ the economic system as it relates to individuals and communities ■ human rights charters and issues ■ sustainable development and environmental issues

It would be unfair to suggest that Crick promotes an uncritical acceptance of authority; the report is explicit in drawing a distinction between law and justice:

> Respect for the rule of law is a necessary condition for any kind of social order and a necessary component of education. In a parliamentary democracy, however, education must also help future citizens distinguish between law and justice. Such a distinction marked the very beginning of political thought in ancient Athens. Citizens must be equipped with the political skills needed to change laws in a peaceful and responsible manner (QCA, 1998 p.10)

In my view, the compromise that Crick seems to have alighted upon, is that the promotion of a critical approach to the actions of the state is an important element of citizenship education, but that the questioning of the wider status quo, the underlying nature of the political or economic system, and its dominant ideology, is either too difficult, or too controversial, to openly promote. This was primarily because of the existence, at the time of the report's publication, of a broad consensus among the three major parties over the desirability of a neo liberal economic system. Given the degree of unity between the parties, it might be argued that Crick's caution stems from the recognition that any attempt to suggest the examination of potential alternatives to this hegemony, would be opposed across the (party) political spectrum. The result is that, while Crick's own position, and aspects of the overall tone of the report, are close to Gutmann's approach to democratic education, in balancing the promotion of values necessary for the continuation of the state against a critical approach which maintains its legitimacy through 'conscious social reproduction', the actual recommendations which form the basis of the National Curriculum Order are noticeably more conservative. Faulks comments:

> The Crick Report, however, adopts a traditional, top-down approach towards conceptions of politics and little acknowledgement is given to the essentially contested nature of citizenship… the official line on citizenship education is

designed to encourage participation in the system, not to question or challenge it (Faulks, 2006a p.65).

While Arthur and Davidson agree that the position taken up by the Crick Report does not encourage, what they refer to as, a sufficiently *active f*orm of citizenship, one which encourages a critical approach to the underling structures of democracy (Arthur and Davison, 2000 p.11).

To its credit the report does recognise that providing a clear understanding of purpose is an important part of the establishment of the subject, and it does attempt to provide guidance in this area:

> The purpose of citizenship education in schools and colleges is to make secure and to increase the knowledge, skills and values relevant to the nature and practices of participative democracy; also to enhance the awareness of rights and duties, and the sense of responsibilities needed for the development of pupils into active citizens; and in so doing to establish the value to individuals, schools and society of involvement in the local and wider community (QCA, 1998 p.40)

The problem is that the above statement does not really engage with the debate, outlined in the previous chapter, regarding the conservative or progressive nature of the subject. It is a fairly bland statement which is non-threatening and politically neutral but, a kind reading might suggest, leaves the door ajar for citizenship education to get to grips with more controversial issues should the teacher see fit. This interpretation, outlined in the previous chapter, that Crick was prepared to compromise heavily in order to establish the subject, but ultimately would have wished to see some slightly more robust debate within the classroom than the general tone of his report suggests, is a plausible one. He spoke of the subsequent National Curriculum as a 'light touch order' (Crick, 2002a) and made it clear that considerable scope was to be given to classroom teachers to interpret the committees' recommendations in ways that they felt were relevant and appropriate

153

for their schools. This would suggest that part of the rationale of the report was, alongside providing a clear set of guidelines on content, to create a space where some of the more controversial elements of citizenship education could be explored. Whilst it might be argued that there is limited evidence of this in the report itself, it makes much more sense when the report is placed in the context of Crick's other writing on the subject, particularly his earlier writing such as his 'Essays on Citizenship' (Crick, 2000b).

The 'light touch' approach means that precise questions regarding content and delivery are not tackled by the report, which instead, opts for outlining a set of learning outcomes (reproduced in the table above) that paint a picture of a student who has benefitted from an effective programme of citizenship education. These learning outcomes reflect the three strands of citizenship that the report identifies:

> **Social and moral responsibility**
> Children learning from the very beginning self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom, both towards those in authority and towards each other (this is an essential pre-condition for citizenship).
>
> **Community involvement**
> Pupils learning about and becoming helpfully involved in the life and concerns of their communities, including learning through community involvement and service to the community.
>
> **Political literacy**
> Pupils learning about and how to make themselves effective in public life through knowledge, skills and values. (QCA, 1998 p.41)

These strands do show some attempt to balance the more progressive and conservative elements of citizenship education. Crick has retained his favoured term 'political literacy' and uses it to strongly suggest the necessity for an active, participatory,

approach, rather than simply one of learning about political institutions. Such activism implicitly contains an element of critical thinking about politics. However, the other two strands, whilst still emphasising an active approach, particularly within the volunteering element of community involvement, do tend towards the impression of 'good' citizens, upstanding and controllable, demonstrating 'morally responsible behaviour' (as presumably defined by the state) and 'service to the community' (perhaps picking up some of the slack in welfare provision as the importance of welfare rights diminishes).

Haydon (2003) argues that moral and social responsibility can not be separated from the other strands and Crick agrees, in fact he goes further suggesting that this strand is common to all education (QCA, 1998 p.63). At the same time he points out that the community involvement strand has significant cross over with the existing curriculum content of Personal and Social Education (PSE). However he sees political literacy as clearly distinct and not covered by any existing provision (QCA, 1998 p.63). His emphasis here, I would suggest, betrays, to an extent, his core concerns regarding the purpose of citizenship. The importance of the subject, he concludes, comes from taking both new and pre-existing knowledge and skills from the first two strands and applying them in the political context of the third (QCA, 1998 p.66). For Crick then, as might be expected, citizenship is, ultimately, always political (a failure to ultimately make citizenship education 'political' enough is a theme that emerged from my fieldwork and is discussed in Chapter Eleven).

The report aims to strike a workable balance with regard to several of the debates concerning purpose that were outlined in the previous chapter. It goes beyond a

minimalist political liberalism, and promotes both autonomy and civic virtue, but does so within a broadly pluralistic approach which attempts to limit itself to promoting only those virtues which form part of the 'overlapping consensus' (Pearce and Spencer, 1999 p.221). While it perhaps over-estimates the neutrality of this 'overlapping consensus' in liberal terms, it should be remembered that the report is not a piece of political philosophy, it is a working document with a practical purpose; to find a way of making citizenship education workable in schools and beneficial to the existing, rather than a hypothetical society.

Overall then, the report takes Crick's vision of citizenship education, which places a similar emphasis on compromise between promoting values which protect the state, and encouraging a critical approach towards it, as Gutmann's democratic education, and presents it in a politically palatable form, with all of its elements just about intact, albeit with the critical elements somewhat downplayed and limited to discussion of decisions within the society rather than its underlying nature. It then uses a structure which encourages teachers to make key decisions about delivery through its 'light touch' approach. This gives the implementation of the report an unusually prominent role in defining the actual emphasis that citizenship education will have in schools, something that will be explored in the Chapters Seven and Eight, which deal with policy.

Criticisms of the Crick Report

This section will deal with some of the criticisms made of the Crick Report; it will only attempt to provide a brief overview, since the central question of this research concerns the purpose of citizenship education and observations relevant to this area have been

explored above and in the previous chapter. Nevertheless, touching upon other critical responses helps to contextualize the report within the wider field of educational research. Criticism relating to policy matters and implementation, which are particularly important given the responsibility placed on school leaders by the 'light touch' approach of the report are dealt with in the policy chapters, while those relating to race and multiculturalism will be considered in slightly more detail since they contribute directly to the addition of a 'fourth strand' to the citizenship National Curriculum, and therefore are partly responsible, for what might be considered a shift with regard to the perceived purpose of citizenship education.

Faulks (2006a p.59-60) criticizes the report for being too abstract and of failing to give enough consideration to institutional or social structures, but Rainsford (2011 p.4) sees this as a 'sophisticated vagueness' which presents an ideal, and suggests ways of moving towards it. As previously discussed the report is attempting a difficult balancing act both politically, and in terms of producing both a statement concerning the purpose of citizenship and a workable means of implementing it as a curriculum subject. It is therefore not surprising that Crick aims for broad agreement on principles (Mclaughlin, 2000 p.554) both in terms of definition and policy. As McLaughlin observes:

> The Crick Report insists that teachers and others be provided with a clear conception of citizenship… What is involved in this, however, may be more difficult to achieve than is generally realised, particularly given the complexity and controversiality of the notion of citizenship which was noted earlier and the need for complex balancing judgements to be made in relation to it (Mclaughlin, 2000 p.560).

Haydon (2003) expresses a concern that the three strands identified by the report may not always be mutually supportive and that a particular interpretation of one of the strands may compromise the effectiveness of the others. He shows a particular concern for interpretations of moral and social responsibility which may lead to some individuals within society feeling excluded and limited in their ability to engage with the community involvement and political literacy elements. The report acknowledges that moral and social responsibility can not be taught separately but must be integrated with the other elements in a way which encourages an inclusive approach (QCA, 1998 p.59-62). However, Haydon (2003) argues that the moral element of citizenship must be more clearly defined and limited only to those norms which are necessary for the continued operation of a liberal society, suggesting, 'We need to make a distinction between citizenship education (even its moral and social responsibility aspect) and moral education in general' (Haydon, 2003 p.87). This is what Crick is attempting to describe when he makes reference to an 'overlapping consensus' but it is clear that Haydon feels it needs to be more clearly defined.

Perhaps inevitably given the nature of the compromise that the Crick Report struck, with regard to the more progressive and conservative elements of citizenship, the report comes under political attack from both the left and the right.

Garminokow and Green (1999 p.122) see the report as lacking in ambition particularly with regard to the promotion of social justice. They accept there are positive aspects to encouraging a greater engagement with politics but object to Crick's acceptance that economic responsibility has shifted from the state to the individual, and the absence of

any attempt to deal with inequalities built into the structure of society. Crick, they argue, settles on a timid version of political literacy that is instrumental rather than critical, concentrating on 'effectiveness in public life' (Gamarnikow and Green, 1999 p.118). Given his background and previous writing it is likely that Crick would have some sympathy with this criticism and would simply offer in mitigation that, given the failure to establish the subject in the past, it is was necessary to compromise in order to secure the establishment of the subject within the curriculum, and that, hopefully, the 'light touch' approach may create a space where more progressive ideas might be explored.

Crick's lack of room for manoeuvre is apparent when the criticisms of Flew, writing on behalf of the Institute of Economic Affairs (I.E.A), are considered. He attacks the principle of compulsory citizenship education on the basis that there is insufficient protection against the introduction of ideological bias by teachers, citing the example of Peace Studies in the 1980s as an example of political discussion in the classroom being used as a form of indoctrination (Flew, 2000 p.19-21). Although the report acknowledges that care must be taken when dealing with controversial issues it suggests that teachers already face these problems in other subjects and:

> Teachers are aware of the potential problems and are professionally trained to seek for balance, fairness and objectivity. Furthermore, safeguards in education law exist to guard against biased and unbalanced teaching or indoctrination (QCA, 1998 p.8).

Flew does not accept this reassurance, arguing that teachers are not sufficiently well trained in this area and that the report makes unjustified assumptions about the level of teachers' knowledge in areas such as justice, human rights, equality, racism and, particularly, the European Union. As a consequence he concludes:

> The Advisory Group has provided us with no sufficient evidencing reason for believing that we already possess a teaching force able and willing to inspire and with impartial competence to chair the classroom discussions which everyone agrees to be necessary for education in democracy and citizenship… my personal recommendation is that, for the foreseeable future, citizenship education in those schools should be limited to strong encouragement of such purely local and non-ideological projects (Flew, 2000 p.35)

It is noticeable that Flew concerns himself primarily with what *might* happen in the classroom, rather than taking particular issue with the learning objectives identified by the report, and therefore, it might be argued, gives the impression more of a general mistrust of the teaching profession, when let near political issues, than of Crick's report.

Rainsford (2011 p.1) suggests that the major fault with the report is that it aims to provide education for citizenship rather than education for citizens. In other words it does not recognise children as existing rights holders who need to participate in shaping their own citizenship education. As a consequence of this there are also a lack of appropriate institutions that allow young people to practise their citizenship skills. Osler and Starkey reinforce this with the observation that:

> The programme of study for citizenship in schools in England clearly situates children as future citizens… However, just as citizenship has been achieved by women and by other categories to whom it was previously denied, so too have citizenship rights been extended to children. This is recognized under the terms of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which, since 1989, has recognized children's participation rights (Osler and Starkey, 2006 p.445).

The argument that students' understanding of citizenship is significantly enhanced by their own active participation in democratic institutions within their schools is fully accepted by the report and initiatives such as school councils, which are seen as important in this regard (Faulks, 2006a p.67) are supported with reference to examples

(QCA, 1998 p.14). In fact the report reveals that the committee considered making school councils a compulsory requirement but resisted for fear of overburdening teachers (QCA, 1998 p.25). Nevertheless the general tone of the report does give the impression that citizenship education is about preparation for future citizenship, so to an extent these criticisms may be seen as justified.

However, while children may be citizens of the state that does not necessarily make them *citizens* of their schools. Unlike the state, where the rights of citizenship are a necessary protection against over mighty government, schools are a voluntary form of association with free entry and exit, and multiple available alternatives, the adoption of citizenship education by those who advocate wholesale democratization of schools is not, therefore, necessarily justifiable. Undoubtedly the Crick Report could say more about the nature of student participation in schools, and give greater acknowledgement to children's rights as citizens but it is clear in its belief that active involvement, doing rather than learning, is one of the most effective ways of learning the skills as well as the knowledge attached to citizenship.

There has been relatively little criticism of the report with regard to gender issues and Crick is generally regarded as using 'citizen' as a gender neutral term. Although it might be argued that such an assumption is somewhat dangerous, particularly given the historical usage of the concept, where it has often been directly connected with the privileges of property owning men, even critics of the report appeared to have tacitly accepted Crick's understanding of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship as applying entirely equally to men and woman. Often the liberal assumption that universal

161

rights automatically protect women from the effects of prejudice has been demonstrably misplaced but in the case of citizenship education Crick appears to be granted the benefit of the doubt.

The Crick Report and Race

The main criticism of the report made by Osler (and Starkey) is that it fails to address the historically exclusive nature of citizenship on the basis of race (Hodgson, 2008 p.424). She argues that any programme of citizenship education needs to provide opportunities for children and young people to identify barriers to equal citizenship and give them the means for overcoming them. More controversially, she suggests that not only does the report fail to provide an adequate basis for a sound anti-racist programme, it may itself unwittingly reflect racism (Scott, 2000 p.5).

The basis of this argument is that the report fails to take multiculturalism seriously because it is based upon a traditional liberal universalist approach to citizenship, where society is seen as a collection of individuals with identical rights. Although it goes beyond the very narrow confines of a strictly rights-based neo-liberal perspective, to include a communitarian emphasis on rights and responsibilities, it still aims to establish one, clear, common citizenship, which is shared by all. This leads to the criticism that, 'The problem with the (liberal) social-democratic conception of citizenship is that injustice arises as much from treating different peoples as the same as it does from treating the same peoples as different' (Olssen, 2004 p181).

Osler (2000) acknowledges that the report stresses the importance of tolerance, but

argues that this is not enough to develop a multi-cultural society and criticizes the failure to explicitly mention racism at any point in the text. More worryingly she accuses the report itself of racism, both through its unfortunate references to the 'homelands of our minority communities' and most seriously of assuming that ethnic minorities must change in order to participate in the common culture. It is this latter claim that leads to the conclusion that the report is 'institutionally racist' (Osler, 2000 p.33).

These are strong criticisms and on one level it is easy to agree that the report could have handled these issues more sensitively, and should have paid more attention to them. However it should be recognised that Osler is intent on pursuing a human rights based version of citizenship education which is significantly different from the approach that Crick is taking. Aside from a certain clumsiness of execution, the central criticism regarding universalism is not one of Crick, but one of liberalism itself, albeit one that certain liberals, such as Galston, with his particular concern for diversity, have worked hard to address. As Kiwan points out, Osler has a completely different, human rights based, conception of citizenship (Kiwan, 2005a). Ultimately Crick is working to produce a practical document for the implementation of the subject in a liberal democratic state. Therefore, I would argue, Osler is taking aim at the wrong target.

While sharing some of these concerns Olssen is more sympathetic to the report arguing that it can be used, in conjunction with the Parekh Report on multiculturalism (Parekh, 2000), to establish a richer understanding of citizenship, which resolves the tension between universality and difference:

> While it is true that the Crick Report tends to ignore racism, multiculturalism, and any sophisticated understanding of how the politics of difference might

inform citizenship education, I am arguing here that it need not do so, at least on the grounds of theoretical coherence, and that the Parekh Report resolves the issues between difference and universality in a way that makes sense. This is to say, that to be a consistent multiculturalist one must be committed to democratic values at a minimum… What universal democratic justice promotes then, is the conditions for an effective multiculturalism, one that gives the members of minority groups equal rights to coexistence with majority culture (Olssen, 2004 p.188).

This he recognises is a position similar to the one outlined by Gutmann in her democratic education; that multiculturalism is not incompatible with liberal universalism. Although she sees it in rather more traditionally liberal terms, as maintaining the neutrality of the public sphere, something that itself brings to mind Crick's 'overlapping consensus'.

I would suggest that, while the Crick Report dealt less confidently with race than with most other issues, some of the more extreme accusations leveled at it in this regard seem unfair. As with the majority of criticisms examined, the major faults of the document appear to lie in its determination to steer a workable middle course through a variety of different areas, of which race was probably the most difficult. The question of multiculturalism and social cohesion was to result in the only major alteration to the citizenship curriculum since the report, the addition of a fourth strand following the 7/7 bombings and the Ajegbo Report (Department for Education and Skills, 2007), developments which are discussed in the next chapter.

Overview

Overall the Crick Report is consistent with the development of Crick's thinking discussed in the previous chapter, however, there is no doubt that he felt the need to

limit his ambition and curb his own inclinations in order to find a formulation of citizenship education which was politically acceptable. It seems likely that his hope was, as I suggested earlier, that by encouraging a 'light touch approach' the subject may naturally move in a more progressive direction. If this was the intention, it involved placing a considerable amount of faith in citizenship teachers themselves, something that, as one of those teachers, I am glad Crick felt able to do. Unfortunately it also suggests a certain naivety about the time and curriculum pressures that both the subject, and its teachers, would face in the real world of secondary school education. Such an approach also meant the subject was unusually reliant upon educational policy makers to define both its ethos, and the nature of its implementation. Whether Crick was over-optimistic with regard to this will be discussed in Chapters Seven and Eight.

6) The Ajegbo Report and Citizenship

'It doesn't completely not ring a bell.' (Citizenship Coordinator, Guildford Road)

Much of my research, regarding the purpose of citizenship education, has focused on the Crick Report, and its theoretical underpinnings, as this document was almost entirely responsible for the tone and content of the 1999 National Curriculum Order which introduced it as a compulsory subject in English Schools. However, any examination of current perceptions of its purpose must acknowledge a significant additional influence in the shape of the Ajegbo Report, or more formally, the 2007 Curriculum Review into Diversity and Citizenship, chaired by Sir Keith Ajegbo. Not only does this report address some of the issues raised in the previous chapter with regard to the Crick Report's handling of race issues, more importantly, with regard to this research, it directly influences the revised National Curriculum Order of 2007 with its call for a 'fourth strand' to be added to those identified by Crick; one which explicitly identifies the promotion of social cohesion as a purpose of citizenship education.

This chapter will examine the circumstances behind the commissioning of the Ajegbo Report and its recommendations, as well as exploring whether the changes it prompted represent a significant change in direction for the subject, or simply a shift in emphasis which merely gives greater prominence to pre-existing but underdeveloped elements. It is this interaction with both the Crick Report and the National Curriculum which makes a discussion of the Ajegbo Report relevant to the examination of my second research question. I will also explore these developments within the context of the central question of this research; does the approach of the Ajegbo Report fit more comfortably

with a view of citizenship education as a means of inculcating the values necessary for the survival of the state or as a means of encouraging critical and autonomous citizens? I will suggest that the Ajegbo Report does not make significant alterations to the basic principles identified by Crick, and that the changes it suggests are largely to do with an emphasis on certain policy consideration resulting from shifting political priorities, most notably from concern over political apathy to concern over homegrown terrorism. That is not, however, to suggest that the report is insignificant. Its shifts of emphasis have considerable potential impact in terms of school policies and the way the subject is perceived by those responsible for its delivery. Whilst some teachers and commentators may have welcomed greater clarity in a difficult area, and applauded the use of the subject to deal with relevant contemporary issues, others will have been further confused by changes to a subject which had barely established itself, and whose purpose was already somewhat ill defined as a consequence of Crick's well intentioned, but ultimately problematic, 'light touch' approach.

The Background to the Ajegbo Report

The commissioning of the Ajegbo Report came about through a combination of a general concern with issues of Britishness, social cohesion and diversity, and a specific need to respond to the events of the London bombings of the 7th July 2005, which had led to a dramatically increased fear of so called 'homegrown' terrorist attacks, perpetrated not by foreign extremists, but by alienated British citizens. Even before these events Trevor Philips, the head of the Commission for Racial Equality, had begun to express concerns that the policy of multiculturalism, at least as it was commonly understood, had sometimes caused more problems than it had solved by emphasising

cultural differences and underplaying the shared values of Britain's diverse religious and ethnic groups (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.11). Although this had received some media coverage, it took the London attacks to really focus the minds of politicians on the role citizenship education might play in promoting social cohesion. Osler (2008 p.2) suggests that although education was a stated priority of the Blair government from the 1997 election, it was only after the terrorist attacks that senior government figures began to stress the importance of education in uniting the nation and points to examples of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown making speeches that connected education, Britishness, and British values to the importance of multiculturalism.

Neither Brown nor Blair made the connection to the fear of terrorism explicit, the emphasis being placed firmly on the uniting values of Britishness:

> Britishness is not just an academic debate... Indeed in a recent poll, as many as half of British people said they were worried that if we do not promote Britishness we run a real risk of having a divided society…And I believe that out of a debate, hopefully leading to a broad consensus about what Britishness means, flows a rich agenda for change: a new constitutional settlement, an explicit definition of citizenship, a renewal of civil society, a rebuilding of our local government and a better balance between diversity and integration" (Brett, 2007 p.1 quoting Gordon Brown).

However the circumstances of the announcement of the review made the connection more obvious:

> On 15 May 2006, Bill Rammell, Minister of State for Higher Education and Lifelong Learning, announced that the DfES was commissioning a review of National Curriculum citizenship's coverage of diversity issues and how modern British cultural and social history might be incorporated into the citizenship curriculum. *At the same time, he also announced a review of university teaching of Islam* [my italics] (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.12).

Despite the understandable effort to focus on the uniting concept of "Britishness", rather than directly identifying, or targeting, alienated sections of society, government ministers found it difficult to pin down exactly what was meant by the concept, often simply listing fairly generic values of a liberal democracy (O'Hare and Gay, 2006):

> It wasn't a question that should have caught Alan Johnson on the hop… when (he) was asked, "What is Britishness?" on Radio 4's Today programme, it was a surprise to hear him dither for a few seconds before listing free speech, tolerance and respect for the rule of law. You couldn't quibble with the ideas, but it was hard to see what made any of these values uniquely British (Crace, 2007).

Brown and Jack Straw dealt with this problem by emphasising the importance of a shared British history, arguing that it was not the values themselves that were British but the process by which the principles were gradually applied here (Brett, 2007 p.2). The lack of clarity in the thinking, or at least the public statements, of the politicians who were responsible for the commissioning of the Ajegbo Report, might suggest that they intended to use citizenship education simply as a means of short term reassurance on an issue of pressing public concern, in much the same way that it had focused upon low turnout and political apathy of young people after the 1997 election. However, the appointment of Sir Keith Ajegbo, to head the review was seen as providing an opportunity to tackle some of the criticisms and apparent shortcomings of Crick's original vision for the subject.

As discussed in the previous chapter, much criticism of the Crick report centred on its treatment of issues related to race. While these criticisms were not the primary driver behind the establishment of the Ajegbo Report, many of those who had criticised Crick's blueprint for citizenship hoped that it would help to address some of the concerns that they had raised. Osler, who had gone as far as accusing the Crick Report of institutional

racism, for its assumption that minority communities must adapt to the behaviours of the majority (Osler, 2000 p.33), expressed the belief that the potential for Crick's political literacy strand to make a meaningful contribution to anti-racism could be unlocked by adjustments which made the discussion of race issues a necessary requirement (Osler, 2008 p.13). Similarly, it seems reasonable to assume that Olssen (2004 p.188), who was slightly more sympathetic to Crick, arguing that his report could be used, in conjunction with the Parekh Report on multiculturalism (Parekh, 2000) to establish a richer understanding of citizenship, would have welcomed the potential of any change to the National Curriculum which might embrace his attempts to resolve the tensions between universality and difference.

Crick was accused of interpreting diversity both pejoratively and passively:

> Critics argued that the Crick Report failed to treat difference plausibly or coherently. Diversity was seen as a problem to be managed rather than an inherent and enriching element of society… A further criticism of the Crick Report in this context is that it represents diversity under key concepts, values and knowledge and understanding but not in relation to active participation under 'skills and understanding'. (Brett, 2007 p.14).

It was these issues that the Ajegbo Report was seen as having the potential to address.

Others felt that while Crick was not guilty of applying negative connotations to the term diversity, his use of it masked a different problem; a failure to engage more directly with the concept of multiculturalism(Eferakorho, 2008 p.2). There was, therefore, also hope that Ajegbo might encourage a more bold approach within citizenship education that would find a way to include greater use of this term, despite its potential for controversy.

Finally, and in marked contrast, some traditionalists, ably represented by the Daily Telegraph's response 'Teach History and Good Citizenship Will Follow' (Daily Telegraph 26th Jan 2007), hoped that the increased focus on Britishness, might lead to changes to the curriculum that would include a refocusing of citizenship, with British History playing a much more prominent part (Brett, 2007 p.7). Although this might seem rather optimistic in light of Ajegbo's focus on diversity, it is understandable given the comments of Brown and Straw mentioned above.

The Findings of the Ajegbo Report

The Report makes a clear statement regarding the importance of dealing with issues of diversity, the failure of schools to do so under the existing National Curriculum, and, its proposed solution, the addition of a discrete fourth strand within the new order:

> We believe there is a moral imperative for diversity and Citizenship education to be inherent in the ethos and intrinsic to the curriculum of every school, in the context of the community within and without the school gates. We will recommend that diversity and Citizenship education be brought together more coherently by developing a fourth strand in the Citizenship curriculum of Identity and Diversity: Living Together in the UK (Department for Education and Skills, 2007 p.22).

The problem was that:

> Issues of identity and diversity are more often than not neglected in Citizenship education. When these issues are referred to, coverage is often unsatisfactory or lacks contextual depth (Department for Education and Skills, 2007 p.7).

These findings were reflected in the evidence given to the Education and Skills Select Committee by Scott Harrison on behalf of OFSTED:

> What we are finding is more teaching of what you might perceive as the central political literacy/government/voting/law area than, for example, the diversity of the UK, the EU, the Commonwealth, which are somewhat neglected, I think, because some of them are perceived to be dull and some of them are particularly sensitive areas that some teachers go to with great reluctance. I am talking about,

for example, the diversity of the UK, which in the Order says, the 'regional, national, religious, ethnic diversity of Britain'. Some people find that difficult to teach (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.15).

The proposal for a fourth strand was designed to address this problem by taking the requirement to address issues relating to diversity, which the report acknowledges are present within the existing, Crick inspired, curriculum, and making it considerably more explicit. The Ajegbo Report makes the suggestion, on more than one occasion, that the 'light touch' approach, envisaged by Crick as a means of ensuring flexibility, has enabled schools to bypass areas of the programme of study that they find either more difficult, or less attractive, with which to deal (Department for Education and Skills, 2007 p.82-83, 88-89). It also puts this within a legal context reminding schools of their statutory obligations under the Race Relations [Amendment] Act 2000 (RRAA) which requires schools as public bodies to promote race equality (Osler, 2008, p. p.14).

The recommendations for the fourth strand themselves state:

> A fourth 'strand' should be explicitly developed, entitled Identity and Diversity: Living Together in the UK This strand will bring together three conceptual components:
> • Critical thinking about ethnicity, religion and 'race'
> • An explicit link to political issues and values
> • The use of contemporary history in teachers' pedagogy to illuminate thinking about contemporary issues relating to citizenship
>
> The following areas should be included:
> • Contextualised understanding that the UK is a 'multinational' state, made up of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales
> • Immigration
> • Commonwealth and the legacy of Empire
> • European Union
> • Extending the franchise (e.g. the legacy of slavery, universal suffrage, equal opportunities legislation) (Department for Education and Skills, 2007 p.12).

The clear statement that there should be critical thinking about race does, at least partially address some of the concerns expressed regarding the Crick Report and this is allied to a suggestion that such consideration must involve active discussion, and potential for disagreement, with regard to these issues rather than a passive acceptance of the need for toleration. Brett (2007 p.7) suggests that the curriculum can serve as a means of teaching pupils to face up to the realities of a diverse and complex Britain and can help to provide pupils not only with the knowledge to understand this but also equip them with the essential skills to participate in political debates themselves.

Rather than associating diversity with knowledge and understanding as Crick did, the report links it to his favorite concept, that of the active citizen, again not substantially deviating from the original blueprint but offering a significant shift of emphasis which builds on the strengths of the original. It certainly sees a full engagement with issues of diversity as an important element of modern British citizenship:

> The link between education for diversity and Citizenship education is clear: whilst we need to understand and celebrate the diverse cultures and backgrounds of the UK's population, we also need to acknowledge what brings us together as active citizens and agents of change…Education for diversity is key to preparing children and young people for the 21st century world (Department for Education and Skills, 2007 p.21).

Perhaps wisely, in light of Alan Johnson's aforementioned difficulties, the report was not keen to emphasis an abstract notion of 'Britishness', preferring to place its emphasis upon the experience of living in contemporary Britain. It observed:

> The term 'British' means different things to different people. In addition, identities are typically constructed as multiple and plural. Throughout our consultations, concerns were expressed, however, about defining 'Britishness', about the term's divisiveness and how it can be used to exclude others (Department for Education and Skills, 2007 p.8)

This pleased those who felt Crick's approach was uncomfortably close to suggesting that minority communities needed citizenship education to bring them into line with the majority (Osler, 2008).

As well as dealing with the fourth strand the report makes a number of other observations regarding citizenship teaching; that pupil voice is an important component (p.9) that it is a subject best taught discretely, not alongside PSHE (p.11), and that Initial Teacher Training and Continuing Professional Development needs improving in the subject (p.11). Further consideration will be given to these issues in the next chapter.

The overall tone of the report is one which is strongly optimistic about citizenship as a subject and its potential for producing genuine change. Its approach is evolutionary rather than revolutionary, avoiding criticism of Crick but looking to make shifts of emphasis where appropriate. Ajegbo acknowledges a shift in priorities, from addressing apathy to dealing with issues of diversity, is largely a result of political changing circumstance but does not see this as compromising the integrity of the subject, or indeed requiring any wholesale change of approach.

The Effect of the Ajegbo Report on the Citizenship National Curriculum

The most obvious impact of the Ajegbo Report and its 'fourth strand' recommendation can be seen in the differences between the 1999 National Curriculum Order and its replacement in 2007. However these changes are not quite as simple as they might seem. Despite the 1999 Order following the recommendations of the Crick Report 'to an unusual extent' (Crick, 2002a p.500) it did not make direct reference to the three strands

which Crick identified; social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy (QCA, 1998 p.42). The various elements of the strands were, instead, contained within a three part programme of study:

1) Knowledge and understanding about becoming informed citizens
2) Developing skills of enquiry and communication
3) Developing skills of participation and responsible action (QCA, 1999 p.16)

The reasons for this are understandable, Crick's strands were broad themes for citizenship education, which linked back to Marshall, and attempted to give some guidance about the underlying purpose of the subject, whereas the Order, was giving a more practical guide to its delivery in the classroom; this is why Crick argued that they should be read together (Crick, 2002a p.500). However, this did lead to confusion amongst citizenship teachers (see interviewee responses in Chapter ten), myself and various colleagues included, about what the 'three strands' were, as they were easily confused with the three elements of the programme of study found in the National Curriculum document, which was more widely read than the Crick Report itself.

It is not immediately clear whether the fourth strand suggested by Ajegbo relates to an addition to Crick's original three, or the three elements of the programme of study. The use of the term 'strand', which does not appear at all in the National Curriculum document, would strongly suggest it finds its home with the former, however it is closer in tone to the latter, and, given the potential breadth of Crick's original three strands, would arguably be a superfluous addition there. This is, perhaps, a moot point, but what is significant is that, unlike Crick's strands, it is directly transferred to the National Curriculum. The 2007 Order contains a section entitled 'Identities and diversity: living together in the UK', confusingly not as a 'fourth strand' but as one of three 'Key

176

Concepts', which sit alongside three 'Key processes', to form the new guidance on the curriculum:

Identities and diversity: living together in the UK

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

b Exploring the diverse national, regional, ethnic and religious cultures, groups and communities in the UK and the connections between them.

c Considering the interconnections between the UK and the rest of Europe and the wider world.

d Exploring community cohesion and the different forces that bring about change in communities over time (QCA, 2007a p.28) (QCA, 2007b p.42).

The content also relates strongly to Ajegbo's fourth strand recommendations, but with some important differences. Most notably the section above does not, unlike Ajegbo, make direct reference to 'race'. It is also apparent that the phrase 'community cohesion', beloved of New Labour policy makers at the time (Fairclough, 2000), which although discussed by Ajegbo does not feature in his fourth strand, has been elevated to a position of greater importance. The difference between issues of diversity and social cohesion may be largely semantic in this case but the language used almost certainly reflects the political priorities of the government at the time. Finally, where Ajegbo was explicit about the need for 'critical thinking' on these issues, the Order talks about the need to be 'informed' suggesting a more passive approach, which, perhaps it might be argued, prioritizes the needs of the state when it comes to managing a diverse population.

Response to the Ajegbo Report

Generally the Ajegbo Report was welcomed as making a useful contribution to the development of citizenship education. The Commons' Education and Skills Select Committee made clear that its own investigation came to similar conclusions as Ajegbo:

> We took evidence throughout our inquiry, which ran concurrently with the Ajegbo review, on the proposals as we understood them - namely, that the citizenship curriculum may be augmented to include more elements of British cultural and social history, in the context of a concern to strengthen a shared sense of belonging; and that diversity issues may need to be covered more adequately in the school curriculum, including in citizenship education. Broadly speaking, our findings support those of Sir Keith Ajegbo (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.13).

It was therefore happy to endorse both the report itself and the government's adoption of its proposals, accepting the central recommendation that the citizenship curriculum be amended to have a closer focus on issues of identity, diversity and belonging (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.5).

This might be regarded somewhat cynically, as simply a Labour dominated committee, endorsing the decision of a Labour government, to adopt recommendations that it had fairly heavily hinted at before it even commissioned the report. However, this would be to fail to give credit both to the independence of the report, which was perhaps more radical than was initially expected, for instance being fairly critical of the notions of 'Britishness' that had been espoused by some prominent members of the government, and the independence of the committee, which, while generally supportive of Ajegbo did raise several concerns regarding the recommendations.

These concerns included, the danger that the fourth strand would weaken the emphasis on participation and active citizenship that had been such a strong element of Crick's

178

original vision, as well as practical considerations, such as fears expressed by teachers that adding additional elements would overburden the curriculum and lead to excessive time pressure. Teachers' unions expressed concerns about the potential for curriculum overload, with John Dunford, general secretary of the Association of School and College Leaders stating 'Diversity should not be added as a separate requirement to an already overcrowded curriculum' (Brett, 2007 p.9).

As a citizenship teacher at the time, my concern was not so much with changes to the content but simply the fact that changes were already being made to a subject that we had barely established within the curriculum. Other teachers I interviewed during the course of my field research also commented that the sense of 'permanent revolution', to borrow a phrase, was a major source of stress and confusion.

It also considered the possibility that Ajegbo's aims would be better achieved through the teaching of History. Although the committee did not support this conclusion, much of the criticism that the report did face from the right of the political spectrum focused on this issue:

> Shadow education secretary David Willetts was less openly critical, welcoming 'the broad thrust of the Ajegbo Report' and acknowledging the importance of community cohesion, but he added that: "Grounding citizenship on the teaching of British history is crucial…We believe citizenship shouldn't just be taught in the abstract but linked very closely to narrative British history" (Brett, 2007 p.8).

Perhaps the most vociferous critics of the Ajegbo report were those, most notably Osler, who saw it as yet another missed opportunity to engage successfully with race issues. Despite offering some extra impetus to teaching about diversity, she argues that the

report failed to adopt a critical perspective on race or multiculturalism, or adequately engage with young people's lived experiences of citizenship within a globalised world (Osler, 2008 p.11).

She admits that the fourth strand has possibilities, but argues that it is ultimately limited by the existing framework, defined by Crick, and that it therefore lacks the ability to enable the critical thinking which it wishes to see adopted. This framework is, she believes, as we saw in the previous chapter institutionally racist itself. Perhaps the most damning accusation is that despite its good intentions the Ajegbo Report may do more harm than good by giving the appearance of change without providing the means to back it up:

> My fear is that the Ajegbo report and the addition of a fourth strand on 'identity and diversity' may prove to be a new placebo. If schools promote a depoliticised multiculturalism which does not encourage political literacy or critical analysis there is a real danger that this will leave unchallenged (and possibly disguise) the considerable inequalities within schools, while allowing individual institutions to assert they are fulfilling their duty to promote community cohesion (Osler, 2009 p.13).

Ultimately, I would suggest, the criticism of the report by both Osler and Eferakorho is inevitable as they are promoting a vision of cosmopolitan citizenship which is concerned with the human rights of individuals that should be protected by the international community (Osler, 2008 p.22) (Eferakorho, 2008 p.5). This is a very different approach to citizenship which traditionally focuses on the relationship between the individual and the nation state (Kiwan, 2005a). Both Crick and Ajegbo, along with the vast majority of other commentators, took the later view as their starting point, commissioned as they

were by a national government. It is not so much that the two sides disagree, as much as they are simply at cross purposes.

Does the Ajegbo Report Indicate a Change in the Purpose of Citizenship Education?

Although discussion regarding the merits of the Ajegbo Report as a means of tackling racism is important, for this research the primary interest lies in whether it shifted, to any significant degree, the perception of the purpose of citizenship. With regard to practitioners themselves, this will be a question that will be tackled by my primary research with school leaders. However, it is also necessary to examine just how different the version of citizenship present in Ajegbo's report was to the version in Crick's.

Crick, in one of his last pieces of writing, made clear that he did not believe that changes, whether in the name of issues surrounding diversity or community cohesion, were necessary, or indeed helpful, in addressing the problem of home grown terrorists:

> Some ministers began to think that a revised citizenship curriculum could help greatly against recruitment to terrorist organisations. I thought that most unlikely (Crick, 2007b p.153),

However, he recognised the political pressure and welcomed the appointment of Ajegbo. Significantly, he regarded the finished report as firmly within the spirit of his own, with the highlighted issues essentially tackled through his existing framework:

> The emphasis in guidance papers is on discussion of what are or may be shared values and also discussion of what is Britishness. Few teachers would have any confidence about teaching the values of Britishness, whether from their common sense or from a book; so in practice discussion is in the spirit of the rest of the citizenship order (Crick, 2007b p.154).

Significantly, Ajegbo himself accepts that his report primarily represents a shift in emphasis which reflects the political circumstance. The change, which he identifies as necessary, is not the *introduction* of discussion regarding diversity, to the citizenship curriculum, but the need to make it an *explicit requirement*. This is hardly a radical departure. This conclusion would seem to be supported by evidence given to the Select Committee, before the publication of the Ajegbo Report, by the Association of Citizenship Teachers, who argued that a substantive change to the National Curriculum was not necessary (House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, 2007 p.13).

The most significant change was probably one of presentation. As a citizenship teacher at the time I recall much emphasis being placed on the new requirement for the promotion of 'social cohesion', something, as noted earlier, that was not mentioned in Ajegbo's recommendations, but was rather a government priority (note again the use of New Labour policy 'buzzwords') (Fairclough, 2000). Hence the perception of a change was probably greater than any noticeable difference between the two reports, this aspect, as well as Ajegbo's practical criticism of the policy aspects of Crick, such as the 'light touch' approach, will be dealt with in Chapters Seven and Eight.

On the key question regarding the purpose of citizenship education Ajegbo seems entirely comfortable with Crick's compromise, outlined in Chapters Four and Five, between citizenship education as a means of the state developing the values and behaviours that it regards as necessary for its survival and success, and encouraging the autonomy and critical thinking of its citizens. Both emphasize the importance of active citizenship and participation, and both are criticised by those who regard their view of

citizenship as too narrowly tied to the nation state. Both therefore balance what might be regarded as the more conservative and more progressive interpretation of citizenship education and have produced reports which are designed to be acceptable across the political spectrum.

7) Citizenship Education and Policy: Vertical Policy

'The programme of study for citizenship is designed to be 'light touch' and flexible so that schools can build on what they are already doing and develop a curriculum that is relevant to their pupils, connecting with their interests and experiences, and relating to their abilities and backgrounds' (QCA, 2002d p.3).

This research is primarily concerned with the purpose of citizenship education, and educational leaders' understanding of that purpose. However, the policy questions connected to the introduction of citizenship education cannot be ignored, for two key reasons. Firstly, the methods of policy implementation can provide valuable evidence about the way in which the purpose of the subject is perceived; and, secondly, the nature of policy implementation can potentially compromise the intended purpose of the subject. For example, the observation of a very traditional didactic approach to the delivery of the subject and its assessment, may suggest a somewhat conservative interpretation of citizenship education as primarily concerned with producing good, law abiding, tax paying, but ultimately fairly passive citizens; equally a school leader who clearly holds progressive views regarding the purpose of the subject and its importance in promoting an active engagement with, and critical approach towards, our democratic institutions may find that their room for manoeuvre, in terms of classroom activities, is limited by the requirements of their immediate superiors and the education establishment more generally (the use of the terms conservative and progressive in this context is discussed in Chapter Three).

My third research question asks; *What do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by*

theory and policy issues? In order to be able to fully address this question it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the policy issues that citizenship coordinators will encounter, this is the primary purpose of this and the following chapter. These chapters will also, through a discussion of Crick's 'light touch' approach to the subject's implementation, contribute to a better understanding of the issues involved in the shift from the theory of the Crick Report to the practice of the National Curriculum subject of Citizenship, and therefore my second research question.

What is immediately apparent is that the general term policy encompasses a wide range of factors related to the implementation of the subject. There are two main aspects examined in the following chapters, utilizing the distinction, which Colebatch draws, between vertical and horizontal policy. The formal process whereby Crick's Report is turned into a National Curriculum Order and supported by assessment and inspection regimes of the QCA and OFSTED; and the more informal policy making of school leaders as they look for ways to implement these national policies in the most effective and efficient way in their own schools. Ultimately I will try and draw some conclusion both about the way in which the question of purpose has affected the creation of policy, and the way the particular policies regarding the implementation of the subject may have impacted upon schools' perceptions of its purpose.

Colebatch – Vertical and Horizontal Policy

When considering policy, in many ways we are considering two interrelated ideas. Policy can be understood in 'vertical' terms as 'top down'; a deliberate plan of action to guide decisions and achieve particular outcomes. In educational terms this would

include policy and directives from the government, and official bodies such as OFSTED or the QCA. At a more local level it may emanate from the local education authority or even individual school managers and headteachers. However, policy may also be used in a 'horizontal' sense to denote what is actually done 'on the ground' even though it may differ from 'official policy', or even be unplanned. This may relate to the approach of individual teachers, departments, or even the aforementioned local authorities or headteachers who, whilst they might create 'vertical' policy for those below them, respond in a 'horizontal' manner to those decisions from higher up the chain of command.

Colebatch draws a distinction between what he refers to as the 'vertical' and 'horizontal' dimensions of policy stating:

> In the vertical dimension, the focus is on the authorities making decisions, and policy activity is seen in terms of 'decision support' (e.g. identifying and comparing options), checking that decisions have been executed and that they have had the desired effect. In the horizontal dimension, the focus is on the range of participants, the diversity of their agendas and the limited capacity to impose a solution by the use of authorized decisions. Policy activity is seen more in terms of negotiation, coalition-building, and the generation and ratification of agreed outcome (Colebatch, 2002 p.111).

As a working citizenship teacher I inevitably came to this research with certain preconceptions about how policy decisions were affecting the subject, and much of my early reading confirmed my feelings that two major areas of difficulty existed with regards to policy in citizenship education. Firstly that the 'vertical' policy had been somewhat confused and ill defined and secondly, that 'horizontal' policy was often driven and defined by priorities other than those defined by the decisions of the 'vertical element'. In other words, the combination of the Crick report and the Citizenship Order

was not clear enough in establishing a policy framework for the delivery of citizenship, and the reality of staffing, and curriculum problems, meant that policies followed within individual schools, for their teaching of citizenship, often severely compromise some of its key components. Crick's 'light touch', rather than freeing teachers to pursue their own interpretations of the subject, had the opposite effect to that intended, and saw time pressed and confused teachers retreat into the certainties of the most traditional approach in the classroom. This was compounded, I felt, by an educational establishment which immediately emphasised assessment (QCA) and inspection (OFSTED) thereby further shifting teachers' focus from the purpose of the subject and concentrating it on ensuring a check list of externally provided criteria were met.

Whilst I believe there remains some truth in the observations made above, a more detailed examination suggests that the situation is more complicated. Whilst the 'light touch' approach was, to a certain extent, problematic, it was initially supported by the National Curriculum Order (QCA, 1999) and by the regimes of assessment and inspection. Arguably, what then happened was that a combination of problems of delivery on the horizontal policy axis, and the increasing concern that this promoted from the authorities responsible for the vertical axis, created something of a vicious circle where the authorities became more prescriptive and critical, and the schools responded not by engaging more fully with the requirements of the subject itself but by attempting to ensure that they were producing sufficient evidence for inspection, often at a cost to the particular nature and requirements of citizenship education itself:

> I think it (OFSTED inspection) took out valuable time, because I did stuff to have evidence... I did that to meet what I'd been told to do… Was it useful?

Probably not. (Citizenship Co-ordinator, Guildford Road (see Chapter Eleven for more views on policy)).

This chapter, and the subsequent one, will briefly examine the development of both vertical and horizontal policy from the publication of the Crick Report onwards, in an attempt to understand both how they interacted with each other, and how each may have impacted upon the perceptions of purpose, held by the citizenship coordinators that were interviewed in the course of my research. It will trace the development of 'official' policy through the creation and revision of the National Curriculum, informed by input from both OFSTED and the QCA and its successors. Whilst the following chapter will take a parallel look at some of the practical policy issues that were faced by schools who were introducing a brand new and somewhat ill defined subject into the compulsory curriculum.

The Crick Report, Light Touch and the Original National Curriculum Order

Citizenship as a subject has had a considerably more complicated relationship with policy than most areas of the curriculum. The Crick Report, which offered some fairly well defined expectations in terms of its perceived benefits and outcomes, was deliberately vague when it came to questions of implementation. Crick saw this flexibility as vital, giving individual schools the ability to offer citizenship education in the form that was most appropriate for its students. However, it could also be argued that it was, at least partly, based upon the recognition that as soon as you make clear policy decisions about the way citizenship is taught you also affect what is learnt about citizenship. Perhaps more than any other, citizenship is a subject which is defined by the

context in which it is taught, and although Crick may have been understandably reluctant to impose a clear policy framework for the subject's delivery, at least in part to avoid concerns regarding space within the curriculum and accusations of politicisation, I believe he should have realised that by failing to do so he was risking a situation where his hopes for the subject were, at least in some instances, likely to be compromised by the nature of the individual school's teaching policies.

There is a, possibly apocryphal, story that Crick claimed that the only thing worse than chairing a public committee whose conclusions are rejected, is to chair one where almost all are accepted. The degree to which the Crick Report successfully combined the various government policy priorities, using the concept of 'civic republicanism' to capture the emphasis both on individual rights, and responsibility to the community, is reflected in the fact that the statutory Citizenship Order 'follows the report to an unusual extent' (Crick, 2002a p.500). Most importantly, in policy terms, the Order, whilst making the subject compulsory, follows the logic of the report in specifying little about the nature of its delivery. Like the report it places its emphasis on outcomes rather than process. This approach which is described as 'light touch' is approved of by Crick for two reasons:

> Firstly it would not be appropriate for the government or its agencies to give precise prescriptions on some politically or morally sensitive matters – the detail should be at 'arms length' from the state…Secondly, in the very nature of citizenship (somewhat concerned with enhancing freedom, after all) there must be local discretion (Crick, 2002a p.499).

Crick's concern to allow flexibility for individual schools seems sensible, showing a sensitivity to the nature of a subject which might become severely compromised by an

over prescriptive approach, and a determination to avoid accusations of political bias. However there are significant weaknesses in this approach. Faulks (2006a p.60-61) expresses a concern that, with different schools free to interpret the rather abstract concepts of citizenship in their own way, they will simply reinforce the existing ethos of their school and the result will preclude an inclusive notion of citizenship. Whilst others, such as Rainsford (2011 p.4) and Miles have pointed out that flexibility can be a weakness as well as a strength:

> Whilst flexibility within the Citizenship Order allows for creative interpretation by some schools it has also allowed for a lack of engagement by others. It is this freedom of interpretation within the policy that has prompted questions about the quality and nature of the citizenship being introduced in schools (Miles, 2006 p.713).

Whilst the first concern is, perhaps, unavoidable, given the acceptance that all policy will have 'horizontal input', the second highlights something of a paradox, namely that sometimes greater freedom within the curriculum will lead to a more rigid and inflexible approach to classroom teaching. This will be a particular danger when, as with the Citizenship Order (QCA, 1999), clear learning outcomes are specified, but methods are not.

Scott highlights that in order to make a 'light touch' approach workable, within the limitations of the existing National Curriculum policy, it was necessary to focus heavily on outcomes, to balance the lack of prescription when it came to pedagogy, and that this may have created an emphasis on assessment which risked being counter-productive, as far as the initial intention to maintain flexibility was concerned (Scott, 2000 p.4). The suggestion is that, within the context of the publication of the Citizenship Order (QCA,

1999) being accompanied by QCA assessment and reporting material, and OFSTED's *'framework for inspection'* (OFSTED, 2002a), 'the move from tightly prescribed outcomes to tightly prescribed activities designed to achieve those outcomes is all too easy to make in a climate that favours immediate and obvious measures of accountability' (Halliday, 1999 p.51).

Kerr (1999 p.278) describes the intention that the 'light touch' nature of the order should find schools, 'substituting for the present input and output model of the existing National Curriculum subjects, an output model alone based on tightly defined learning outcomes'. However, this is more easily said than done, and with a culture of school policy based around the relatively tightly proscribed demands of the National Curriculum it seems likely that Halliday's fears often became reality. It is telling that the most clearly expressed support for the strong emphasis on learning outcomes came from the deeply conservative Flew (2000 p.15), who in all other respects was strongly opposed to the introduction of citizenship education. He clearly saw this guidance as offering some protection against politicized teachers pursuing their own agendas, something he felt had happened in the 1980s with the teaching of 'Peace Studies' and other 'anti-establishment' subjects (see Chapter One).

The focus on learning outcomes also raises a philosophical issue about the current status of pupils. Biesta and Lawy argue that if the focus is placed upon citizenship as an outcome then young people are placed in the position of 'not-yet-being-a-citizen'. They suggest that, 'Citizenship is not so much a status, something which can be achieved and

maintained, but that it should primarily be understood as something that people continuously do: citizenship as practice' (Biesta and Lawy, 2006 p.72). It seems highly likely that Crick would have considerable sympathy with this viewpoint, given the emphasis that he wished to see on active citizenship. However, once again he was working within existing parameters and saw 'light touch' as the best compromise between the competing pressures of a tightly defined National Curriculum and a demand for a more progressive approach to citizenship and education for democracy.

The danger that citizenship teaching would, contrary to Crick's intentions, fail to embrace a variety of teaching approaches, and instead follow a 'death by worksheet' approach, designed to clearly demonstrate the achievement of particular learning outcomes, was an acute one, because of the potential for a general lack of understanding about citizenship amongst the, largely non-specialist, staff who would deliver it. Crick himself emphasised that the Citizenship Order should not be read in isolation but in conjunction with the report so that its prescriptions can be justified and explained (Crick, 2002a p.500). This echoes Tate's reasoning that, 'If teachers are able to develop a shared sense of what a particular subject is for they are more likely to teach it well than if they are simply following a prescribed set of procedures' (Tate, 2000 p.69) These observations certainly chime with my personal experience, both as a teacher and head of department. McLaughlin comments:

> The order is not self explanatory with regard to its rationale and values; it is in the nature of such a document that it offers only a 'formal' statement of aims and a justification that is implied rather than fully articulated. Attention therefore needs to be paid to the rationale offered in the Crick report' (Mclaughlin, 2000 p.558)

Unfortunately, as my research shows, it is highly unlikely that many schools' citizenship coordinators, let alone the teachers they were coordinating, had time to read and digest the Crick Report in full.

Crick saw flexibility as an advantage:

> The virtue of the order is that the generality of its prescriptions will leave the school and the teacher with a good deal of freedom and discretion, possibly more than in other statutory subjects… No other National Curriculum subject was stated so briefly, left so much to the individual teachers in different schools in different circumstances (Crick, 2002a p.499).

But it was also potentially a major weakness in a subject that was relatively new, not particularly well understood, and lacking in specialist staff. The potential problem is neatly summed up by McLaughlin:

> The resultant provision, especially given the need to take account of the overlaps and complementarities between citizenship and PSHE and spiritual, moral, social and cultural development, will result in an overall incoherent provision (McLaughlin p.558).

However, given the need to immediately demonstrate at least some success to OFSTED, in terms of learning outcomes and assessment it was perhaps more likely that citizenship would be simplified into a more rigid and easily deliverable form, 'At worst citizenship education may collapse into the "safe and dead, dead safe, old rote learning civics", which Bernard Crick and others fear' (Mclaughlin, 2000 p.559) My experience, in line with that of several interviewees (see Chapter Eleven), is that where this was the case such an approach would generally be accompanied by a nod to the 'active citizenship' in the order, which in reality was little more than a renaming of schools' existing community service or charity work.

The intention of the 'light touch' policy was clearly positive. Well informed staff, with a clear and nuanced understanding of citizenship, should be given room to manoeuvre and develop appropriate teaching for their institutions, by a 'bare bones' framework which concerned itself with outcomes rather than methods of delivery, and left space for the competing conceptions of the purpose of citizenship, such as those of Galston and Gutmann, discussed in Chapter Three, to co-exist.

Unfortunately the reality is that Crick was probably over optimistic in his belief that teachers could quickly and easily establish a clear conception of citizenship education (evidence of this can be seen in some of the comments of interviewees in Chapter Eleven). As McLaughlin (2000 p.560) notes, 'what is involved in this… may be more difficult to achieve than is generally realised, particularly given the complexity and controversiality of the notion of citizenship' and this is before 'horizontal' elements such as lack of time, resources and specialist training are considered. In these circumstances the advantages of a 'light touch' approach could quickly become liabilities. Crick's right hand man on the committee David Kerr acknowledged that:

> The Citizenship Advisory Group has worked hard to develop a definition, framework and approach to citizenship education which offers consensus, and to get Citizenship Education as an entitlement for all pupils in the revised National Curriculum. However, policy can only ever provide opportunities for change. Such opportunities must be grasped and acted upon (Kerr, 2003a p.8).

Kerr hoped that funding for Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs) , the provision of material by Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and the establishment of 'communities of practice' would help to flesh out the 'light touch' and assist teachers in developing the curriculum. However, these still required a level of engagement from working teachers,

the majority of whom had more pressing priorities than citizenship. Where the hope was that the 'light touch' would stimulate variety and innovation by giving teachers flexibility, the reality in many cases has been that citizenship has been 'bolted on' to PSHE (Personal, Social and Health Education), its learning outcomes theoretically met by worksheet provision, and its delivery depressingly formulaic (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003; Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005) with little opportunity for the kind of active engagement that forms such an important part of Crick's conception of 'civic republicanism'. Whilst the enthusiasm and commitment of the interviewees who I spoke to as part of my field research was very impressive, many of these problems were apparent in my discussions with them and are examined in Chapters Ten, Eleven and Twelve.

The Development of Citizenship Education as National Policy

The next chapter will consider some of the practical difficulties that individual schools and teachers faced when attempting to implement Crick's 'light touch' vision. The remainder of this chapter will examine the development of official, 'vertical', policy for citizenship education and attempt to establish the extent to which the 'light touch' was maintained, and, where evidence of a more heavy handed touch is apparent, establish whether this was because of any change in perception regarding the purpose of the subject or simply a response to 'horizontal' policy failure, in schools' implementation.

The CELS, Horizontal Research and Vertical Policy

In 2001 the then DfES, commissioned the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) to undertake a longitudinal study extending over a total of nine years, in order

to track a cohort of young people who first entered secondary school in 2002, and were therefore the first students to have had a continuous entitlement to citizenship education

The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) occupies a space somewhere between the chapters on vertical and horizontal policy; this is because, whilst it examined the implementation of the new subject in schools through its stated aims to:

- Assess the short-term and long-term effects of citizenship education on young people in England;
- To explore whether different processes – in terms of school, teacher and individual-level variables – can have variable results and produce different outcomes (Keating et al., 2010 p.7).

Also included in its brief was:
- To consider what changes could be made to the delivery of Citizenship Education in order to improve its potential for effectiveness (Keating et al., 2010 p.7).

This meant that as well as reporting on the implementation of policy, the annual reports of the CELS, which provided recommendations for the Department of Education (in its various guises), OFSTED and the QCA (in its various guises), helped to shape the development of vertical policy, highlighting areas of concern and suggesting possible remedies.

Given the importance of the research in providing key judgements about the success or otherwise of a brand new curriculum subject an extremely comprehensive research design was constructed. The first annual report commented on the lack of pre-existing research in the area and pointed out that, what there had been, 'focused more on theoretical and qualitative aspects than on quantitative approaches…', and that, 'This

lack of a strong research base explains the important role of the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study in building strong foundations for this area' (Kerr et al., 2003b p.4).

The original study was designed to include; a seven year longitudinal tracking survey following one year group through (and, in the case of leavers at sixteen, beyond) their entire secondary schooling in a representative sample of one hundred schools, four cross sectional surveys of students in years 8, 10 and 12 across a representative sample of 300 schools, twenty case studies with each school visited every two years for the duration of the study, and finally an ongoing literature review designed to produce at least three reports of its own.

The decision to produce annual reports gives a valuable insight into the development of the research as it progresses, and simultaneously reports upon and attempts to influence the development of the subject. One example is the creation of a series of typologies that are developed through the reports. The second report identifies four approaches to citizenship education; progressing, focused, minimalist and implicit (Kerr, 2004 p.viii). A new typology of approaches is developed by the fifth report; curriculum driven, student efficacy driven, participation driven, citizenship rich driven (Kerr et al., 2007 p.iv) and by the seventh report these have been further developed into; curriculum driven, student efficacy driven, participation driven, and multiple drivers. These changes are mirrored by the priorities identified in contemporary documents from OFSTED and the QCA.

This approach is helpful in many respects, making what would otherwise be an enormous final report more manageable, and, perhaps most usefully, providing an ongoing commentary on the development of the subject. A good example of this is a change of emphasis in the subject from 2008 when the new National Curriculum Order included an instruction that the subject must look to promote greater social cohesion. This development, reported in depth in the seventh CELS Report, is first anticipated with the publication of the Ajegbo report in 2007, discussed in Chapter Six, and its possible ramifications are first discussed in the (fifth) CELS report of that year. To read the reports in order is to be able to trace the ongoing development of the subject within the educational and political policy making context of the UK.

However, there is another reason behind the decision to produce annual reports. As well as looking to provide the definitive judgement, for government at least, on the success of citizenship as a new subject, the CELS was also expected to provide ongoing input into the development of the teaching of the new subject. This is made explicit in the first report which states:

> With Citizenship Education moving rapidly from a policy proposal to a real school subject there is a need to identify, measure and evaluate the extent to which 'effective practice' in Citizenship develops so that such practice can be promoted more widely' (Kerr et al., 2003b p.10).

Each report not only detailed the latest research data and policy context, it made key recommendations to policy makers, educational leaders, teachers and other interested parties. Although it is not acknowledged as such, it seems that the CELS contain a strong element of action research. It aimed to influence and develop policy not simply at the end of the nine year study but while it progressed. This sometimes led to a degree of

circularity, where later reports refer to developments which early reports have themselves encouraged. Particularly since schools participating in the longitudinal survey were likely to have taken at least a passing interest in the reports to which they were contributing their data.

This problem was compounded by the fact that the director of the CELS was David Kerr, who was seconded from the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) to be the Professional Officer on the Citizenship Advisory Group, the body that produced the Crick Report. As a key member of this group Kerr was, along with Crick himself, responsible for drafting the final report upon which the National Curriculum Order was based (Pykett, 2007 p.309). He then headed up a research project into a subject whose content and means of delivery he helped to formulate.

The reference made to other research by the annual CELS reports, by way of giving some triangulation, is usually limited to evidence collected by OFSTED or the QCA. This reinforces the impression that the CELS was very much part of the educational establishment and worked within the vertical dimension of government education policy making. None of this should invalidate the material collected, which is utilized in the next chapter, but it should be remembered that the CELS was as much a part of creating vertical policy as it was reporting on the horizontal.

The National Curriculum, OFSTED and the QCA

Although the 1999 National Curriculum Order followed the recommendations of the Crick report 'to an unusual extent' (Crick, 2002a p.500) it did not make direct reference

to the three strands which Crick identified; social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy (QCA, 1998 p.42). The various elements of the strands were, instead, contained within a three part programme of study:

1) Knowledge and understanding about becoming informed citizens
2) Developing skills of enquiry and communication
3) Developing skills of participation and responsible action (QCA, 1999 p.16)

The reasons for this were discussed in the previous chapter, Crick's strands were broad themes for citizenship education, which linked back to Marshall, and attempted to give some guidance about the underlying purpose of the subject, whereas the Order, was giving a more practical guide to its delivery in the classroom; this is why Crick (2002a p.500) argued that they should be read together. This did lead to confusion about what the 'three strands' were, as they were easily confused with the three elements of the programme of study found in the National Curriculum document, which was more widely read than the Crick Report itself (all my interviewees had read the National Curriculum while only a small minority had read the report) . Nevertheless, although a document designed for direct implementation rather than discussion, the order does indeed retain the overall flavour, and, most importantly, the 'light touch' approach of the report.

Whilst the National Curriculum Order was produced in 1999, some acknowledgement was made of the difficulties of introducing an entirely new subject and its statutory introduction was delayed by two years to allow schools time for planning and preparation (QCA, 2002a p.2). Although it was made clear, as Crick had intended, that assessment was to be an important part of the subject, an immediate difference from other subjects was apparent in the absence of the usual eight point National Curriculum

level descriptors from the schemes of work and assessment advice (QCA, 2002b; QCA, 2002c; QCA, 2002d). In their place was the suggestion that pupils should be described as; working towards, achieving, or working beyond expectations, with regard to their end of key stage performance. Whilst this may not have entirely put at rest the minds of those critics who felt that *any* assessment of citizenship was inappropriate, it certainly indicates some sensitivity towards the particular nature of the subject, as does the recognition that any assessment should, 'measure what we value about citizenship and not value only those aspects that are easy to measure' (QCA, 2002c p.8). The success of this approach and its effect on teachers is discussed in Chapter Ten.

The commitment to 'light touch' is made explicit by the QCA (see the quotation that opens this chapter) as is the acceptability of a wide range of potential methods of implementation within the curriculum:

> This scheme of work is designed to allow teachers to deliver citizenship through a combination of:
> - discrete provision for citizenship within separate curriculum time;
> - explicit opportunities in a range of other curriculum subjects;
> - whole-school and suspended timetable activities
> - pupils' involvement in the life of the school and wider community' (QCA, 2002d p.3)

These points were reinforced in guidance to senior management (QCA, 2002e).

OFSTED also acknowledged that there were specific concerns relating to the introduction of a new National Curriculum subject and admitted that initially at least this would have to be taken into account. In its initial advice to inspectors it states:

> In most schools, where citizenship has been newly established, there may be tentative arrangements as teachers develop, modify and refine provision.

Inspection and self-evaluation should be helpful to this process. During this stage of development, in inspecting and reporting on citizenship, allowance should be made for the emergent nature of the subject (OFSTED, 2002a p.9).

At the same time it made clear that citizenship was a full National Curriculum subject and must be treated as such when it came to carrying out inspections:

You will have to report on how well a school is addressing the National Curriculum in citizenship in the same way that you report for other subjects. In a full inspection, you will complete a subject section of the report and, as with any other subject, your findings will contribute to overall judgements in other sections of the Evaluation Schedule (OFSTED, 2002a p.11).

Although this position may seem slightly contradictory, the two statements can be taken together to suggest that OFSTED was attempting to strike a balance between giving the new subject some space to grow, and develop, and making sure that it was taken seriously as a compulsory element of the curriculum.

However it is noticeable that the overall tone of the OFSTED documents from 2002 is considerably less optimistic than those from the QCA. Even at this stage they were highlighting problems such as; the potentially problematic link to PSHE (Personal, Social and Health Education), complacency and the incorrect assumption that citizenship was already covered by existing provision, failure to properly integrate the three strands, and a reliance upon non-compulsory extra curricular activities (OFSTED, 2002a; OFSTED, 2002b).

By 2003 OFSTED was making explicit the suggestion that the 'light touch' approach was the cause of serious problems with the implementation of the subject. Reporting that half of the schools inspected in its sample were unsatisfactory it stated:

Both during the planning phase and since September 2002 there has been a tension between, on the one hand, the new status of citizenship as a National Curriculum subject and, on the other, the notion that citizenship is a 'light touch' subject… the idea of a 'light touch' and the presence of some (pre-exiting) citizenship elements may have promoted a degree of complacency (OFSTED, 2003 p.9).

This criticism of a 'light touch' approach was not a criticism of Crick's vision of citizenship, in fact in many ways it was a defence of it. OFSTED's concerns reflected; a failure of schools to properly differentiate the subject from PSHE and therefore a failing to give sufficient emphasis to the essentially political elements of citizenship, a tendency to point to isolated examples of skills of enquiry and communication without them being placed within the context of knowledge and understanding about citizenship, and a tendency to refer to individual examples of extra curricular active citizenship when the provision must be an entitlement for all students (OFSTED, 2003; OFSTED, 2004; OFSTED, 2005). The extent of this problem, and teachers' responses to it, is examined in Chapter Twelve.

The QCA annual reports from 2004 and 2005 highlight similar concerns, particularly over the failure to take citizenship seriously as a distinct, compulsory element of the National Curriculum. Often the link to PSHE is cited:

The majority of schools are using PSHE as the main vehicle for curriculum provision for citizenship. Ofsted monitoring shows that sometimes this has simply involved renaming or rebranding aspects of PSHE as citizenship (QCA, 2004 p.5)

The association of citizenship with personal, social and health education (PSHE), and indeed with other subjects, remains a challenge… Clear national guidelines about teaching aspects of citizenship that relate to PSHE, with examples of where the two subjects can be taught concurrently, and those that should be approached separately, would help to create an effective curriculum partnership. (QCA, 2005 p.4)

This issue is, of course, closely related to concerns that are expressed relating to pressure on curriculum time and lack of specialist teachers (both issues that affected nearly all the schools I visited), as bracketing citizenship with PSHE was often seen as a potential solution to both of these problems.

Unfortunately although much of this early criticism of schools implementation could be seen as an attempt to protect Crick's vision for citizenship and ensure that its essential aims and purpose were maintained, albeit with an acknowledgement that 'light touch' may have provided insufficient guidance for schools, its effect was to cause a certain amount of panic amongst school leaders. Unfortunately this did not tend to lead them to increase the timetable allocation, ensure discrete lessons, separate the subject from PSHE or employ more specialist staff, all moves that might have pushed the subject in a more progressive direction. Rather, they increasingly focused on an area where they felt they could most easily demonstrate that the school was taking the subject seriously, assessment.

The various reports suggest that the most common concern raised by schools was how to correctly assess their pupils in the subject (my own research confirmed this was a major issue for citizenship teachers – the different approaches of my interviewees are discussed in Chapter Ten), with 63% requesting the creation of a standard model eight point end of level descriptor (QCA, 2005 p.5). Schools that really wanted to show a commitment to the subject increasingly turned to the GCSE, something which both OFSTED and the QCA had been showing a steadily increasing enthusiasm for throughout the reports previously mentioned.

This shift to a focus on assessment was largely responsible for my feelings, as a citizenship teacher, that I was being pushed in the direction of getting classes to produce easily assessable, knowledge based, written work. However, reviewing the documents from the time it becomes clear that this perception was unfair. The 2006 QCA assessment advice stresses the benefits, indeed the necessity, of using a wide range of assessment types, with only two of the five case studies provided being examples of written work (QCA, 2006). Was I at fault for not carefully reading through QCA documents at the time? Perhaps, but in my defence no senior manager has ever stressed to me the importance of careful and detailed reading of educational policy documents, while many have pressured me to have written work available as evidence for OFSTED inspectors. In this case, as in many, the *perception* of inspection requirements is more important than their actual content.

The clearest indication of OFSTED's commitment to Crick's progressive vision for citizenship comes in the 2006 report 'Towards Consensus', which directly asks the question 'What were the reasons for introducing citizenship? Was it intended to produce compliant young people or to educate them to be critical and active citizens?(OFSTED, 2006 p.1), and answers that:

> What makes the current National Curriculum very different from what was taught a century before is the inter-relationship of the knowledge and understanding with the other two 'strands' of citizenship: enquiry and communication, and participation and responsible action. It is these active elements that make citizenship new and challenging and so moves the curriculum away from 'compliance' towards 'critical democracy' in a school context (OFSTED, 2006 p.8).

With the benefit of hindsight, I feel my original theory, that OFSTED was largely responsible for pushing the subject in a deeply conservative, tick box direction, and

therefore compromising its central purpose, was somewhat unfair. Nevertheless the fact that I, and many of my colleagues, felt this way is certainly worthy of investigation. Discussion of this issue with my interviewees can be found in Chapters Eleven and Twelve.

Naturally, alongside this clarification of the nature of the subject, OFSTED made a number of other observations in this period, suggesting the benefits of more specialist staff and Continuing Professional Development (CPD), more dynamic leadership and higher status for the subject, the potential for greater student involvement and more rigorous assessment (OFSTED, 2006; OFSTED, 2007). Unfortunately it was the last of these that inevitably focused the minds of schools. The CELS reported in 2006 that:

> The main challenges to citizenship education were felt, by school leaders and teachers, to include time pressure, assessment, the status of citizenship and teachers' subject expertise (Ireland et al., 2006 p.iv).

And in 2007 recommended:

> An emphasis on increased discrete delivery, more specialist teachers, stronger leadership, more active and interactive teaching and learning approaches and clearer standards, will contribute to, but not necessarily guarantee, the effective delivery of citizenship in schools (Kerr et al., 2007 p.viii).

In theory the problems faced by the schools and the recommendations of the policy makers were not that far apart. The problem, of course, was that while those recommendations may have gone a long way to addressing some of the concerns, citizenship did not exist in a vacuum. Horizontal policy makers in schools were battling with tremendous pressure on curriculum time, not least from other government initiatives in numeracy and literacy, and were being judged, ultimately, not on whether

they turned out well rounded citizens, but on whether they were meeting a variety of short term, measurable criteria. OFSTED may have shown a clear understanding of Crick's vision, but they weren't testing citizens' interaction with the state, and civil society, ten years later, they had inspectors on the ground that needed immediate evidence for their reports, and for many schools the easiest way to provide this was through traditional forms of assessment.

Aside from the inclusion of the new section on 'identities and diversities', the fourth strand prompted by the Ajegbo Report, as discussed in the previous chapter, the biggest change in the new National Curriculum Order, issued in 2007, was the incorporation of the eight level attainment target descriptors. This development, which had been much requested by schools, brought citizenship into line with other National Curriculum subjects and made it possible to standardize the now statutory end of Key Stage 3 assessment. Although carefully drawn to avoid being too prescriptive this inevitably signaled a move away from the more open ended approach advocated by Crick and many schools will have found the easiest way to judge a student against this criteria was through a piece of written work. Perhaps to counteract this the QCA introduced a new structure to the order which separately emphasised the concepts, processes and content of the curriculum (QCA, 2007a; QCA, 2007b).

The last major OFSTED report into citizenship, in 2010, welcomed the introduction of the eight level scale, and formal reporting requirement, and suggested that the best schools had used the deconstruction of the eight levels to support the development of tighter learning objectives (OFSTED, 2010 p.21). Alongside this they noted that the

schools with exam experience were generally further forward in their thinking about assessment and standards than the other schools visited (OFSTED, 2010 p.22) (See Chapter Ten for interviewee's views on the impact of assessment). The value of written work was reinforced:

> The schools where citizenship was strongest recognised the importance of a written record of students' work in the subject, including independent research using books, printed media and information and communication technology (ICT).-. In one school, inspectors were told that students liked citizenship because they did not have to write anything…Such approaches ignored the need for a distinct body of knowledge that enabled students to become informed as well as active citizens (OFSTED, 2010 p.10).

These references, alongside multiple positive referrals to the GCSE course, combine to give the impression that citizenship is best thought of in the terms of a traditional academic subject. Whilst this might help to tackle the perceived low status of the subject it does shift its emphasis considerably from Crick's original intentions. To take such an impression from the report is not, however, to do it justice. OFSTED, in its publications at least, continued to emphasise the unique nature of what Crick was trying to do. This comes across most clearly in its insistence that the three strands must be mutually supportive and that all of the teaching should have a wider political relevance:

> One of the reasons for establishing citizenship in schools was to engage young people in public life. Government and politics are at the heart of citizenship education, yet some schools and teachers play down their significance because they are perceived as difficult to teach (OFSTED, 2010 p.47).

The report makes reference to a wide variety of possible ways the provision of the subject could be improved, including separating it from PSHE, integrating it more

closely with the student voice programme, and employing more specialist staff. Its

overall conclusions are remarkably similar to the eight year CELS:

> A number of changes could be made to the delivery of citizenship education in
> order to improve its effectiveness. They include looking at ensuring the delivery
> of discrete citizenship lessons, which are planned by CE teachers and linked to
> external examinations or certification. It is also suggested that consideration is
> given to providing citizenship education through to age 18 and providing support
> and training for the 'political literacy' strand and for embedding citizenship
> learning in schools' (Keating et al., 2010 p.iv).

However, the most common response of schools to these reports was not to address

wider structural problems, but to ensure that examples of assessed written work were

available upon the arrival of actual inspectors. Despite continuing to highlight case

studies which promote a form of engaging, active and critical citizenship which chime

closely with Crick's vision (OFSTED, 2011; OFSTED, 2012), the suggestion is that the

progression of this vertical policy has pushed schools in a more and more conservative

direction, where the purpose of citizenship becomes limited to learning the basic

knowledge and disposition to be a 'good' rather than a critical or active citizen.

Where the views that I held at the outset of this research have been challenged, is with

regard to the responsibility for this development. As a practising citizenship teacher I

felt that OFSTED and the QCA were forcing citizenship teaching in a direction that

compromised its purpose. However, it is clear from detailed reading of the reports

outlined above that they remained committed to the framework outlined by Crick, albeit

with a gradual tightening of guidelines to deal with schools that were almost completely

ignoring the subject, or making no attempt to differentiate it from PSHE. Vertical policy

did play some part in shifting the direction of the subject, but in order to properly

understand the developments it is necessary to consider the roles played by the schools themselves; the horizontal policy dimension.

8) Citizenship and Education Policy: Horizontal Policy

'I think it took out valuable time, because I did stuff to have evidence…Twice a year I would sit them down in a room and they would do some writing based around a built up task where I had my criteria that I could mark against. I did that to meet what I'd been told to do… Was it useful? Probably not.' (Citizenship Coordinator, Guildford Road)

Given the issues already raised, by the examination of the development of vertical policy in the previous chapter, it would not be surprising to find that schools, while trying to implement the directives from above have had some difficultly in putting together successful citizenship programmes. However, it is important to remember that the role of horizontal policy makers is not simply to do as they are bid, but is, at least partly, collaborative (Colebatch, 2002 p.111-112). All vertical policy is subject to interpretation and a variety of potential approaches to implementation. Directives may contain certain weaknesses, contradictions and compromises, and sometimes these can be successfully addressed by contributions made to the overall policy on the horizontal axis. This chapter will examine some of the major issues that were experienced by schools as they attempted to implement the National Curriculum Orders, and respond to various initiatives from OFSTED and the QCA. Many of these issues have already been raised through the examination of the alterations that were made to the vertical policy, most notably attempts to define the subject more clearly and encourage more rigorous assessment. However, examination of developments at a national level cannot give the complete picture, since interpretation of national directives plays a key part in their impact.

The previous chapter suggested that, while OFSTED and the QCA had initially been fairly supportive of the 'light touch' approach, they gradually became slightly more prescriptive, at least partly in response to requests from schools themselves. However, it also concluded that, whilst these bodies made their expectations more explicit, they did not fundamentally compromise Crick's vision of a subject with strong critical and active components, and were not responsible for imposing a particular pedagogical approach. This chapter will examine these developments from the schools' perspective and will suggest that it was a combination of their own internal policy difficulties and the *perception* of a more demanding, assessment led, approach from OFSTED, that led many schools to adopt a fairly conservative approach to citizenship, which may well have compromised the original vision, in terms of purpose, that was held by individual citizenship coordinators.

As we have seen the Citizenship Order gave schools a very free hand when it came to implementation. Teachers are free to make their own decisions as to where, when and how the subject is taught and assessed and what specific content is to be included (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003 p.3). With the learning outcomes at least partially suggesting what content is appropriate, there were two main initial policy decisions to be made by schools. Firstly, whether citizenship should be taught as a separate, discrete subject or whether it should be integrated into the existing curriculum, and secondly, how the subject should be assessed.

<u>Timetabling and Discrete Status</u>

A strong case can be made either for integrating citizenship, or, for giving it discrete status. Crick seems, generally, to favour having dedicated lessons, but is mindful of the problems of curriculum overload and ends up rather apologetically pointing out that it could be delivered in a variety of ways including existing tutorial time or general studies time. Faulks is highly critical of this arguing:

> Given the lack of appropriate expertise in schools it imperils the coherence of citizenship education to suggest that it can be delivered 'with whatever combinations with other subjects seem appropriate' (Crick, 1998, para. 5.2.2). It is almost as if having claimed National Curriculum status the Crick Report lacks the courage of its convictions, finding a contradictory form of words that can only be described as a fudge but which puts another ill-defined burden on schools already struggling with a multitude of new initiatives and competing subjects (Faulks, 2006a p.67).

Certainly, it seems fair to suggest that there are tangible benefits in terms of status, and therefore perceived value, for citizenship in having its 'own' lessons. However, it can also be argued that the, admittedly more challenging, option of integrating citizenship teaching into existing subjects, is ultimately more beneficial, showing, as it does, the relevance of citizenship across subject boundaries. Although it does not necessarily meet with OFSTED's approval, since citizenship may become 'invisible', it is not necessarily the case that a student needs to know they are 'doing citizenship' in order to be benefiting from it, and it has the advantage that once revealed its relevance is self evident (Pike, 2007 p.481-482). I am sympathetic to this viewpoint since, as a teacher of both politics and history before citizenship was introduced, I am confident that I was making a contribution to my pupils' civic education without it necessary being labelled or identified as such. On the other hand several of my interviewees stressed the importance of students knowing when they were covering parts of the citizenship

curriculum; usually this was related to concern over inspection requirements (see Chapter Twelve).

A clear distinction needs to be drawn between an ambitious cross-curricular approach which attempts to simultaneously integrate citizenship, and highlight its particular importance throughout the curriculum, and a rather dismissive assumption, as reported in many early OFSTED inspections, that citizenship was already covered and 'we do that already' (OFSTED, 2003). Some citizenship coordinators (CCs) saw the opportunity to use citizenship education as a means of bringing about change across the entire curriculum:

> The most ambitious statement of objectives expressed by CCs included in this research… centre around an aspiration to revitalize, not just a small part, but potentially, the whole curriculum, to make it more socially relevant, focused on positive social and personal outcomes, acting as a catalyst to pedagogic transformation. (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003 p.8).

However, even where such good intentions existed the reality was often much more difficult than expected:

> The cross-curricular provision that other subjects contribute to citizenship… was a process where problems rather than solutions were occurring, and the optimistic expectations of CCs as implementation began had turned into a realization that progress was hard to claim' (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005 p.34).

More often than not it was noted that time pressure that was the major problem, with good intentions regarding cross curricula initiatives being compromised by the requirements of various other developments. Alongside this there was a resistance from heads of existing subjects who perceived a threat to their independence and disliked the interference from another coordinator, particularly one from a new subject that they did

216

not necessarily respect (Leighton, 2004 p.174). My interviewees reported various derogatory terms that had been applied to their subject, most notably 'citizenshit'; attitudes towards the subject are discussed further in Chapter Ten.

In fact the debate was largely academic, relatively few schools opted for a cross curricular approach, and those that did, did so not out of any ideological commitment but in the hope that they could get away with changing as little as possible. The attitude that citizenship was something that was done already and could be demonstrated through a simple audit was observed both by OFSTED (OFSTED, 2003; OFSTED, 2004; OFSTED, 2005) and more small scale research (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003; Leighton, 2004). It was this abuse of the 'light touch' approach which helped in the process of 'hardening' the vertical policy advice discussed in the previous chapter.

As citizenship became established it became clear that the consensus of expert opinion was that citizenship was best taught as a discrete subject (OFSTED, 2010; Keating et al., 2009; Association for Citizenship Teaching, 2012; Department for Education and Skills, 2007). However, this was not the route that most schools chose to take. For various reasons, discussed below, citizenship has consistently been most commonly delivered as part of, or in conjunction with Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE).

Link to PSHE , Lack of Specialist Staff and Lack of Status

The majority of schools opted neither to carefully integrate citizenship teaching into subjects across the curriculum, nor to afford it the status of an important and valid subject in its own right. Rather they paired citizenship with PSHE (Calvert and

Clemitshaw, 2003; Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005) (OFSTED, 2004). This is understandable in many ways, since there are superficial similarities in some of the content and there are pre-existing structures within school timetables upon which citizenship can 'piggy back' thereby minimising disruption to the rest of the curriculum.

In some cases PSHE coordinators were simply expected to absorb citizenship into their remit (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003). This was often explained by there being no obvious candidate for the job (Faulks, 2006a p.69). As a new subject it was inevitable that there would not be a reservoir of specialist trained staff ready made to introduce the subject. Throughout the first decade of the subject's existence OFSTED, the QCA and other interested bodies consistently stressed the need for investment in both Initial Teacher Training (ITT) and CPD for citizenship. The degree of success achieved in these areas is explored in Chapter Ten (one of my ten interviewees had a PGCE citizenship qualification).

Whilst, in the absence of any subject specialist, making a link to PSHE might have seemed an attractive option, it immediately created the potential for the new subject to inherit many of the problems of its more established partner:

> Some of the problems that have always beset PSHE… These same issues are predictably affecting the progress of the initiative. Principally, the status of the subject, resourcing and levels of understanding, training and commitment of staff are ongoing problems (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005 p.31).

PSHE has most commonly been delivered, not by specialist teachers but by form tutors, either in dedicated lessons or in extended form periods. By incorporating citizenship into this arrangement many schools felt they were able to deal with both timetabling and

staffing problems. However, this overlooked the fact that citizenship has its own particular requirements which were not necessarily always compatible with this arrangement, and that there was a danger that an already unsatisfactory arrangement for one subject was now being utilised for two. The requirement to teach PSHE is often resented by members of staff, who wish to concentrate on their own subject area, and lack both the knowledge and inclination to deliver a high quality programme. The concern therefore existed early on that:

> The danger… is the risk of ghettoizing citizenship by locating it in an area that already enjoys low status in many schools and which is often not considered in a holistic way in terms of its contribution to pastoral care provision in the school…The current low status of PSHE in many schools will lead to a corresponding low status for the citizenship curriculum. (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003 p.8-9)

This low status is reinforced by the perception that, due to all teaching staff having commitments to their primary subject, little time is made available for citizenship subject meetings or training. Also the disparate nature of many citizenship 'departments', in other words tutors charged with providing citizenship, makes it very difficult for coordinators to monitor the provision, with most admitting that they have no way of knowing whether their schemes of work are actually being implemented and some strongly suspecting that there are instances where they are not (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005 p.33-34). The coordinators I spoke to had certainly experienced these problems and they are discussed in more detail in Chapter Ten.

It is not just the attitude of staff that is affected by this association, but the general provision made for the subject:

219

> This can be seen in the symbolism surrounding practices and resources: lack of text books – and often exercise books, no homework or end of year reporting. In terms of citizenship, the lack of responsibility points in a number of schools, the lack of recognition of a formal role, the lack of strategic planning and discussion about resourcing and provision at the outset, all cast doubt on the status of the subject (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003 p.4).

These pre-existing difficulties that affected PSHE were made all the more problematic because of Citizenship's status as a brand new subject.

Perhaps most importantly, although there were significant areas in common, much of the distinctively political nature of citizenship was undermined by the assumption that it was just another element in a general attempt to educate students into being 'good' responsible individuals. At the same time it dashed hopes that citizenship could be presented to students in a more dramatically engaging way.

The final CELS report (Keating et al., 2010) did not explicitly identify a link with PSHE as problematic, but it made clear a preference for genuinely discrete citizenship teaching and characterised a means of delivery generally incompatible with the PSHE programmes of most schools. The OFSTED (OFSTED, 2003; OFSTED, 2004; OFSTED, 2005) and QCA (QCA, 2004; QCA, 2005) reports considered in the previous chapter were more forthright, repeatedly identifying the link to PSHE as a, if not the, major factor in poor delivery of citizenship. However it is still the most common method of delivery for the subject, and for all their protestations and models of good practice the educational authorities have not taken the same kind of action to deal with this problem as they did to tackle confusion over assessment. Reports suggested that there was some movement towards the use of specialist teams for teaching both PSHE and citizenship,

which would help to deal with many of the problems outlined above, but in reality these were few in number and will diminish further if, as expected, citizenship loses its statutory status.

Assessment

As was seen in the previous chapter, assessment was the area where the horizontal policy of schools had the most direct impact upon the vertical policy of the educational authorities. The failure of many schools to put any formal assessment in place, combined with the requests for clarification and clear guidance by many others, led to a rethink about the nature of assessment within the National Curriculum framework and a tightening up of the original 'light touch' advice.

Although convinced of its necessity, the nature of assessment was largely left open by the Crick Report (QCA, 1998), and the subsequent Order (QCA, 1999). Crick (2002a) himself expressed a preference for avoiding formal examinations, Faulks (2006a p.68) is critical of this suggesting that, 'His decision to recommend that citizenship be a non-examination subject is questionable if citizenship is to gain equal status with mainstream subjects'. There is some evidence that in schools where it has been examined at GCSE the subject has been more favourably regarded (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005 p.35), and, as noted earlier, OFSTED has reported that, 'Involvement in GCSE citizenship short courses has been generally associated with greater focus, better teaching and higher standards and achievement' (OFSTED, 2005 p.3).

However, it has also been suggested, and perhaps this was what was in the back of Crick's mind, that traditional formal assessment might compromise some of the subject's aims. Pike argues:

> Given the asymmetry in the relationship between assessor and assessed, and the power wielded by the former over the latter, summative assessment of citizenship carried out by teachers or examiners may undermine the values of equality the curriculum is intended to promote (Pike, 2007 p.478).

The argument is that in a subject that hopes to go beyond simple academic concerns, traditional formal exams might not be the most appropriate form of assessment. Pike offers support to the idea of a citizenship portfolio built up over time, which, while it does not entirely alleviate the inherent tension between assessment and citizenship, would at least appear to respect citizens' ownership of their work.

Such a solution is in many ways attractive but was not employed by many schools for two main reasons. Firstly, it required considerably more supervision and involvement from (usually non-specialist) staff, thereby stretching resources and goodwill. Only one of the coordinators I interviewed has pursued this portfolio based approach (see Chapter Ten). Secondly, since OFSTED gradually made explicit their particular satisfaction with the examined route, this became progressively more attractive to schools who wished to be seen to take citizenship seriously. As a consequence assessment tended to polarise between virtually non-existent or fully examined, at least until the revised National Curriculum introduced the standard statutory eight point end of key stage assessment (QCA, 2007a).

In assessment, as in the question of cross-curricular delivery, the space that Crick hoped the 'light touch' approach would create for innovative and creative thinking about the teaching of citizenship was not really utilised. Schools, pressed by worries about inspections and lack of space in the curriculum, simply adopted solutions that fitted most easily into their existing structures. Those who expressed concerns that the learning outcomes approach would lead to an assessment driven subject, which left little room for the flexibility required by the subject (Halliday, 1999; Scott, 2000; Biesta and Lawy, 2006), were, initially at least, worrying about the wrong problem; excessive assessment wasn't stifling citizenship, in fact, in the early days at least, there was relatively little of it going on (OFSTED, 2004; OFSTED, 2005).

This highlights a dilemma that was faced by many citizenship coordinators, rigorous assessment helps to ensure that citizenship is being delivered, and helps to raise its status within the school, particularly where that assessment takes the form of a public exam (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005 p.35). Unfortunately it may also be argued that such a strong focus on assessment may compromise the purpose of the subject, through encouraging the utilisation of a traditional results driven approach in the classroom, or indeed create a situation where assessment itself is driving the curriculum. Recognising this fear, Jerome suggests that it can, at least partly, be allayed by utilising a variety of approaches; formal examinations, class tests, extended writing, presentations, portfolios and peer assessment (Jerome, 2008 p.552), as well as the use of diagnostic assessment of which formal testing is only a part.

Perhaps the reality is that in most cases school leaders were not actively engaging with the above dilemma, rather assessment policy was being made by default. In the majority of cases citizenship was taught with PSHE and therefore took on a similar assessment regime (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003 p.8). The lack of assessment that was so heavily criticised in the early OFSTED reports (OFSTED, 2003; OFSTED, 2004) did not reflect any ideological concerns over the appropriateness of assessment in the context of citizenship education, rather it was a consequence of lessons generally being delivered in restricted time, by reluctant non-specialists who had neither the inclination nor the expertise to carry out rigorous and appropriate testing. That is not to suggest, however, that horizontal policy making became irrelevant. Once it became clear that OFSTED was not going to tolerate a compulsory National Curriculum subject being, in many instances, practically ignored, schools quickly looked for a means to demonstrate that they were taking their responsibilities seriously and alighted upon assessment as the easiest way of doing this. It was this that led to the pressure from schools for the introduction of the standard eight point assessment (QCA, 2005).

A commitment to rigorous assessment need not push the subject in a conservative direction, with a focus on knowledge and written work. The Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT) advice endorsed the eight point system as an effective means of demonstrating progress, but emphasised the variety of approaches that should be employed in deciding upon a level:

> When you are planning your assessment of Citizenship across Key Stage 3, we recommend that you create an assessment framework which uses a:
> - range of evidence (not just written work);
> - range of methods (not just teacher-led);

- range of formality (not just tests).

The type of evidence you might use to make a judgment about student progress in Citizenship at the end of key stage 3 include:
- Draw and write a concept
- Mind-mapping
- Display of a community action project eg at parent's evening
- Presentations
- Observation of a group discussion or group task
- Photographs, films or even video made on a mobile phone
- Web page or blog
- Role play
- Campaigning letters, emails or press releases
- Silent debate (where students write down their arguments / opinions)
- Written evidence and extended writing'

(Association for Citizenship Teaching, 2012)

However, with specialist teachers still a rarity and all the other attendant pressures still in place the most convenient solution often remains the final item on the list.

Failure to Integrate Strands and a Lack of Understanding of Purpose

The close association of citizenship with PSHE, alongside the lack of sufficient CPD, had a further detrimental effect on the subject that was noted by both OFSTED and Ajegbo; the failure to properly integrate the various strands of the curriculum:

> In many schools teachers do not sufficiently anchor and integrate work on developing pupils' skills to knowledge and content; and there is evidence that some 'active citizenship' projects are insufficiently grounded in relevant knowledge and understanding (Department for Education and Skills, 2007 p.8).

This suggests that various examples of skills and participation drawn from across the curriculum, and beyond, have been used by schools as evidence of meeting the criteria set down in the Citizenship Order, despite the fact that they were not carried out within any kind of citizenship context. To do this removes the essentially political nature of the subject and fatally compromises Crick's vision for citizenship. It is this approach which

has allowed citizenship to blend fairly seamlessly into PSHE in many schools, where the combined subject is simply regarded as a form of general personal education.

Some of OFSTED's strongest defence of Crick's version of citizenship can be found in their insistence that the strands of citizenship must be taught in an interrelated way (OFSTED, 2006; OFSTED, 2010). However, central to this must be an understanding of the purpose of citizenship on behalf of the teacher (Crick, 2005) and this has proved difficult to achieve . Again when it comes to horizontal policy schools have tended to emphasise assessment over CPD for reluctant non-specialists. Once again the best solution, and the one endorsed by the final CELS report (Keating et al., 2010) would be the use of specialist teachers, but this option simply is not available to the majority of schools operating on a horizontal axis of competing priorities and lack of funding.

School Ethos and Pedagogy

> More recent reports from the longitudinal study (CELS) reveal improvements but… suggest the need to reduce the gap that exists between the policy aims for citizenship and the actual practice exhibited in schools (Evans, 2008 p.526).

Evans outlines three pedagogical approaches; the transmission orientation, the transactional orientation, and the transformative orientation, with the first concentrating on reproducing existing societal patterns, the second aiming to develop the individual within the context of social and economic need, and the third focusing on the development of the whole individual, with an emphasis on social connectivity. It is the third which he suggests should be the model for effective citizenship teaching, if the gap between policy aims and practice is to be narrowed.

He goes on to argue that the naturally hierarchical nature of schools and an emphasis on teacher led delivery of citizenship is hampering the subject's development. However, what is significant here is not that schools have not been proposing alternative arguments regarding the pedagogy of citizenship teaching; rather that it is an issue that has received remarkably little attention at all. Evans points to two studies which suggest that there has been very little consideration given to the pedagogy of citizenship in schools, and Calvert and Clemitshaw largely concur:

> Some teachers saw citizenship as a potential 'Trojan Horse' which would, hopefully, transform a school's pedagogical culture, one that had left children unengaged and unheard... However, this was not an issue uppermost in the minds of most of the teachers interviewed (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003 p.10).

The reasons for this will not come as a surprise as they have been dealt with at length already; low status, poor understanding of purpose, lack of specialists and failure to differentiate it from PSHE. All of these elements, to some extent, featured in my own fieldwork findings (see Chapters, Ten, Eleven and Twelve). Once again horizontal policy is made by default; there is no decision made not to engage with the issue, simply a lack of time and inclination to do so in a situation where, 'Contextual pressures beyond the school further complicate matters. Teachers and school systems are subject to pressures of rapid change and increasing levels of accountability, often with low status' (Evans, 2008 p.527).

On the wider question of general school ethos, Evans and others (Rainsford, 2011; Osler and Starkey, 2006), have suggested that schools need to have a clear democratic structure in order to be able to model the citizenship values that they are required to teach. However other research (John and Osborn, 1992) concludes that school ethos is a

relatively minor factor in influencing students views on citizenship. In many ways it is a moot point since citizenship as a subject is unlikely to be given sufficiently high priority to influence the school ethos.

Student Representation

One area where horizontal policy does seem to have had a positive impact on the delivery of citizenship is concerning student representation. Many commentators have stressed the importance of students having access to democratic representation in their own schools, both to assist with the development of their understanding of democratic institutions and to encourage them to feel like current, rather than future, citizens (Miles, 2006; Watts, 2006). Both the CELS and OFSTED are positive about the development of student councils (OFSTED, 2010) and it is generally regarded as an area where significant progress has been made, with almost all schools demonstrating student representation in some form. Although this may often be as a result of 'student voice' rather than citizenship initiatives (see Chapter Twelve).

However the simple existence of student councils should not be taken as a simple indicator of success. Rainsford (2011 p.3) argues, 'These institutions must be sensitive to the transitional nature of youth but must also have an empowering element to not be tokenistic'. There is a danger that the existence of representative bodies which lack any real ability to effect change can be counter productive, undermining the sense of efficacy which citizenship education aims to promote. A positive impact on citizenship should, therefore, not be taken for granted (a point discussed with my interviewees in Chapter Twelve).

In any case it would be naïve to see the growth in student councils as a horizontal policy contribution to the development of citizenship, since much of the initiative for these changes, and other forms of student representation, have come from an alternative vertical policy. This is Student Voice, which has arguably been given a higher priority by schools, at least in terms of visibility, than citizenship has in recent years.

Conclusions on Policy

Recorded in my research diary, near the outset of this project, was my feeling, as a citizenship teacher, that the policies being put in place by OFSTED and the QCA were potentially compromising Crick's intentions for citizenship education. However, the picture that has emerged is considerably more complicated. As noted in the previous chapter, much of the published work by these bodies, most particularly discussion surrounding the necessity of the integration of the teaching of the three strands, and the protection of its essentially political nature, goes out of its way to protect Crick's vision. This is an issue that concerns itself directly with the purpose of the subject.

It is clear that there was something of a shift away from the original 'light touch' approach, but this was primarily because many schools were simply using it as an excuse for not doing very much citizenship at all; certainly not Crick's intention. The shifts that were made, particularly in terms of a greater emphasis on assessment, were made largely at the request of the schools. Yet it remains the case that many citizenship teachers felt under pressure to make their teaching more orthodox and results driven (see examples in Chapters Ten and Eleven).

It is clear that the original 'light touch' approach showed a genuine concern to empower schools, and in many ways it did an excellent job of balancing out competing conceptions of citizenship and government policy priorities. Whilst there is no question that it was very ambitious to believe that the majority of teachers would take the time to carefully read the report and educate themselves about its theoretical underpinnings, it seems that often their intentions were, at least partially, thwarted by the need to fit citizenship within the context, not of the particular policy documents relating to citizenship, but the wider framework of existing educational policies. As I mentioned earlier my experience of pressure from senior management has almost always been inspection related rather than driven by pedagogical concerns.

It may have been, that without the pressure exerted upon schools by the assessment regimes of the QCA, and the inspections from OFSTED, to immediately fit citizenship within the context of the normal demands placed upon a National Curriculum subject, it could have slowly grown, and evolved, making full use of the room for manoeuvre offered by the 'light touch' policy. There would almost certainly have been failures, but also, perhaps, successes that would now be pointing the way forward. Instead, we seem uncomfortably close to the prediction, made in 2003, that:

> In the pressured environment that schools work in, initiative fatigue may lead to citizenship being simply 'delivered', through a process of little more than 'death by worksheet', emphasizing little more than sterile knowledge and vain attempts to promote citizenship values outside meaningful contexts (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003 p.9).

I believe that something of a vicious circle was created. Schools, already overloaded by new initiates and fearful of immediate criticism from inspectors, looked to implement

citizenship by the easiest and least disruptive route, which, in many cases, as we have seen, was simply to treat it as an additional element of PSHE. Ironically, the open ended nature of the 'light touch' vertical policy may have contributed to this conservative approach, partly by allowing the opportunity, and partly by failing to offer more emphatic support to teachers who had a more exciting view of the possibilities for the subject.

In turn, OFSTED observed that the general standard of citizenship provision was extremely poor and began to take a more aggressively critical line in its reports and inspections. Unfortunately the response to this from the majority of schools was not to; employ more specialists, ensure discrete provision, increase the timetable allocation, or most crucially separate the subject from PSHE, it was to fall back upon the most immediately visible and reassuring evidence that could be presented to inspectors, assessed written work. This overwhelmingly conservative development was not what was being requested by OFSTED, although improved assessment was one element, but it was *perceived* by many school leaders as what they required. This perception was then reinforced as, in response to requests from schools for a greater emphasis on assessment, the QCA duly obliged.

OFSTED, the QCA and the CELS continued to produce materials which emphasised the breadth of Crick's programme, but it was arguably the wider educational culture, of which they were a key part, with its emphasis on standards and inspection, which created the original climate of fear which doomed a 'light touch' approach to failure.

At the heart of this question is the issue of purpose. I would suggest that those schools which have been identified as models of good citizenship practice, by OFSTED and CELS, have had coordinators who were determined to drive their vision forward despite the attendant difficulties. The best way for the subject to make progress was for those teachers to care enough to distinguish it from PSHE and ensure that it was allocated its own valued place in the curriculum. This could only come from having a clear understanding of the purpose of the subject itself. Crick may have been naïve to believe that everybody who was to teach the subject would read his report, but he was probably correct in thinking it was necessary.

9) Research Findings – Pilot Study

Although the initial purpose of the pilot study was to assist in the development of the primary research design it generated some significant data of its own, which is presented in this chapter. As it concerned Headteachers, rather than citizenship coordinators, it allows for the possibility of comparison between the perspectives of those at the top of the management structure in schools and those directly responsible for the subject's implementation.

As the pilot study was based upon a questionnaire rather than interviews it could not hope to explore the understanding of purpose in any great depth, however it does give an overview of the way the subject is perceived by headteachers. The majority of the survey concerned itself with factual information regarding the provision of the subject. This was useful when preparing my interview schedule, but it has also provided a good deal of information which can be used, alongside the examination of policy in the previous two chapters, to build up a picture of the kind of policy issues that might impact upon a citizenship coordinators perception of purpose regarding their subject (the influence of these issues is explored in Chapter Ten).

Personnel

The first section of the questionnaire dealt with staffing issues. It revealed that most schools had clear provision for citizenship in place but that this was rarely provided by subject specialists. 85% of schools have a citizenship coordinator but only 15% have a member of staff who holds a citizenship PGCE. In terms of delivery, by far the most

common provision for citizenship education was for it to be taught across the curriculum by subject teachers, by a team of non specialist citizenship teachers (as a secondary role) or by a combination of both. A minority, reflecting very different approaches to the importance of the subject, used specialist staff (almost certainly those with the PGCE training mentioned above, or form tutors (suggested by both OFSTED (OFSTED, 2010) and the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) (Keating et al., 2009) to be the least successful method of teaching the subject)).

Table 4: Methods of Citizenship Education Delivery in Pilot Schools

Citizenship delivered by:	
Subject specialist teachers	3
A team of citizenship teachers	10
Form tutors	4
Across the curriculum by subject teachers	11

Asked to comment about the confidence of their staff in their ability to teach the citizenship requirements of the National Curriculum, the majority of headteachers indicated that they believed this was relatively high. With a likert scale running from 1 (less confident) to 10 (more confident), the responses produced a mean of 6.5 with a standard deviation of 2.0, a median of 7 and a mode of 8. This may reflect the likelihood that respondents were happier to make a strongly positive assessment of their staff than a strongly negative one, but it does indicate that whatever their reservations concerning citizenship, the confidence of their staff was not seen as a major issue, or, at least, not one that they wanted to reveal.

Of those who chose to comment on Crick's advice that his report should be read, in conjunction with the National Curriculum, by all those delivering citizenship, by far the

most common response was that this was an unrealistic expectation. This was expressed in more forceful terms by some than others! Several respondents felt this expectation could reasonably be made of subject coordinators, while only one felt it could be applied to all staff. Most identified lack of time as the primary reason that the advice could be considered unrealistic, perhaps showing a greater understanding of the pressure on modern teachers than I, or many of my colleagues, would usually associate with headteachers.

Curriculum

This section of the questionnaire included simple questions about the delivery of citizenship in the respondents' schools. Only thirty percent of schools taught citizenship as a discrete subject, with the majority delivering it through PSHE lessons, again a method which has come in for criticism from OFSTED (OFSTED, 2010) and the CELS (Keating et al., 2009), or in some cross curricular form.

In most cases there was a clear organisational framework in place with eighty-five percent of schools having a scheme of work for citizenship, and seventy percent having a development plan for the subject.

Respondents were asked about time allocation for the subject at the three senior key stages and answers varied dramatically. This would seem to be because, as mentioned above, most of the schools deliver citizenship through PSHE or in a cross curricular approach and while some simply reported the total amount of time made available for the combined subjects, others estimated a proportion of the total. Obviously those

teaching citizenship as a discrete subject were able to be more specific, identifying a time allocation that varied between one and two hours a week. Very few schools set aside curriculum time for citizenship at KS5 (16-18 year olds) where it is not a statutory requirement.

At the time of questioning forty percent of schools offered citizenship as a GCSE, and in all of these cases it was the short course version that was preferred. As you would expect there was a high correlation between these schools and those that taught citizenship as a discrete subject, although there were two examples who offered examination preparation exclusively through a PSHE/cross-curricular route. Only one offered AS or A2 citizenship, naturally in this case citizenship was taught as a discrete subject, and, somewhat unusually in my experience, it was allocated full timetable status with equivalent periods to any other A-level subject.

Citizenship and Pupil Voice

All twenty schools included in the survey had a school council, which is perhaps unsurprising since this is seen as the most public way of demonstrating commitment to the pupil voice agenda. The vast majority (ninety percent) of the schools held elections to fill the positions on the council, methods varied, including voting based upon form or tutor group, year group, and house. Two schools used volunteers rather than elections although it is not known whether this was to promote inclusiveness or because of a lack of faith in the efficacy of elections. Given the choice of self selection by volunteer, rather than appointment, perhaps the former is more likely.

The most common frequency for council meetings was half termly, as was the case in forty-five percent of schools, while twenty percent met either termly, or on a significantly more regular monthly basis. Three demonstrated a strong commitment to regular meetings with weekly or fortnightly meetings; although it must be remembered that the frequency of meetings can not necessarily be taken as an indication of the effectiveness of these bodies, in terms of their ability to make a genuine impact on school policy.

Sixty-five percent of school councils were chaired by a student representative; usually a senior pupil, head boy/girl, or head of house, while twenty-five percent were chaired by a member of staff; usually an assistant head or citizenship coordinator. The remainder were jointly chaired by staff and pupil representatives. This would seem to reflect the desire, in most cases, for students to feel a degree of ownership of the council and that it was not simply another teacher controlled environment. However, whilst the majority of schools may be keen to make a statement about the independence of their council they are not generally prepared to give them any responsibility beyond an advisory capacity (eighty-five percent), although fifteen percent did offer some degree of budgetary control.

Other student voice initiatives were also well supported with eighty-five percent of schools reporting a degree of student involvement in staff appointment and seventy-five percent allowing some input into the school rules. Sixty percent consulted pupils for feedback on teaching and learning. Without further investigation it is hard to come to any conclusions about the impact of student voice since, in each of the above categories,

the degree of student involvement could vary from informal consultation, a quick chat, the purpose of which may not even be apparent to the student, through to formal student panels who have a clearly set out remit and reporting responsibilities. It is clear, however, that the need to demonstrate some kind of engagement with the student voice agenda is considered necessary by all the schools.

Surprisingly, particularly given the importance that it was afforded by many in the final section of the survey (see below), a clear majority of schools (sixty percent) had not involved the local community in their citizenship activities. Those that confirmed some community involvement most commonly reported engagement with local charities, community groups and the police. Notably none mentioned local politics, either involving pressure groups or local political parties, perhaps reflecting a concern that any kind of involvement that might be regarded as controversial should be avoided (see Flew's concerns discussed in Chapter Four).

Citizenship and Purpose

The final part of the survey concerned attitudes towards the purpose of citizenship education. Obviously this was the most directly relevant section to my substantive study. Whilst, for the reasons outlined in the study design section, there is a very limited amount that can be learned from a simple tick box question on this issue, and the expectation must exist that responses will be heavily biased towards the perceived 'correct' priorities promoted by current official literature, the intention was to gain a snapshot of the initial thoughts of a group of headteachers. These views could then be discussed, developed, and possibly contrasted with those of the Citizenship subject

coordinators who would be taking part in the more in depth interviews of the main research.

Placed at the end of the survey, following questions which had largely required simple factual answers in an attempt to promote a relaxed response, the respondent was asked to select five terms, regarding the purpose of citizenship education, from a list of ten possible responses, and, ideally, to rank them in order. The results are outlined on the graphs on the following page.

Table 5: Headteachers' Perceptions of the Purpose of Citizenship Education

5 purposes of citizenship

Category	Value
moral reasoning	~13
critique of the values of the state	~3
political/advocacy skills	~1
commitment to the values of the state	0
political participation	~4
social justice	~14
community involvement	~13
understanding of rights and responsibilities	~18
social cohesion	~13
political literacy	~11

(x-axis: 0 2 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20)

5 purposes of citizenship (ranked)

Category	Value
moral reasoning	~23
critique of the values of the state	~6
political/advocacy skills	0
commitment to the values of the state	0
political participation	~6
social justice	~41
community involvement	~35
understanding of rights and responsibilities	~49
social cohesion	~32
political literacy	~18

(x-axis: 0 10 20 30 40 50 60)

(The second graph was created from the responses of those who ranked their choices in order by allocating a score of 5 points for a ranking of 1, 4 points for a ranking of 2 etc.)

As can be seen a similar picture emerges from both sets of results. The importance given to rights and responsibilities almost certainly reflects the political origins of the current understanding of citizenship education within the wider New Labour rights and responsibilities agenda. The development and implementation of the subject took place against a political, and educational, backdrop, where this phrase became common currency. More interestingly, given that one of the driving forces behind the introduction of citizenship was a concern with the political apathy of young people, is the relatively low priority accorded to political literacy and political participation, two elements that were absolutely central to the vision of citizenship outlined in the Crick report. This raises the key question about the extent to which the purpose of the subject is being effectively communicated to school leaders, something that I followed up in much greater depth during my interviews with citizenship coordinators (see Chapter Eleven).

As already mentioned, despite its relatively high ranking here, community involvement was not something that many schools had actively engaged with, suggesting that the theoretical priorities of citizenship are not necessarily reflected in the programmes that schools pursue.

Social cohesion is identified as a significant priority, despite not being one of the purposes of citizenship education mentioned by Crick, reflecting a change of emphasis in the subject from 2008 when the new National Curriculum Orders (QCA, 2007a; QCA, 2007b) included an instruction that the subject should promote this, in line with the recommendations of the Ajegbo Report of 2007 (Department for Education and Skills, 2007).

The relatively high showing for social justice is somewhat surprising, however, this is a term that can, and is, interpreted in a number of ways and it would probably be unwise to see this as an endorsement of the kind of redistribution of wealth most commonly associated with the use of the term in political literature (This suspicion was confirmed when, in more in depth discussion with citizenship coordinators, social justice was generally taken to mean placing an importance on fairness and non-discrimination rather than using it in the economic sense of narrowing the gap between the rich and poor (see Chapter Eleven).

No respondents identified promoting commitment to the values of the state as an important purpose of citizenship, perhaps discouraged by the fact that this sounds rather close to indoctrination and doesn't fit with the perception of citizenship as a 'progressive' subject. This is interesting because it is one area where political theorists are relatively united, for example, despite the different positions that they represent with regard to the extent that civic education should promote autonomous critical thinking, both Galston and Gutmann agree that a basic commitment to certain core values, such as tolerance, are necessary for the successful operation of a liberal democracy. Perhaps this is because, as was noted in Chapter Four, there has been considerably more discussion about the underlying principles of civic education in the USA (both Galston and Gutmann are American) and this is not an area to which most British headteachers will have given much consideration, particularly since discussion of the implementation of the subject has focused almost entirely around policy issues rather than its underlying purpose.

The final question simply asked whether citizenship was a useful part of the curriculum. Given its then compulsory status, and relatively high profile in recent years, it was not a surprise that the reply was an almost unanimous yes, with only one dissenting voice. This probably demonstrates nothing more than the fact that headteachers are unlikely to be straightforwardly critical of current educational policy, particularly with regard to a subject which they have no choice but to include in their school curriculum. Clearly a more in depth conversation would allow a more nuanced position to be explored and this will be the aim of the substantive study.

The final part of the questionnaire issued an open invitation, to respondents, to add any further comments they might have regarding citizenship. This section was largely ignored, although several did mention uncertainty about the continued existence of the subject in light of the current curriculum review (With the benefit of hindsight this becomes much more significant, see the sections in Chapters One and Ten about the impact of academy status and the removal of the compulsory status of citizenship education). Two Heads who clearly took particular pride in their schools' commitment to the subject made positive comments regarding its importance while one was openly dismissive, in line with their approach to the questions throughout the survey, and simply declared that 'it's over'.

10) Research Findings - Citizenship Education: Policy and Practice

In Chapter Seven, I outlined why any discussion of the purpose of citizenship education could not take place in isolation from questions regarding its implementation. There were, I suggested, two key reasons why policy questions connected to the introduction of citizenship education cannot be ignored, even if an understanding of purpose is the primary concern. Firstly, the methods of policy implementation can provide valuable evidence about the way in which the purpose of the subject is perceived; and, secondly, the nature of policy implementation can potentially compromise the intended purpose of the subject. I also suggested that it was necessary to have a clear understanding of the policy issues in the respondents' schools in order to answer my third research question; *What do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by theory and policy issues?*

Whilst, then, the majority of the time during my interviews was spent discussing issues directly related to purpose, in each case time was also spent establishing the nature of provision within the schools I visited, and the position of citizenship in the curriculum. This chapter will present these findings, making appropriate comparison with pre-existing research in this area, and set the context for the discussion relating to perceptions of purpose which will follow in Chapter Eleven.

Nationally based policy research into citizenship education has been largely restricted to OFSTED, the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS) and the QCA, but they

showed a good deal of agreement about both the problems with the implementation of the subject and the potential solutions:

> The main challenges to citizenship education were felt, by school leaders and teachers, to include time pressure, assessment, the status of citizenship and teachers' subject expertise' (Ireland et al., 2006 p.iv)

> A number of changes could be made to the delivery of citizenship education in order to improve its effectiveness. They include looking at ensuring the delivery of discrete citizenship lessons, which are planned by CE (specialist citizenship) teachers and linked to external examinations or certification. (Keating et al., 2010 p.iv)

Issues such as the need for discrete delivery and the problems of too close an association with PSHE, the lack of specialist staff and CPD, the lack of curriculum time and low status afforded the subject, and, problems with assessment are consistently and repeatedly raised by all three bodies over a ten year period and it was not a surprise when they featured prominently in my discussions with citizenship coordinators.

One issue which has made a substantial impact since the completion of this national research has been the shift of many schools to academy status in the last two years. This has removed the legal obligation to follow the National Curriculum, and with it has gone the compulsory status of citizenship education, meaning my interviews were taking place at a time (the spring and summer of 2012) when the subject was facing increasing marginalization. Nine out of the ten schools I visited were academies, most of them only very recently so.

This chapter will begin with a table that compiles the data set, and some accompanying comments, before moving onto a more in depth discussion of some of the key areas. The names of the schools have been changed in order to preserve their anonymity.

Table 6: Participant Schools with Contextual Data

School	Abingdon Road	Bedford Road	Colchester Road	Didcot Road	Eastbourne Road	Fleetwood Road	Guildford Road	Horsham Road	Ivybridge Road	Jarrow Road
Academy/Maintained	Maintained	Academy	Academy	Academy	Academy	Academy	Academy	Academy	Academy	Academy
Age Group	11-18	11-18	11-18	11-16	11-16	11-18	11-18	11-16	11-18	11-16
Co-educational	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Selective	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Rural/Urban/Semi	Urban	Semi	Rural	Semi	Urban	Semi	Urban	Semi	Urban	Semi
OFSTED	4	2	1	1	4	3	1	3	1	2
Paid Coordinator	Yes as Subject Leader	Under RE	Yes	Faculty Head with RE, PSHE	Not as of this year	Yes	Yes as PSHCE	Yes as PD	Yes	Part of Assistant Head role
Citizenship Qualified Coordinator	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Discrete Citizenship	PSHFE within Citizenship	No – within 'lifeskills'	No	Yes at KS3 Some at KS4	Yes at KS4 *	No – within PSHE	No – within PSHE	No – within 'PD'	Yes in Yr 11 only	No – within 'PD'
Dedicated Department	Yes	No	No	Faculty with RE and PSHE	No	No	Was a core group of staff	Yes as 'Personal Development'	No	No
Cross Curricular Monitoring	No	Yes	No	No	Limited	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Time Allocated at KS3	1 lesson per week	1 lesson per week	3 PSHE days per year	1 lesson per fortnight	1 lesson of 'Ethics' per week *	1 lesson of PSHE per week	1 lesson of PSHE per fortnight	1 lesson of PD per fortnight	6 week block of extended tutor periods + 1 full day	1 lesson of PD a fortnight
Time Allocated at KS4	1 lesson short course 3 lessons full course	Tutor time (15 mins)	3 PSHE days per year	1 per week + exam allocation	Standard GCSE allocation *	1 lesson of PSHE per week	8 or 9 lesson per year on carousel	1 lesson of PD per fortnight	As above - 1 period per week for Yr 11	1 lesson of PD per week on carousel
Time Allocated at KS5	Full subject allocation at AS and A2	Tutor time (rare)	3 PSHE days per year	N/A	N/A	1 lesson of PSHE per week	No specific time.	N/A	No specific time	N/A

School	Abingdon Road	Bedford Road	Colchester Rd	Didcot Road	Eastbourne Road	Fleetwood Road	Guildford Road	Horsham Road	Ivybridge Road	Jarrow Road
Examined at GCSE	Short Course & Long Course	No	No	Changing from all doing Short Course to Long Course as option	Short Course & Long Course *	No	No	No	No	No
Examined at AS Level	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	No	No
Examined at A2 Level	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	No	No

* Ending this year not to be replaced

Glossary

P.S.H.E – Personal, Social and Health Education

P.S.H.F.E – Personal, Social, Financial and Health Education

P.D – Personal Development

As the table shows, the sample, although essentially self selecting for reasons discussed in the Chapter Two, does provide a reasonable cross section of Gloucestershire schools; with both co-educational and single sex, selective and non selective, 11-18 and 11-16, rural, semi rural and urban institutions all represented (the names of the schools have been changed to preserve their anonymity). The schools have also achieved a wide variety of ratings in their most recent OFSTED reports. Perhaps the most striking information is that in the short time that academy status has been available, since the passing of the Academies Act 2010, nine out of ten schools have been through the conversion process, effectively freeing them of the legal obligation to teach citizenship at all

Discrete Status and the Link to PSHE

The most common problem identified by national policy research, and the one most likely to have an adverse affect on the potential for citizenship education to have its own clear sense of purpose, is a failure to properly distinguish it from Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE). Although the original National Curriculum Order and its associated material makes it clear that a variety of methods of implementation are suitable for the subject, in line with the 'light touch approach' suggested by Crick, it implies that discrete time for citizenship should form at least some part of a school's approach (QCA, 2002d p.3).

However it became apparent, relatively quickly, that in many cases citizenship was simply being added to PSHE in a partial rebranding process that gave it very little in terms of a distinct identity (QCA, 2004 p.5; QCA, 2005 p.4). Disquiet about this grew, with reports from OFSTED, QCA and CELS all suggesting that the development of the subject was being impaired by its close association with PSHE; and highlighting a particular concern that this caused a neglect of the distinctly political elements of Crick's vision for citizenship education. As I suggested in Chapter Eight a consensus emerged among policy makers that citizenship was best taught as a discrete subject (Association for Citizenship Teaching, 2012; Department for Education and Skills, 2007; OFSTED, 2010; Keating et al., 2009). This was not to suggest that high quality citizenship education could not be delivered by cross curricular methods, but that the cross curricular approach had usually taken the form of a minimal audit of existing practice rather than an ambitious new cross curricular programme.

As the table shows, despite the policy makers' preference for discrete delivery, the majority of schools I visited (six out of ten) combined citizenship with some form of PSHE (sometimes as PSHFE including financial education, sometimes as PD, Personal Development, sometimes as Ethics), this was broadly in line with the findings of my pilot study (which found 30% provided discrete provision). Of the remaining four, three only provided discrete lessons for exam classes; all non-examined citizenship was part of a shared model. This immediately raises questions about the extent to which the coordinators in these schools can ensure that citizenship has its own clearly defined purpose, and maintains its distinctly political identity. In some cases there was some confusion about what such provision even entailed, with one citizenship coordinator (CC) suggesting:

> It is discrete, but it is a melded subject called Ethics which is citizenship, PSHE and RE all brought together (CC Eastbourne Road).

In others the need for discrete provision was questioned:

> You know I don't really see them as being different…(although) I knew that one was about an outcome about the external community and one was definitely based on their own personal experience' (CC Guildford Road).

Several CCs demonstrated that the distinction was much clearer in their schemes of work than was implied by whatever subject name appeared on the timetable. They had clearly differentiated citizenship topics from PSHE, although they generally admitted that the students would probably not be aware of the shift from one subject to another, and would rather see it all as the same thing. One interesting exception was Abingdon Road where the combined subject was 'branded' as Citizenship, perhaps in a bid to boost its status and avoid some of the stigma that had become attached to the PSHE

250

label. The CC made a point of explaining they would be doing two distinct subjects within the same timetable slot:

> (It's) Buy one get one free. So on the timetable it says Citizenship and the very first lesson they ever do in Year 7 I always say to them you're going to get two for the price of one, so incredible value you're getting. The only reason we don't put PSHFE on the timetable is Mr A who designs it says citizenship is a really big word, if you think I'm putting the other one on as well, forget it…My take on this and when we try and do a definition…some (topics) are really personal to you as the individual and they're about relationships, personal relationships, but the citizenship is more about this stuff… it talks about things like Councilors and Members of Parliament, and voting; issues within society that you will choose to engage in. You are who you are so you are going to have personal issues, citizenship is that step that you take where you make a choice about whether you're going to involve yourself, whether you're going to be a participant in this or whether you're just somebody who sits back and watches. (CC Abingdon Road)

This suggests that the crucial difference might be, not so much that the subject enjoys discrete status on the timetable, but that the CC has a clear personal understanding of the purpose of the subject which they ensure is communicated to the students.

The other noticeable exception was Ivybridge Road where, in a move that seems to buck the general trend, Citizenship was being separated from PSHE and given its own dedicated timetable slot, albeit currently only a Year 11 pilot programme. This is particularly noteworthy as most schools who have, like this one, recently been awarded academy status have used it as an opportunity to reduce their commitment to non core academic subjects. In this case it might be reasonable to speculate that having a PGCE qualified CC (the only one in the sample) has played a significant part in this decision.

Although a cross curricular approach to citizenship education was often criticised due to schools employing it as a 'minimal' approach to implementation of the subject, there are

obvious advantages to bringing out citizenship issues in other academic subjects. Not only does it highlight the wide ranging relevance of the subject, but it can also help to supplement a relatively modest official timetable allocation. Whilst none of the schools have opted for a fully cross curricular approach, perhaps mindful of OFSTED criticism (OFSTED, 2003), five have at least some cross curricular monitoring of citizenship in place. These vary from detailed citizenship audits of other departments' schemes of work (Bedford Road and Guildford Road) to a much more informal arrangement where other Heads of Departments are encouraged to develop areas of citizenship focus without any formal monitoring or coordination taking place. Again, it seems likely that securing the cooperation of other departments will be easier if the CCs themselves can clearly articulate to colleagues their understanding of, and vision for, citizenship education.

Citizenship Coordinators and Citizenship Departments

For the purposes of this research I have referred to all the interviewees as citizenship coordinators, in reality they have a variety of titles (all the schools I visited had a named individual responsible for citizenship, the figure in the pilot study was 85%). Obviously these usually reflect the particular curriculum arrangements for citizenship (PD Coordinator, PSHE Coordinator etc.), and in most cases it was not a high status position in the school, with Abingdon Road, the only institution to examine to A Level, affording it parity with other Heads of Department. In most cases the role attracted only a small additional payment, and in the case of those PSHE coordinators who had simply had citizenship added to their portfolio the additional work did not bring with it greater remuneration:

It's a paid position, but very little, probably one of the lowest. I mean, you know, it's unfortunate… unlike other subjects, they will get a second in faculty, but not in this subject area. (CC Didcot Road)

This is broadly in line with the findings of Calvert and Cleminshaw, that the low status of PSHE coordinators was to a large part transferred to CCs (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003; Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2005).

The most significant exception to this was at Jarrow Road where Citizenship was the responsibility of one of the assistant headteachers, within a wider Pupil Development remit. This appeared to be something of a double edged sword, for while the subject benefited in terms of status because of its coordinator's position in the school, it lacked the specialist attention of a full time coordinator and consequently citizenship education provision in the school was somewhat ad hoc.

Alongside the recommendation for discrete citizenship lessons, the other, key, and obviously interrelated, recommendation from educational policy makers was that the subject should be taught by specialist teachers. OFSTED, QCA and the CELS recognised that, as a new subject, there would initially be a lack of trained citizenship teachers and consistently stressed the need for investment in Initial Teacher Training (ITT) and Continuing Professional Development (CPD). Through the first ten years of the subject's existence, they repeatedly raised concerns about delivery by form tutors and 'spare' members of staff with gaps to fill in their timetables.

As a snapshot in 2012, my results give little encouragement in this area. Only one of the CCs had a citizenship PGCE (broadly in line with the pilot study which found a county

wide figure of 10%) suggesting that subject specific training has had limited impact. More worrying, however, is the lack of any kind of specialist approach in many of the schools; after all a dedicated coordinator is likely to be perfectly capable of educating themselves in the subject, but such dedication is unlikely to be found in busy subject teachers from other departments who teach one or two citizenship lessons on their timetable:

> There are such a huge range of teachers who teach life skills. It's not necessarily teachers who have volunteered to teach it, it's if you've got a gap on your time table, then they often get sneaked in (CC Bedford Road).

Of the ten schools, seven report that they have no dedicated citizenship department, or even a small group of willing non specialists. In the majority of these cases the default approach is for the subject to be delivered by form tutors (the pilot study put this figure at 89%). Even those schools which do have dedicated departments report being weakened over time (Guildford Road) or basically composed of 'spare' staff:

> So, it's dependent on what the commitments are for those subjects, as well, and then I get a team, and, over time, we're starting to see the same staff on the team, but it's always staff that have got time remaining on their timetable (CC Horsham Road).

The problem is not simply one of a lack of specialists, but also the difficulties it creates in terms of planning and training. Even where departments exist, the staffs' commitments to their 'primary' subjects will make having departmental meetings very difficult:

> Yeah, I should have meetings with that team. The problem is when it's subject meeting time, they're all meeting in their subject space. So, if it happens, it happens at lunch time. And the other issue is, a lot of staff here are part-time. So, we never get the full staff, a full PD team meeting (CC Horsham Road).

Where no form of department exists, the only option in terms of CPD is full staff INSET or Teaching and Learning sessions. Several CCs report making efforts in this area (Bedford Road, Eastbourne Road and Fleetwood Road), but have found the time made available is very limited as core teaching and learning priorities related to inspection tend to dominate (the headteachers in the pilot study almost all identified lack of time for training as a problem). Interestingly, given the overall focus of this research, one of the CCs used her limited time to discuss not the delivery but the purpose of the subject:

> It had to be explained. I did some INSET and explained what exactly was involved for staff. They had some training, not in terms of delivering it… but in terms of understanding what we were trying to do (CC Eastbourne Road).

This would seem to suggest that even in difficult circumstances the CC had realised that an understanding of the purpose of citizenship education was crucial to its effective delivery.

Unsurprisingly the school with the strongest citizenship department was Abingdon Road where citizenship can be studied to A Level, and the department is therefore given full academic status. This would seem to confirm the suggestions made by OFSTED that examinations are an extremely effective way of raising the status of the subject (OFSTED, 2005). However, as has previously been discussed, a focus on examination and assessment, while increasing the academic profile of the subject, may undermine the elements of critical thinking towards our democratic institutions that thinkers such as Gutmann regard as so crucial.

Given that in the majority of schools citizenship lessons are being taught by non-specialists, schemes of work become particularly important as a means of ensuring some

consistency and continuity of delivery. All the schools had schemes of one sort or another (the figure for the pilot study was 85%), with the majority following a fairly similar approach. Concerned that non-specialist teachers would have difficulty with lesson preparation, many of the schemes took a highly prescriptive approach, and, in four cases, went as far as providing a detailed lesson plan and all the required resources:

> I've made it as easy as possible for them... So, everything is on the computer and everything is also in a hard folder, which is kept at the back. Every lesson plan is written for them. All the resources are put together for all of them. All the assessments done for them. And, essentially, the lesson plans are quite descriptive…Because people come in from so many different subjects and that they should be able to just pick it up, theoretically, read it the night before. Get all the resources together they need, but, usually, they've already been prepared, in the cupboard for them. And they just run with the lesson (CC Horsham Road).

While this allows the CC to exercise a good deal of 'quality control' it does have its drawbacks, in that it can make the lessons very formulaic and fall into the 'death by worksheet' trap discussed in the policy chapter (Calvert and Clemitshaw, 2003). Some CCs, sensitive to this problem, try to bring in potential for the lessons to have a certain amount of organic development:

> Yes (they are provided with resources to deliver), they are essentially just powerpoints but they have got conversational pieces in, they have got stimulus material built in (CC Bedford Road).

Such an approach suggests a sensitivity to the critical thinking elements of the subject and an attempt to try and preserve them, even if the circumstances of the subject's delivery are not ideal.

The alternative is to give teachers much greater freedom to interpret the citizenship brief in ways which they find comfortable:

> I put out an overall scheme of work and then based on that they tailor it to their year group and the age group or whatever…You can ask a member of staff,

> 'Look, on the carousel you're going to be teaching some lessons on young people and the law' and rather than giving them out a folder of stuff, very often they'll just go now and do their own research on the internet. They'll find some film clips, they'll find some websites or even lesson plans on the internet that they can use (CC Jarrow Road).

The advantage of this is that it draws on the strengths of individual staff, and may help to make them more enthusiastic, although some will no doubt prefer to have lessons supplied ready to go. However, there is a very real danger that, without a clear and uniting vision for citizenship, its distinctive critical thinking and political elements may be lost.

Timetable Allocation

One of the difficulties that all the CCs have faced is ensuring that sufficient time is made available to deliver the subject. The association with PSHE has been particularly problematic in this regard since in many cases the new joint subject was simply allocated the same, often extremely limited, timeslot that the old subject enjoyed. At Key Stage 3 (KS3) eight of the ten schools had one timetabled lesson (either per week or per fortnight). Provision tends to be strongest for this age group as it is the only one that requires a compulsory end of level National Curriculum assessment. However, the amount of time is still very limited, particularly after it has been, formally or informally (approaches vary), divided between the PSHE and the Citizenship components.

At Key Stage 4 (KS4) provision becomes slightly more haphazard with citizenship featuring in several institutions as part of a carousel or relying upon time being found in tutor periods. Except for Abingdon Road, where it features as an A level option, post-16 citizenship is to a large extent non existent.

Several CCs report that pressure on their time allocation has increased over recent years and that they have found themselves losing lessons to 'core' academic subjects. This is partly because of ongoing pressure to maximize results in subjects which are seen as crucial to league table performance and successful OFSTED inspections:

> Every class gets one lesson a fortnight. So, one hour a fortnight of PD. It did used to be one hour a week, but, for whatever reasons, it got cut. Which is a common story, isn't it? The fact that they've cut our hours by half in the past two years, three years… would suggest that (there is now less focus on citizenship). But I also think there is such pressure in terms of Maths and English (CC Horsham Road).

However, the most serious threat seems to come from the conversion to academy status and consequent loss of Citizenship's compulsory status. This is a source of frustration to many CCs:

> I'm quite lucky here, in the sense that, I suppose, because I've worked quite well to establish the subject in its own right, I have a school which thinks it's part of its core values. But, I definitely see that the subject could easily disappear, and I wouldn't be surprised… obviously academies don't have to follow it, but I don't understand how any academy can just get rid of it, because it's basically saying that we don't want people to understand the world they live in (CC Ivybridge Road).

It is also notable that the school that provides the least citizenship, restricting it to a minor element of three PSHE days with no ongoing provision at all, only felt able to make this change once it had achieved academy status.

The ability to make successful use of limited time will, to an extent, depend on the commitment and the ingenuity of the CCs, many of whom show considerable resilience despite feeling the tide is moving against them. However, as OFSTED and the CELS have confirmed (see Chapter Seven), there can be little doubt that the more the subject's

time allocation is limited, the more of its subtlety and uniqueness is lost and its sense of purpose compromised.

Assessment

This chapter's brief review of policy and practice would be incomplete without some reference to how the ten CCs have integrated assessment into the curriculum. As was seen in the policy chapter, at a national level schools' failure to get to grips with assessment was at the root of much criticism emanating from OFSTED, and lay behind the decision of the QCA to abandon a 'light touch' approach to citizenship assessment and bring the subject into line with other academic disciplines by introducing a standardized eight point level descriptor in 2007 (QCA, 2007a).

Attitudes towards assessment, and the greater pressure from OFSTED to demonstrate it was happening effectively, differ quite markedly amongst the CCs. Some see the emphasis on assessment as problematic and distracting, suggesting that it has hampered the effective delivery of the subject:

> We struggle with assessment. We give a kind of best fit level. Are those levels accurate? Probably not, but there aren't many examples out there of 'This is an assessment for this'. It's all a bit vague (CC Jarrow Road).

> To be honest, I've shoe-horned assessment into every year group, so they do at least one assessment. Which fills the other teaching staff with absolute dread to be perfectly honest, because the subject matter has to be quite heavy and quite dense…to be able to assess it (CC Horsham Road).

> My feeling is that by making it overt, it did it loads of damage. Once it became strands and programmes of study, and me with my chart ticking off whether it had been done, it became an exercise. It became an exercise that put peoples' backs up, actually (CC Guildford Road).

These comments reflect the feeling that assessment is ill defined and unwelcome, and that the only way to really get a grip on it is to go down a content heavy path of assessed written work. Whilst this may be primarily the result of the 'perception gap' that I identified in Chapter Eight, since the reality is that OFSTED was not demanding such a prescriptive form of assessment, this matters little 'on the ground', where concerns of teachers regarding inspection, and the pressure exerted on them by senior managers, matter more than the theoretical position of the assessing body.

On the other hand several CCs have found that the requirement for proper assessment has both raised the status of the subject with pupils and forced some of the more reluctant teaching staff to engage with the subject more seriously:

> It's not about OFSTED for me. They turn up every, I don't know how often, and although obviously I have to play the OFSTED game, it's about my feeling for this subject and more importantly it's about my clients feelings for it. So if they think we're not assessing… it doesn't have parity with other subjects (CC Abingdon Road).

The most obvious difference in terms of assessment, among the sample schools, is between those who examine the subject and those who do not. Three schools offer the examination at GCSE, although Eastbourne Road is in the process of phasing it out, and one, Abingdon Road, at A Level (the pilot study had similar findings with 40% offering GCSE and only one A-level). These institutions tend to be more comfortable with assessment, almost certainly because the examination provides a clear framework and considerable sample materials. It will also not have escaped their notice that, as outlined in Chapters Seven and Eight, OFSTED has consistently praised both the long and short course GCSE as a very effective way of delivering the subject (OFSTED, 2005; OFSTED, 2010).

The success or otherwise of assessment will, to an extent, depend on the approach of the citizenship coordinator. An exclusive emphasis on written work can compromise many of the important features of the subject, and can lead to practical problems when staff are resistant to the extra marking workload:

> It leaves me in an extremely difficult position as coordinator. I either mark all the work myself, which I actually did in my first year, hundreds and hundreds of assessments, or I try and train up the tutors to do it, and then you run into issues...so in a perfect world I suppose the tutors do the marking, if OFSTED criticised us that's what we'd have to make sure happened (CC Jarrow Road).

On the other hand, a more creative approach, such as that advocated by the Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT) (2012), can provide a variety of assessment tasks which both account for the particular nature of the subject and avoid an overreliance on written work:

> I've tried to really resist the, kind of, formative, you know, here's 10 questions… what do you know? I try not to do it too much because it's not just a knowledge game… they set out the four, sort of, skills areas. So, one's knowledge, one's, kind of, thinking, questioning, reflection. One's working with others and speaking out. And then the other one is taking action. And I think by taking those, and then drawing up level descriptors that the different departments can use… throughout Key Stage Three, has made it easier… to assess, not just the knowledge bit, but actually assess different aspects of it. And, and I keep emphasizing to teachers, actually working with others and speaking out, and taking action parts are so important for citizenship that we've got to make sure that we (assess) that. (CC Ivybridge Road).

> What we've done at Key Stage 3 is design a structure whereby the assessment is based on a written activity, a spoken activity so that's a debate, a discussion, and then also a research activity. You go away and find out for me please, come back and talk about it… So it's actually using this ability, not to say that everything in citizenship has to be written down and tested, it would kill it and we do not have the time, we don't have the luxury of the heavy lessons per week or fortnight, so in 50 minutes you're trying to do an awful lot but… you must have that balance. I must be able to see the evidence of what you are capable of doing (CC Abingdon Road).

The comments of the CCs above illustrate how a carefully thought out programme of assessment can actually help to maintain, rather than stifle, the wide ranging and critical approach to the subject envisaged by Crick. However, it is clear that this is only possible where coordinators have developed a strong personal understanding of the purpose of the subject; this allows them to create the necessary assessment framework, to explain it to colleagues and to defend it against pressure from senior managers keen on a, more easily inspected, focus on written work.

Conclusion

A brief overview of the major policy issues in the sample schools produces few surprises. The issues that arise are precisely those identified in the national policy documents and the pilot study; an unhelpful link to PSHE, a lack of discrete delivery, a lack of specialist teachers, low status, the difficulties of establishing and running a citizenship department and problems with assessment. However, what is equally clear is that many of these problems can be, at least partially, overcome by committed citizenship coordinators who have a clear vision for the subject. As I concluded in Chapter Eight, what is crucial is the perception that these school leaders have, both of the nature of the subject itself, and the priorities attached to it by the national educational policy makers. If they have a clear understanding of its purpose, then the impact of these problems can be greatly reduced. This might be reflected in the kind of examples that have been outlined in this chapter; having the confidence to defend citizenship's place within the curriculum, to motivate sceptical colleagues, to design effective and appropriate schemes of work and assessment regimes. If they lack a well developed

sense of purpose, and understanding of the nature of the subject, this is likely to result in

much of what is valuable about citizenship education being lost.

11) Research Findings – Citizenship Education: Purpose

Having provided some contextualization, by examining the practical and policy issues related to the implementation of citizenship education, this chapter will engage directly with the third research question and central issue of this thesis; *What do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by theory and policy issues?*

I have suggested, in the previous chapter, that a clear and well developed understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of the subject, or, at least, a clearly reasoned position on its potential contribution to a student's education, can help to minimize many of the problems associated with Crick's 'light touch' approach, and the associated difficulties in delivering the subject, identified by OFSTED, QCA and CELS, which were outlined in Chapters Seven and Eight.

While I established, in Chapter Three, that common ground existed among most commentators, in so far as they agreed that some form of citizenship education should play an important role in establishing the basic values necessary for the health of any liberal democracy, I also noted that there was considerable disagreement regarding the nature of those basic values. I outlined two key viewpoints regarding this question of purpose. For Galston, the state must limit itself to the most minimal form of citizenship education, promoting only the values, such as loyalty and civic virtue, necessary to maintain its own stability, taking care not to promote a thicker conception of the good through the promotion of autonomy or critical thinking at the expense of a respect for

diversity (Galston, 1995; Galston, 2008). Gutmann, by contrast, argues that, in addition to encouraging respect for the institutions of the state and democratic government, citizenship education should encourage a critical approach towards them. Only by this process of 'conscious social reproduction' where the state and its values are subjected to constant reassessment and examination by autonomous citizens can its legitimacy be maintained (Gutmann, 1999).

These two positions illustrate the essential tension within citizenship education in a liberal democratic state, between a somewhat conservative inclination to inculcate the values necessary for the preservation of the state itself, perhaps, put simply, encouragement to obey the law and pay your taxes, and a more progressive notion, that a truly democratic state must encourage its citizens to actively reassess and question its values.

In reality both Gutmann's and Galston's are too nuanced to be characterised simply as opposites; both acknowledge that there is an ongoing tension within liberalism; between the need to promote liberal values and the need to maintain as neutral a position as possible on individual values, between the demands of diversity and autonomy, and those of loyalty and critical thinking. Their disagreement is largely one of emphasis but it is nevertheless highly significant in educational terms because each will lead to a very different approach in the classroom.

Crick is explicit in both acknowledging the existence of these contrasting views on citizenship education, and his belief that it is necessary to find a compromise between

the two (Crick, 2002a p.496). His earlier writing suggests that he is ultimately closer to Gutmann, albeit with his focus on the primacy of politics rather than democracy, in their shared vision of the citizen as actively taking part in debate and discussion, rather than passively acquiescing to the demands of the state. Yet there is no doubt that he is also sympathetic to the need to inculcate the necessary values to provide the structure within which such critical thinking can take place. I argued, in Chapter Four, that Crick's ideal of 'civic republicanism' sits relatively happily alongside Gutmann's call for 'conscious social reproduction' and both believe these can exist alongside, rather than in opposition to, Galston's requirement for the inculcation of basic liberal democratic values, whilst avoiding a simple, and somewhat conservative maintenance of the status quo. It is Galston's rejection of the need for active participation that represents their most significant disagreement.

Chapter Five examined how Crick's understanding of citizenship was applied to the task of creating a working curriculum structure for implementation as a compulsory subject in schools, and observed that a combination of political compromise and lessons learned from previous failures in the promotion of political literacy had led to a more conservative approach than might have been expected. The central question regarding purpose, which Crick identifies so clearly above, he ultimately avoids, making a statement which is, perhaps deliberately, somewhat bland and non committal:

> The purpose of citizenship education in schools and colleges is to make secure and to increase the knowledge, skills and values relevant to the nature and practices of participative democracy; also to enhance the awareness of rights and duties, and the sense of responsibilities needed for the development of pupils into active citizens; and in so doing to establish the value to individuals, schools and society of involvement in the local and wider community (QCA, 1998 p.40)

Crick's 'light touch' approach was applied not just to the implementation of the subject but to its very purpose. He fashioned a report which had strong traditional elements in terms of its concern with social and moral responsibility, and emphasis on volunteering, but hinted at the possibility of a more critical approach to politics through its concern with political literacy and active participation. Whilst this might be regarded as an artfully constructed compromise, which was successful in maintaining a relatively wide base of political support, it contains the inherent problem that it fails to give a clear lead to teachers about the nature and purpose of the subject, a difficulty further exacerbated by the lack of any trained citizenship teachers at its point of introduction.

I have already suggested, in Chapter Five, that the 'light touch' that Crick hoped would allow teachers the space to explore a variety of approaches, perhaps even some of the more radical political approaches that he himself had previously favoured, in fact in many instances created the confusion which led to teachers seizing upon the most recognizably safe, often knowledge based, elements of the syllabus at the expense of a more critical approach. The extent to which this occurred, in any particular school, depended, to a large extent, upon the personal understanding that the individual citizenship coordinator had of citizenship education, hence the importance of the practical element of my research.

When interviewing citizenship coordinators (CCs) about their understanding of the purpose of citizenship education I used a variety of approaches; partly to try to examine the consistency of their position, and partly to establish whether there were significant tensions between their personal viewpoints and the 'official' viewpoints of their

departments. I asked them directly about their feelings on the competing priorities that Crick had identified within the subject, followed by more specific questions about the three strands, and their understanding of 'active citizenship'. I also asked them about a specific example, student protests over the Iraq war, to see how they applied their theoretical approach to a real world situation. However, I began by asking a much more general question about the position of citizenship in their school; this allowed some insight into their feelings regarding the purpose of the subject before engaging in the more formal discussion related to the Crick Report. In the section that follows, I will outline the responses I received from the ten citizenship coordinators that I interviewed, and analyse them within the context of my wider research.

<u>How Would You Defend Citizenship Education to a Sceptical Colleague?</u>
This question invited the citizenship coordinators (CC) to make a general statement about how they felt citizenship made a positive impact in their schools without the pressure of being asked to consider it within any kind of ideological or philosophical framework. Its phrasing simply reflects the experience of many citizenship teachers, myself included, who have found themselves defending the subject to other members of staff who are dubious about its place within the curriculum.

The most common response was to suggest that citizenship was in some way filling a gap. Several of the CCs (Didcot Road, Eastbourne Road, Horsham Road and Jarrow Road) mentioned a lack of family discussion about contemporary issues around the dinner table. While there is a danger in harking back to an imaginary 'golden age' it

seems this was being used as a general metaphor for a significant reduction in the amount of citizenship education that pupils receive in the home:

> There was a lot more news going on within families; the radio would be on Radio 4 or whatever… dinner table chat and there wasn't as much to do for kids and very often there would be just one TV. You would be sitting down and it's the nine o'clock news. Just that, I think, is lacking in a lot of kids today. So therefore the lessons are important I think because it's covering stuff that they used to know and they don't know anymore (CC Jarrow Road)

Others (Colchester Road, Didcot Road and Fleetwood Road), felt that the key gaps were not in home life but in school curricula that had become increasingly exam focused and failed to engage with some of the more general aspects of education that could be explored in the past.

More generally there was a feeling amongst all of the CCs that it offered an opportunity for some kind of genuine preparation for adult life which went beyond helping students to pass exams:

> It isn't a wishy-washy subject… I think most importantly it's about building and preparing young people for adult life. And, actually, what you would determine through Citizenship lessons often was that students have no basic awareness of how our country operated…how they could interact with different agencies, how they could get support and guidance, that sort of thing. It, in essence, provides an opportunity to deliver key skills for life (CC Eastbourne Road).

In some cases this preparation for life was undoubtedly confused with the kind of personal preparation offered by PSHE, one of the CCs talked about visiting the doctor and healthy eating, for example, and this does provide evidence of the kind of failure to distinguish the subject from PSHE mentioned in Chapter Seven. However, some of the CCs made this 'preparation for life' in a much more political context. In Abingdon Road, where the majority of students come from a relatively disadvantaged background, citizenship was seen as an important facilitator:

> In a school such as ours… many of our youngsters have much lower aspirations than they should, where many of them are going to go out into a world where things will be done to them… talking about citizens advice bureau, knowing where to go to get the right advice, understanding your rights but equally understanding that you have duties and responsibilities is incredibly important and they'll often come from backgrounds where maybe that input has not happened at home… So putting across arguments and saying, this is an entitlement that you have and it's really important in terms of the progress that your life is likely to make and the fact that you can bring about change (CC Abingdon Road).

Whereas in the much more economically privileged Guildford Road political awareness and, particularly, community involvement, were seen as an important counterweight to the somewhat sheltered existence led by the majority of its students:

> I think anything which is to do with the community out there is really easy to defend. I think most people, particularly within an insular school would find that really easy to defend; that students should know about the world around them; that they should specifically interact with it (CC Guildford Road).

These two observations certainly hint at a more overtly political agenda for citizenship in terms of promotion of a greater awareness of social issues if not the actual promotion of social justice. However, with regard to the positions of Galston and Gutmann it is noticeable that none of the responses could be simply characterised as conservative or progressive, certainly some lacked any sense of real political content and failed to really differentiate the subject from PSHE but, perhaps unsurprisingly given their positions, all had a sense of developing the student rather than simply instructing them in correct behaviour.

Familiarity with the Crick Report

Although familiarity with the Crick Report is in no way a prerequisite for being an effective CC, I was interested, particularly in the light of Crick's own assertion that the

National Curriculum should be read alongside his committee's document, in how many of them had engaged with it directly. Of the ten CCs I spoke to; four had not come across Crick at all or had simply come across his name in passing, two briefly studied the report as part of their PGCEs but had not used it since, three had been involved in a county-wide group which had met to assist with the initial implementation of the subject and were therefore quite familiar with the content, although they had concerned themselves largely with policy consideration, and, finally, the CC from Abingdon Road used the report as an element of her A level teaching, specifically as part of a discussion with the students about the definition of active citizenship.

Given that few subject teachers venture beyond the syllabus and approved texts when planning their schemes of work, it was encouraging to see that over half the sample had engaged with this theoretical exploration of the nature of the subject either in their studies, planning, or teaching, and this suggests that there was an awareness amongst many practitioners that the introduction of this new subject did require some consideration to be given to its underlying purpose.

Views on Crick – Traditionalism or Progressivism?

Having briefly discussed the background to the Crick Report with the interviewees, they were all asked to comment upon the two approaches, traditionalism or progressivism, that Crick identifies regarding the purpose of the subject. The perspectives of Galston and Gutmann were not mentioned explicitly but essentially the conversation provided an invitation to choose between them. Perhaps unsurprisingly when asked directly to make a choice between the conservative or progressive approach none of the CCs were keen to

272

associate themselves entirely with the former. It would be rare to find any educationalist in a modern school who believes it is the role of the teacher to simply instruct students on correct behaviour. All then opted, as Crick does, for some form of compromise between the two. Some saw little tension between the two and believed that they could co-exist fairly comfortably. In one case this seemed over optimistic to the point of naivety:

> I think there is a balance. I'd say the first one is probably more important… I think if you do the first job correctly, the second job should almost come out of it, if that makes sense (CC Horsham Road).

In others however there was a slightly more developed line of thought which suggested that the content-heavy knowledge and understanding element of the course would take care of the former, while a combination of good teaching and the natural instincts of the pupils would develop the latter:

> I think the first one happens anyway... Probably we're doing that in the corridors, everywhere all the time. I think the second one… I think all kids lend themselves to the second one (CC Guildford Road).

Such a viewpoint might be unsurprising coming from the selective Guildford Road, but it is echoed elsewhere:

> I do think they are very good at questioning stuff, they are not like kids from thirty years ago, where you were told something and.... the Prime Minister has said that so it must be true, and I think that kids today are much more questioning...and I think that is a good thing (CC Jarrow Road).

It should be noted however that a tendency of modern school children to be less deferential does not necessarily imply an increased level of independent thought. A simple rejection of authority is not the same as critically questioning its validity.

There was a worrying comment from Eastbourne Road where a progressive approach was associated purely with more academically able students:

> I think the higher order, the next level, is to get young people with a bit of imagination and flair… to challenge the status quo. I would have to say that most candidates at C grade… I do not think, in this school, are capable of doing that… largely they take on board… they're passive receivers of knowledge (CC Eastbourne Road)

The coordinator at Abingdon Road, whilst acknowledging the contrasting interpretations of purpose that can be applied to citizenship, choose to shift the focus slightly:

> I think it's the bigger message that Crick sends that's important… I think the bigger comments that Crick makes about our society, they're the important things… about having people that are willing to be advocates (CC Abingdon Road).

By strongly invoking the active element of Crick's citizenship this CC arguably gives a clear rejection of citizenship as simply a means of protecting the status quo, but also neatly sidesteps criticism that might be attracted from some quarters by a more overtly political form of progressive citizenship.

Whilst all of the CCs had placed themselves somewhere close to Crick's own compromise and, therefore ultimately closer to Gutmann's understanding of citizenship than Galston's, I was interested to discover how they felt schools as institutions impacted upon this balance. Was there a tendency for schools, which after all need to maintain discipline and good order, to encourage an emphasis on the more conservative aspects of good citizenship, rather than encouraging a questioning and critical attitude towards authority? Most CCs were prepared to acknowledge that their personal aspirations for the subject and the natural inclinations of the school do not always perfectly co-exist:

I think they are two very different questions. Personally, as a philosopher and philosophy teacher, I think enquiring minds are most important, but if I think about the schemes of work and what we teach them, I think we are...perhaps, accidentally, putting students...or kind of moulding students into… following the law, not doing things that are wrong, being nice to people. So I would say personally, that you should have more criticism and more critical analysis (CC Bedford Road)

The CCs from Fleetwood Road, Horsham Road and Ivybridge Road all agreed that to some extent the nature of the curriculum and, in particular, the demands of assessment push the subject in a more conservative direction where the emphasis is on knowledge, or good behaviour, or both. However, the point is made that while certain tendencies exist, good teachers will resist an approach that is too prescriptive, if for no other reason than it makes for dull lessons:

It's easier just to stand there and teach them, you know, this is how you vote, da da-da da-da, without the critical things. But the critical things are what, I think, keeps them interested in it (CC Ivybridge Road).

At Eastbourne Road, where the GCSE exam has been an important part of the development of their citizenship programme, I was given a good illustration of how assessment can facilitate rather than inhibit the progressive elements of the subject, something that would have seemed counter intuitive to many of the other CCs:

As part of their course involved controlled assessments… one of which was very active…and they had to run a campaign … I think that's been a positive development... It makes it appealing to kids who think, well, actually, I can do this… I think it did push boundaries, in that it allowed us to get… our students doing things they wouldn't have done otherwise (CC Eastbourne Road).

Ultimately of course the impact of the institution will depend to a large extent on the individual teachers within it. Most CCs accepted that schools, like most traditional institutions, tend to have an element of inbuilt authoritarianism. However, my own belief, and one shared by several of the CCs that I spoke to, is that teachers with a

strongly developed personal sense of the progressive elements of citizenship education can successfully encourage their students to challenge this through appropriate and responsible actions.

Citizenship and the Iraq War

A discussion about student protests that had taken place over the Iraq war provided an opportunity to ask the CCs about the conservative and progressive elements within citizenship education with reference to a real world example. In February and March of 2003, shortly after citizenship education had become a compulsory element within the National Curriculum, a significant number of students across the country were involved in school strikes in protest against the invasion of Iraq. These actions were discussed in a paper by Cunningham and Lavalette, who made clear their view that such protests were very much a positive example of students engaging with citizenship; however many school authorities did not agree and condemned the protests as irresponsible:

> Although citizenship, as outlined in the Crick Report, should have welcomed young people's active engagement with the political process, the overwhelming response of the educational establishment was to castigate and punish those who took part in the strikes (Cunningham, 2004 p.255).

The CCs who I interviewed expressed similar sentiments to those voiced by the teachers who spoke, largely anonymously, to the researchers in the article quoted above. Their views are best summarized as personally supportive but professionally cautious. They show a clear awareness of the potential for hypocrisy:

> On the one hand, citizenship classes encourage children and young people to show a concern for 'the common good', to engage in 'active citizenry' and to accept the consequences of their actions; yet, on the other hand, their 'reward' for proactively articulating their concerns over a major world crisis has been, on the whole, admonishment and ridicule (Cunningham, 2004 p.265).

But they worry about the response of the school and wider educational authorities, their own job security and their ability to maintain discipline:

> If the point of citizenship is to create individuals who have freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and freedom to make up their own mind on things, and then to act on that decision accordingly, then perhaps think I might lean probably a little bit towards the first one (supporting the protest). But as a teacher in an organization, and an establishment like a school then… there is a certain amount of tension between what they would individually like as citizenship teachers, and the demands of the school. (CC Bedford Road)

Whilst broadly supportive of the idea that the protests could represent a positive example of students engaging with political issues in precisely the way that a progressive approach to citizenship would favour, the CCs also showed some concern that not all protest, or more specifically not all protesters, could be taken at face value. While they saw the participation of informed students as broadly positive, they did suggest that there was a danger, both that the less well informed could be dragged along without giving proper consideration to the issues involved, and also that some would blatantly use the protests simply as an excuse for truancy, or even troublemaking. This was not cynicism but rather a case of teachers working on the ground being a little more streetwise than their counterparts working in educational research. Such a viewpoint is entirely consistent with Crick's approach which maintains that action alone is not the measure of effective citizenship, but that it must be informed action, specifically in his view it must be informed by a significant degree of political literacy (Crick, 2002b). This is why a failure to properly integrate the three strands of the subject, usually through a neglect of the political element, has been so strongly criticised (Department for Education and Skills, 2007; OFSTED, 2006; OFSTED, 2010).

Rather than using such concerns as a convenient excuse for rejecting the rights of students to protest several of the CCs provided suggestions for how they might be managed or even utilized as an educational opportunity. One outlined how her school had dealt with the Iraq issue:

> The way we worked around it was that we had… a big thing out in the grounds…Where they, they were allowed in obviously a safe environment… To have their views, you know, passed on to the rest of the students And I think it was a very successful way to deal with it (CC Didcot Road).

Another used it as an opportunity to explain how protest can be more powerful when it is clear that an element of self sacrifice, however small, is involved, and when you can, as far as possible show that your motives are pure (presumably meaning any protest is primarily concerned with the cause rather than other potential benefits such as simply having time out of lessons):

> I always think the better way is to say; yes you need to protest but you pick the moment, so if you want to protest, do it in your lunch hour. Show the world that we're really upset about this, so upset we'll give up our 45 minute lunch hour, we want to have a sit in then we will go back to class (CC Abingdon Road).

In fact, if managed carefully, a third suggested, the whole protest could be directly connected to the school's citizenship provision:

> I think you'd use it, definitely, as an opportunity… to draw upon and say, okay, you know, what makes a peaceful protest? And maybe look at different protests that have taken place over the ages. I mean, if the whole class walked out, you'd say, well, okay, great. Let's all go out and have a lesson about it somewhere else. Fair enough. And…If you've got the whole class doing it, and, you know, the head or whatever does say, hang on a minute, you can probably, legitimately turn around and say, well, actually, this is a citizenship lesson. You know, they, you could argue that… they've done the research; they know what they're saying (CC Horsham Road)

I would argue that there is a difficult balance to be struck here between using a protest as an educational opportunity, and potentially depriving it of much of its symbolic power by co-opting it as an extension to the curriculum. Nevertheless attempts to strike this

balance, particularly if carefully considered and informed by an understanding of young peoples' developing sense of citizenship, is certain preferable to simple suppression.

The most interesting aspect of the discussion around the Iraq War demonstrations is that it showed relatively little disagreement between the CCs in terms of the underlying issues, all were happy that taking part in the protest could certainly be a positive example of student citizenship, and this shows a general acceptance of the more progressive elements of citizenship education articulated by Crick and Gutmann. However, where they differed was in their practical responses, some would keep their views personal and accept school policy, which was largely one of suppression, whereas others would push for recognition of the right to protest, or even actively welcome demonstrations as an educational opportunity. To an extent this depended on the individual and factors such as their age, experience and personality, but it also seems clear that those who had the clearest understanding, and could most confidently articulate their philosophical approach to the subject, were most likely to push for their school to embrace a more progressive approach to the issue.

Crick's Three Strands

The finding that the CCs in the sample broadly identified with a more progressive interpretation of the purpose of citizenship education was not a surprising one. After all to an extent this was something of a self selecting group, to one degree or another they had chosen to become involved in the subject because of a belief in its educational value. For modern teachers, given the nature of our current ITT (Initial Teacher Training), that was unlikely to be confined to a desire to simply instruct young people in

expected standards of behaviour. There were similar finding in the pilot study where none of the headteachers, perhaps fearful that they would be seen as out of step with modern educational values, selected 'commitment to the values of the state' as one of the five purposes of citizenship education. However, this generally progressive tendency does not necessarily equate to progressive teaching in the classroom. As Chapters Seven and Eight showed, Crick's 'light touch' approach, which aimed for a careful compromise between the more traditional and more progressive aspects of the subject could, when subjected to the various pressures associated with its actual implementation in schools, be significantly compromised, resulting in a distinct lack of the kind of critical thinking that characterizes both his and Gutmann's ambitions for the subject.

With this in mind, having discussed their general approach to the subject, I asked all of the CCs more specifically about their understanding of the three stands identified in the Crick Report as essential components of citizenship education; Social and Moral Responsibility, Community Involvement and Political Literacy. Here there was considerably more variety between the interviewees; some were able to articulate an understanding of these concepts which was entirely consistent with their general position, in other cases, despite their broad commitment to a progressive form of citizenship the CCs' understanding of these strands, and the relationship between them, suggested the actual approach they were pursuing in their schools was probably much more conservative than they would have hoped. The most common problem I observed was a neglect of Political Literacy, either through omission, or through seeing it simply as the acquisition of political knowledge, rather than the dynamic spark for students to make an effective political contribution to society. This was not a surprise given that it

was identified by OFSTED (2010) as a particular concern (this is discussed in greater depth in Chapter Seven) and was also apparent in my pilot study. Although the strands were described separately Crick saw politics as an essential element of all of them in his quest for dynamic 'civic republicanism'. The teaching of social and moral responsibility, and the value of volunteering were badly compromised if they were not given a political perspective.

Social and Moral Responsibility

The most limited interpretations of Social and Moral Responsibility focused on a fairly ill-defined notion of being a 'good person'. The CC from Colchester Road linked it directly to charitable works, while another commented:

> I would sort of take that to mean making the right decisions, making the right choices… and I'd be fairly confident that with all the stuff we do… that most kids leaving here, I think, not all, but most, have got that moral compass (CC Jarrow Road).

This focus on personal morality offers little to distinguish citizenship from aspects of PSHE or RE. However all of the other interviewees made some connection between individual morality and the requirements of the communities in which the individual is a part. This immediately gives a much stronger citizenship element to moral discussions in the classroom, as there is a recognition that, if we are living with others, our individual morality can not be the only element that informs our actions:

> You've got to tease out what morality is. It is different things to different people and it is important to understand that you may have a moral position that could be quite different to somebody else's. So morality is an interesting one and you have to explore it, and social responsibility is key, because we live alongside each other, we don't live on islands alone. So I think the social side is important as well but there's certainly a lot of debate (CC Abingdon Road).

The most commonly used phrase with regard to the Social and Moral Responsibility strand is 'rights and responsibilities', mentioned in this context by six of the CCs (it was also the most commonly used phrase by headteachers in the pilot study to describe the purpose of the subject). The frequency with which it occurs is relatively unsurprising since it was a New Labour catchphrase at the time of citizenship education's initial introduction. It would be tempting to dismiss it as a rather glib response, but in this case it does capture an important part of the citizenship project, which was to rebalance what was felt to be the excessive emphasis on individual rights of the Thatcher era, against a renewed concern for the needs of the wider community:

> They need to find their balance, but that's part of growing up I think; of understanding that you have responsibilities when you are in certain social situations. Like when you're in a school community for example. But you do also have your own personal morals and your own principles that you need to stick by (CC Bedford Road).

> I suppose it's making those connections, isn't it, between the actions that we take and understanding the import that they have (CC Jarrow Road).

Whilst the focus on rights and responsibilities is an appropriate one for citizenship it arguably does not capture the essentially political nature of this strand. There appeared to be an assumption, among all of the CCs who used the phrase, that everyday "consideration for others" would be sufficient to ensure that society could resolve conflicts on questions of morality between its citizens. Crick would suggest that 'politics', and Gutmann, that an active and critical engagement with democratic institutions, is necessary if such disputes are to be resolved peacefully, and the value of tolerance maintained. It may well be argued that such an approach was implicit in much

of what was said by the CCs, but I would suggest that the job of citizenship education is to make it explicit.

Community Involvement

The second strand, Community Involvement, was in most cases identified with doing some kind of 'good deeds' in the local community, primarily through voluntary or charity work:

> That is a massive part of life at Bedford Road. Really, work for charity, raising money for charity is something we do in tutor groups. Again I would say that that is not just specific to citizenship lessons per se, but is a massive drive from the whole school (CC Bedford Road).

> We get kids involved in remembrance parades, I mentioned litter earlier on, at Christmas they go up to the old people's home and put on little productions for the old people (CC Jarrow Road).

However, several CCs went beyond this somewhat limited understanding, which, while important and worthwhile, really amounts simply to the kind of voluntary activities that most schools have been carrying out for many years, regardless of the existence of citizenship or not.

The multi layered nature of citizenship, encompassing our membership of a wide variety of communities from local to international, was discussed:

> The extent to which we get involved in a variety of community activities, which could range from school, outside of school…The community, as (names local town)… But, also, take that on to, like, a, sort of, a national and global level community... So, actually, community, for me, it sounds a bit naff, but the whole world. How do you link in with different communities, and what is your role to play? (CC Horsham Road).

The strength of the above definition, I would suggest, lies not only in its multi-levelled approach to community involvement, but also in the acknowledgement that there is an

ongoing relationship between the individual and the communities of which they are a part. It is not simply a case of doing good deeds for other people. The two way nature of community involvement is also emphasised by another CC who points out that it should involve the community coming into school as well as the school going into the community:

> I think community involvement is a two-way process. As teachers, we're often striving to engage the community, so that our young people can go out in the community and do voluntary work, that sort of thing. But I think community involvement is also about the community coming actively into the school... And engaging with us, doing workshops perhaps, members of the community coming in and working with young people on projects, that sort of thing. And, and all too often that doesn't happen very much at all (CC Eastbourne Road).

This emphasis on an ongoing relationship between the individual and the community comes much closer to Crick's understanding of the purpose of community involvement within citizenship education; that, as well as having the opportunity to make a real world difference through their actions, students are reminded that they are part of a web of interlocking relationships in which they should play a part. What is still missing, however, from Crick's perspective, is the acknowledgement that these relationships are inherently 'political'. Only one of the CCs discussed the possibility that the community aspect of citizenship should involve not just action within the community but was about involvement in that community's decision making:

> It's about getting people to engage on some level within the community, and that's the most basic level with, even within their school community, get them to find something that they feel passionate or interested in, and then seeing what they can do about it, whether it be an email to an MP, or whether it be something a bit more, kind of, on the ground (CC Ivybridge Road).

Many of the other CCs I spoke to did discuss explaining to students how to contact an MP, or a member of the local council, but did so as an element of the third strand, Political Literacy. The failure, of the majority of CCs, to see the essential connection

between the strands suggests to me that citizenship is often being delivered in something of a piecemeal fashion, without consideration being given to a central underlying sense of purpose.

<u>Political Literacy</u>

In light of the discussion above, regarding the lack of an essentially political element in much of the work associated with the other two strands, it should not come as a surprise that in many respects Political Literacy is the most problematic area for CCs. This issue had been highlighted in the pilot study where only 55% of headteachers mentioned it at all as a purpose of citizenship education). Failure to properly engage with this element of the subject is also, arguably, the major factor in a drift, exhibited by some CCs, from a largely progressive interpretation of citizenship education in theory, to a substantially more conservative one in practice.

For Crick, Political Literacy is at the heart of citizenship education, and is the key element in terms of making it a distinct curriculum subject. After all, Social and Moral Responsibility, he argues, should be an important element of all education, while Community Involvement has a significant crossover with pre-existing Personal Social and Health Education (PSHE) provision. This gives a clear indication, as I argued in Chapter Five, regarding Crick's ultimate intentions for the subject. Its potentially unique contribution lies in the ability to take both pre-existing, and newly gained, knowledge and skills from the first two strands and apply them in the political context of the third (QCA, 1998 p.66). In other words, for Crick, all elements of citizenship education are ultimately political, and therefore interrelated.

It was the recognition of the need to maintain this political element as a consistent theme within the subject that was behind the OFSTED criticism that far too many schools were failing to teach the three curriculum strands in an interrelated way (OFSTED, 2006; OFSTED, 2010). An example common to several of the schools I visited were parties for local older people. These events provide an opportunity for OAPs to come into the school for some tea and cake, meet the students, and perhaps watch some entertainment. Whilst it would be churlish to criticise such obviously worthwhile events, it could be argued that they do not really represent an example of a citizenship activity, at least not as Crick conceives it, unless there has been some accompanying discussion of society's treatment of the elderly, and perhaps some form of engagement with local, or national policy regarding pensions or care homes, or a look at the work of campaigning groups such as Age UK. Such follow up work was not mentioned by any of the CCs when they discussed such events.

As well as its importance in terms of its integration with other strands, which has been discussed above, there is an explicit element to Political Literacy which deals directly with the political system. CCs often began by defining this in relatively narrow terms, concerning themselves primarily with an understanding of the institutions of UK politics:

> Political literacy just spells the political system in the UK. What different parties believe… How does our local council run? How does our government run? The House of Lords and all those things (CC Horsham Road).

All schools also connected this understanding to the need for participation in its most basic form, voting, almost certainly aware that dramatically falling turnout amongst

eighteen to twenty-five year olds was one of the major factors in the introduction of the subject in the first place:

> Well, I think it, when you show them the percentage of people that vote and make them realize how few actually make the effort It's easy to feel I'm not going to make a difference But we try and show them that with the vote… they can make a difference (CC Didcot Road).

Most of CCs took the concept of participation further and aimed to encourage not just voting but other forms of engagement with the political process. This might be through giving consideration to direct involvement in formal party politics:

> I will say to them, one day you're going to be a councillor and that's going to be important role for you, and if you represent, if your heart is in your representation you will do far more for (your community) than anyone else is likely to do… they're (MPs and Councilors) just ordinary people like you and I, and there is no reason why you shouldn't aspire to do such things (CC Abingdon Road).

On the other hand the emphasis might be placed upon creating a 'toolkit' of skills to allow students to campaign effectively on particular issues:

> We've done a lot work on how to be an advocate. So, if there's something you believe strongly about, and it could be anything from as simple as, if everybody's talking about dog poo on my street… But to that person it might be quite an important thing. How do they actually go about getting their voice heard? What are the channels? So, the different ways to lobby an issue. Is it through letter-writing? Is it through protesting? (CC Horsham Road)

A commitment to enabling and encouraging the active participation of their students characterizes the most strongly developed thinking with regard to this strand, and is at its best when it makes effective connections with the other elements such as community involvement:

> I suppose that, that, then, for me, fits in with the community action… that's about linking the two because, ultimately, whatever community you live in, it's

287

linked to politics… If you want something to change, whether it be in your local, national, or international community, you have to take action, and that's about seeing that there are other methods, other than voting, which is, you know, about running a campaign. And trying to see methods within campaigning, which are the most effective, and getting them to engage with that on some level (CC Ivybridge Road).

To feel that they can do things and be sort of empowered to do things. You've got to give them the skills for it. It's really key… I think that's what the subject's really about, ultimately (CC Fleetwood Road).

It is clear that such an approach moves closer to the kind of 'political effectiveness' that Crick regarded as a central element of political literacy. Not just an understanding of the institutions, that was the 'civics' of the past, but an understanding of how to engage with those institutions to bring about change and challenge existing policy. There is no doubt that this involves a commitment to the kind of critical thinking advocated by Crick, and Gutmann, as a necessary component of democratic government, and it is present, although varying considerably in intensity, within all of the CCs understanding of this strand. It is also clear from the pilot study that this is an area that makes headteachers uncomfortable; only one suggested that the development of political effectiveness and advocacy skills was a priority for citizenship education.

It should, however, be noted that such critical thinking might be regarded as taking a somewhat limited form. It seems that criticism of policies and to a certain extent the institutions of the political system are included within this critical thinking, but challenging the underlying nature of the system itself is not. Whilst all advocates of citizenship education, from Galston to Gutmann, would agree that certain core values should be maintained to protect the liberal state itself, it would be hard to maintain that

these include, for example, the nature of the economic system that the state employs. The lack of any inclination, from any of the CCs, to encourage critical thinking which genuinely challenges the political status quo probably accurately reflects the thinking of the Crick Report, but falls some way short of the democratic education suggested by Gutmann or indeed Crick's own 1970s version of political literacy.

Active Citizenship

The term 'active citizen' is one of which Crick makes considerable use in his own writings, regarding it as a key component of his 'civic republicanism'. The term featured in the single most quoted paragraph of the Crick report, which forms part of its initial statement of aims:

> We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally: for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life and with the critical capacities to weigh evidence before speaking and acting (QCA, 1998 p.7)

However, despite this, it is a term around which there has been a considerable amount of confusion. This is primarily because, while it featured in the Report, it did not feature at all in the National Curriculum Order which followed it and formed the basis of the schools' implementation of the subject. This was partly resolved by the New National Curriculum of 2007 which did make use of the term, but not before many teachers and coordinators had come to an understanding of its meaning which was somewhat different to Crick's intentions.

Crick himself may well have been conscious of this since he wrote a paper entitled 'A note on what is and is not Active Citizenship'. In it he identified two key issues. Firstly

that active citizenship is inherently political and involves a meaningful level of engagement with the decision making bodies of the state:

> It seems elementary that there is a difference between being a good citizen and being an active citizen. One can be a good citizen in an autocratic state. One can also be only a good citizen in a democratic state, that is one can obey the law and behave oneself socially but not work with others on any matters that affect public policy, either at all or minimally – minimally may just be voting or just putting money in a tin or signing a standing order for a voluntary body or pressure group but never attending a meeting (Crick, 2002b p.1).

It is this political element that ties the three strands of citizenship together and gives it its identity as a distinct subject. Secondly, he maintains that it is necessary to draw a clear distinction between volunteering and active citizenship:

> All citizenship must involve at some stage volunteering, but not all volunteering involves citizenship. Cleaning up a field after a rave or a blitz to clean up a local park or young children's playground is admirable, as is giving a party for the old and infirm, but it is not citizenship without a knowledge base (how can such despoliation or neglect be allowed to happen at all?), without a process that enhances skills of discovery and advocacy, or without any attempts to influence local authorities, councillors or the police, whatever, whoever is relevant. Volunteering becomes citizenship when the volunteers are well-briefed on the whole context, given responsibility about how to organise their actions, and debriefed afterwards in the classroom or listened to in a formal meeting about whether they think it could have been done better (Crick, 2002b p.5).

Such an argument does not imply criticism of volunteering itself which would be churlish, but it does imply criticism of traditional volunteering, of which many schools have a long tradition, being represented as examples of active citizenship. It is unfortunate that the distinctions drawn so clearly here are not made as obvious in the National Curriculum or the Crick Report itself.

Whilst Galston would probably take issue with Crick, his maintenance of the liberal state requiring nothing more than 'good citizenship' from the majority of the population, Gutmann's principle of democratic education would strongly echo his sentiments,

although perhaps with a slightly greater emphasis on the possibility of institutional, as well as policy change.

Unsurprisingly, given the discussion above, the CCs interviewed did not always find it easy to clarify their thinking about active citizenship. I asked them directly about their understanding of the term, and also whether they saw it as something different from volunteering, or essentially as a rebranding of pre-existing voluntary activities and community service programmes.

In several cases volunteering and active citizenship were essentially seen as interchangeable:

> (When asked if active citizenship and volunteering were synonymous) Yeah. I mean they're not, but in school…I know it's probably not right, but I would be happy enough if they were doing anything to do with the community or other people helping other people (CC Guildford Road).

> Yeah, I think it is (active citizenship), really, the modern version (of volunteering). And I think, also, a lot less kids are now involved in things like Cubs and Scouts. All that kind of thing, than maybe 25-30 years ago. So, therefore, some of these events are quite appealing to them (CC Jarrow Road).

This tended to be found alongside a rather literal interpretation of active, as involving physical activity:

> Active citizenship is a physical, out-and-about, doing stuff…mainly, getting out and about. There's a bit of community cohesion there (CC Jarrow Road).

This emphasis on activity was developed by other CCs in a slightly more subtle way, by suggesting a link to the student being motivated to action, informed by what they had learned from the more theoretical aspects of the course:

> For me I would say that it's the hope that students do something as a result of what they've learnt... If they are couch potatoes and they just sit in my lesson

291

and suck it up and don't do anything with it, then what's the point? (CC Bedford Road)

It's kids that can actually do things… with some prompting from the teacher, but, then, can actually run with something and make something work… sort of empowering them in a way to actually see something happen (CC Fleetwood Road).

This emphasis on action is strengthened when it is associated with some kind of commitment to improvement of the community, whether local, national or international:

An active citizen is someone who isn't passive within society. It's a broad term. It could be somebody who, at a very simplistic level, is engaging with the people around them… (CC Eastbourne Road).

I think it's about a school providing something tangible that is going to change because of what you do. That's a really hard thing to do in school. But, you can take every child, if you're wanting to audit it, and see where they are taking part positively within their communities… (CC Guildford Road).

Despite it being apparent that all the schools I visited had an impressive commitment to involvement in their communities, and to ensuring that citizenship was not purely something that was learnt in the classroom, it was also apparent that eight of the ten CCs did not understand the purpose of active citizenship in the way that Crick intended. In all these cases they failed both to sufficiently appreciate the central importance of its political component and to distinguish it sufficiently from simple volunteering.

The two CCs who were able to articulate a vision of active citizenship in line with Crick's thinking each had a significant advantage. The CC at Abingdon Road was delivering the subject at A-Level, while the CC at Ivybridge Road held a PGCE in Citizenship. I know from my own teaching that the structure of the A-Level syllabus promotes a clear understanding of Crick's active citizenship by directly teaching, and examining students ability to describe, the various components of an active citizenship

activity, or characteristics of an active citizen. Indeed, the CC at Abingdon Road and I discussed how we used Crick's own writing to reinforce our teaching in this area. When asked to define active citizenship, the CCs reply was practically a textbook answer, picking out the three stages of being informed, participating and bringing about wider (political) change:

> Good citizens obey the law, do what they should do... An active citizen is someone that is actually involved in their community, participates, has a level of knowledge, understands how they can bring about a difference, that's an active citizen (CC Abingdon Road).

The CC at Ivybridge Road was not able to give such a pithy definition, but in the course of the discussion it became clear that their grounding in the theoretical aspects of the subject meant they were aware of the importance of a political element running through the active citizenship activities of their students:

> It's about voicing your opinion, or about taking any kind of action with a view to changing something…it's about acting upon the opinions you have… People actually doing things out in the community… but also about the campaigning aspect… about getting students to think, oh, this is what we would like to do. And then taking those actions, whether it is writing the letters, or having a little campaign and getting the press to come in (CC Ivybridge Road).

In both cases having a clear theoretical understanding of the nature of active citizenship was an important part of being able to translate a generally progressive perception of the purpose of citizenship education into more specific classroom aims. As with some of the other areas discussed, it is apparent that, unless the CC is well grounded in some of the underlying philosophy of citizenship education, there is a danger that their progressive intentions for the subject will dissipate as they are applied to specific elements of the curriculum during the process of implementing and delivering the subject. What is

particularly interesting with regard to the two examples above is where this understanding has come from. It is relatively unsurprising that it should come from a dedicated PGCE course, but much less obvious that it should be a consequence of a commitment to high level assessment in the subject, something which many would assume would push the citizenship in a more traditional, conservative direction. The suggestion here is that, while exams always place a certain amount of emphasis on the traditional acquisition of knowledge, in this case the stronger formal structure of an exam curriculum has offered far better protection to Crick's original vision than the 'light touch' approach found in the National Curriculum.

Conclusion

In the previous chapter I concluded by suggesting that some of the policy difficulties inherent in the delivery of citizenship education in schools could be overcome by committed citizenship coordinators who have a clear sense of the underlying purpose of the subject. An overview of the various discussions that I had with the CCs reveals no lack of commitment; in fact one of the most pleasurable aspects of this research project was the opportunity to meet and share ideas with colleagues from other schools who showed great dedication to the subject. There is also no doubt that all of the CCs I spoke to had progressive intentions for their subject. When asked in general terms about whether they saw citizenship as promoting good behaviour and the status quo, or critical thinking and change, they all aligned themselves with Crick and Gutmann rather than Galston's 'small c' conservatism.

Nevertheless, it becomes clear, when a comparison is drawn between their general intentions for the subject and their specific understanding of its component parts, that for most CCs, there is a lack of consistency in their perceptions of purpose. The responses to the Iraq war example, for instance, show a clear commitment amongst the CCs to the political elements of citizenship, but in their understanding and delivery of the three strands, and of 'active citizenship', this political element is often missing. There is no doubt that some of these issues relate to policy, most specifically the linking of the subject to PSHE, but it is also the case that the drift away from a Crick's vision of an inherently political form of citizenship comes from a lack of real understanding of some of the subject's key conceptual building blocks.

It would be unreasonable to be critical of individual CCs for this lack of clarity of purpose. As the previous chapters have suggested, the implementation of the subject faced major practical difficulties, neither time nor training was made available for CCs to explore the philosophy behind the new subject, schools immediately felt pressure from the educational establishment in terms of assessment and inspection, and Crick's own 'light touch', while well intentioned almost certainly added to the lack of clarity (a little more of the explicit tone of 'A note on what is, and what is not, Active Citizenship' (Crick, 2002b) would, I believe, have been welcomed with open arms by most CCs).

There are contrasting routes that have led CCs from Abingdon Road and Ivybridge Road to a more fully realised understanding of purpose than their colleagues; in one case the stricter external structure of a public exam syllabus, and in the other the rigorous thinking and training of a citizenship specific PGCE. This, I will argue, suggests not

only that there are potential solutions to the difficulties regarding a lack of clear understanding of purpose, but that there is an important debate to be had about which is more effective. This is a question to which I will return in my concluding chapter.

12) Research Findings – The Ajegbo Report, Student Voice and OFSTED

The research findings component of the thesis concludes with an examination of three elements which have impacted upon citizenship education provision and which help to contribute to a more in depth exploration of my third research question; *what do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by theory and policy issues?*

The Ajegbo Report

I suggested, in Chapter Six, that the Ajegbo Report, which examined the contribution that citizenship education could make to social cohesion in the light of the July 7th (2005) bombings, did not make any significant alterations to the intended purpose of citizenship education. Ajegbo himself was clear that his report basically represented a shift in emphasis which reflected the altered political circumstance. The change, which he identified as necessary, was not the introduction of discussion regarding diversity, to the citizenship curriculum, but the need to make it an explicit requirement (Department for Education and Skills, 2007). Crick (2007a p.154) reinforced this viewpoint suggesting that the increased emphasis on discussion of Britishness and associated issues was 'in the spirit of the rest of the citizenship order'. Despite the increased concern regarding homegrown terrorism, that was apparent after 2005, there have been no major changes in the political climate since with regard to citizenship, and New Labour's emphasis on rights and responsibilities remained the dominant political influence on the subject's curriculum.

Given the fact that the report did not attempt any redefinition, regarding the central question of purpose, it was not a major element in my discussions with the citizenship coordinators (CCs). However, since it is clear that perception of purpose can be as important as purpose itself, it was necessary to explore whether the CCs had shifted their priorities at all in response to Ajegbo's findings.

The most obvious finding, with regard to the Ajegbo's report, is that its profile was much lower than that of Crick's. While many of the CCs had not necessarily read The Crick Report, they had all heard of it, whereas seven of the ten had not even heard of the Ajegbo Report, and the other three suggested only that the name rang vague bells. None had read the report itself, a summary, or was even in a position to give a general outline of its concerns. However this does not mean that it can be immediately regarded as insignificant. Given the influence that it exerted over the revised National Curriculum of 2007 it is entirely possible for Ajegbo to have influenced the CCs indirectly through a shifting of their perception of the priorities when it came to delivering the subject.

My personal experience as a citizenship teacher is that the most significant impact of the Ajegbo Report was an increased emphasis on the concept of social cohesion, or as it was described in the 2007 National Curriculum, community cohesion. The pilot study had demonstrated the relatively high profile of the phrase, with headteachers identifying social cohesion as the fourth highest priority for citizenship education). I asked the CCs about these terms and whether they were aware of a sense of shifting priorities within the subject as the revised curriculum was introduced.

Two of the CCs, in Bedford Road and Jarrow Road, were clearly confused between community involvement and community cohesion:

> Community cohesion, isn't it, fitting in, sort of, not just being self-contained in a school, but actually fitting in with the local community. We've done some stuff on that, with things like, I've mentioned the old people's home and litter, litter-picking and stuff (CC Jarrow Road).

> It's (social cohesion) a strong strand throughout school life. Work with the community is really strong here, be it from 'A' Level students going into primary schools and teaching languages, to OAP parties and things like that (CC Bedford Road).

However, in all the other schools the concepts were linked to issues relating to diversity and the need for society to encourage tolerance and mutual understanding between different groups within society:

> It meant, how diverse our communities are. Looking at ways of acceptance, tolerance, and differences, and what happens when this goes wrong (CC Horsham Road).

In one of the strongest definitions this focus on diversity and tolerance was directly connected to the wider citizenship issue of how people come together to successfully bring about change:

> Social cohesion is a bigger picture… where you're saying that, within society, people from across different ethnicities, different social demographic groups can, can live together compatibly. And any issues in society can be addressed as a group. You know, that you can… Work together to make change (CC Eastbourne Road).

Once again, the evidence that assessment can play a part in clarifying issues is present here. The CC in question revealed that her understanding of this area was helped significantly by an OCR GCSE exam sourcebook. This would no doubt meet with Ajegbo's approval as he wrote in his report:

> The QCA should work closely with awarding bodies to ensure, wherever possible, that education for diversity appears in syllabuses and exam questions. QCA should also seek to embed education for diversity in curriculum subjects

and make links to show how education for diversity can be promoted across the curriculum (Department for Education and Skills, 2007 p.11).

Eight of the ten CCs felt that there was no significant change of focus with the introduction of the 2007 National Curriculum. Any changes were seen as largely presentational, and there was a feeling that, even if certain issues were being given greater prominence, they were covered by existing provision:

> I thought, this was the diversity aspects of what we were doing before… (CC Ivybridge Road).

> I don't think we did shift at all, because… we were looking at stuff around, you know, race and prejudice, and all the rest of it, and the community cohesion, I actually just didn't find it quite… I wasn't really sure what they were getting at (CC Fleetwood Road).

This might suggest that schools were failing to properly engage with the curriculum changes, but in fact it was more a case of the CCs feeling that, whilst they understood the need for the government to flag up particular issues for political reasons, the actual educational requirements, or content of the syllabus, had not really changed.

The exceptions to this were two schools (Abingdon Road and Horsham Road) where it was felt a significant change could be observed, namely a distinct focus on Islamaphobia which had not be present before:

> Reinforcing the diversity module was really important. So, actually, it focused a lot more on Islamophobia… it did need to start attacking those stereotypes (CC Horsham Road).

> I think there has been a refocus hasn't there… lots of youngsters talk about Islamaphobia… we need to be aware of extremism… but you have to avoid labeling and stereotyping (CC Abingdon Road).

However, even in these cases, there was not so much a changing sense of purpose as a feeling of some shifting priorities within the pre-existing framework. In other words their position was similar to Crick's response, a change in style rather than substance (Crick, 2007a).

Having established that neither the Ajegbo Report nor the subsequent National Curriculum Order had significantly impacted upon the CCs perceptions of the purpose of citizenship education there was one further point of interest that I wanted to explore. Did the CCs feel that, at least to an extent, citizenship education was being manipulated by politicians to give the impression that they were tackling the headline problem of the day, hence the shift from an emphasis on low turnout to an emphasis on community cohesion? Although primarily related to policy, the relevance of this question lay in the potential for citizenship to become a convenient catch all, thereby compromising its ability to Crick's intentions for the subject.

To one degree or another all of the CCs felt that rapidly shifting government priorities were unhelpful when it came to successfully developing the subject within the curriculum, and many expressed frustration that, to an extent, the subject was seen as a general 'problem solver':

> What they expect out of it, this complete rounded individual that knows everything about this, that, and the other, you know, it's just, it's ridiculous (CC Fleetwood Road).

On the question of whether the priorities in the subject changed due to the carefully considered needs of society, or the political expediency of the governing party, some were prepared to be more generous in their assessment than others:

> We're this little pawn that changes according to (politicians' demands), and we shouldn't. I don't think it reflects very well on education if we are just being bashed around by whoever's got in charge, and has got their latest little whim. I mean, actually what we're doing is valuable…It's quite frustrating when they then shove you something else that you're meant to be doing (CC Guildford Road).

> I don't know that I'm being a bit naïve in that, in thinking that, you know, it's something that was brought in by government that believed that that's important, you know? The difficulty is that you can say what you like about what our policy is, but the reality on the ground is very, very different (CC Ivybridge Road).

Generally, regardless of their attitude towards the politicians involved, there was a certain stoicism evident in the attitude of all the CCs, almost certainly a consequence of operating in an educational environment that has been somewhat addicted to constant change since the late 1980s (Hargreaves, 1994 p.1). This manifests itself in a feeling that there is a valuable basic core to the subject, which they will continue to concentrate on delivering while policy initiatives and political priorities shift around them. With regard to citizenship this is something of a double edged sword. In a traditional subject, such an attitude might offer a useful bulwark against shifting fashions, while still allowing for meaningful long term change and development. However, as the previous chapter suggested, citizenship is a new subject, and while many CCs have a broadly progressive vision for the subject they lack a strongly developed sense of how this is best realised in a classroom situation. As I have previously argued, Crick's 'light touch' failed to create a strong core around which an understanding of citizenship could be built, so the protection of existing practice against government initiatives is arguably less justifiable. That said it is unlikely that further government intervention, at least in curriculum terms, will rectify this. Once again the solution would appear to lie in giving citizenship

teachers the time, space and resources to develop their own deeper understanding of the subject's purpose and best methods of delivery.

Student Voice

In Chapter Eight it was noted that student representation in schools could play an important part in citizenship education, both through assisting with the development of their understanding of democratic institutions, and by encouraging them to feel like current, rather than future, citizens (Miles, 2006; Watts, 2006). Both OFSTED and CELS praised the development of school councils (OFSTED, 2010; Keating et al., 2010) as an area of significant progress.

However, it is important to understand that increased student representation is not primarily a consequence of the introduction of citizenship education, rather it stems from a separate educational initiative known as Student Voice or Pupil Voice (I will use the term Student Voice for consistency but schools use them interchangeably). An in depth consideration of the relationship between citizenship education and Student Voice is beyond the scope of this research, but is certainly worthy of investigation in its own right. I confined myself to two key areas that I wanted to discuss with the CCs regarding pupil representation and its relationship to the perceived purpose of citizenship education. Firstly, I was interested in the extent to which citizenship and Student Voice were integrated within the schools; were they seen as sharing a common purpose, and therefore mutually supportive, or were they very much separate entities? Secondly, were the CCs concerned that some forms of Student Voice could, in reality, undermine what they were attempting to achieve through their citizenship lessons?

<u>Integration of Citizenship and Student Voice</u>

All of the CCs interviewed agreed that it was important to model citizenship practices in their schools in order to send out a consistent message to their students (Osler and Starkey, 2006; Rainsford, 2011). In other words, if you are teaching the importance of active involvement and participation in your community, and its decision makings processes, it is important to provide opportunities for this to take place within the school, the students' most immediate community:

> I think young people, when you're talking about democratic processes…they need to see democracy in action in their own school (CC Eastbourne Road).

> If we're telling them, you can make a difference, then… they need to be able to do that… in their local community, which is the school (CC Horsham Road).

Whilst all of the CCs acknowledged that Student Voice could make a useful contribution to citizenship education, in so far as it could provide opportunities for citizenship activity and models of democratic participation, only two, Eastbourne Road and Horsham Road, made explicit links between citizenship and Student Voice in their schemes of work:

> It is in the schemes work… and it does reference the school council (CC Horsham Road)

For the most part Student Voice was seen as a separate, although complementary, initiative:

> We're a school that's very much behind student voice. Not just limited to citizenship, but across the whole curriculum (CC Didcot Road).

> I think you do (need Student Voice) but I don't think citizenship subject leaders necessarily have to be the ones doing it (CC Abingdon Road).

In part, this is because, at the time I was conducting the interviews, Student Voice was a more high profile issue than citizenship, particularly for senior managers (the pilot study found headteachers to be generally much more enthusiastic and committed to student voice than to citizenship). Both my personal experience, and the evidence from my pilot study (see the conclusion to Chapter Nine), suggests that a concern with student representation, whether in the form of student councils, lesson feedback or even staff interview involvement, had become a major concern in terms of OFSTED inspections, while citizenship was no longer being prioritised. In some schools (Colchester Road is a particular example) Student Voice initiatives were seen as a replacement for, rather than complementary to, the timetabled, academic study of, citizenship. This is a trend that is, I believe, likely to increase, as schools take advantage of their academy status to bypass the compulsory delivery of citizenship.

While it is clear that direct involvement in Student Voice does provide good examples of active citizenship, the major difficulty, as identified by OFSTED, is that these initiatives tend to involve only a small minority directly, through being on the student council or an interview panel, while the majority are involved only in a relatively passive capacity, such as voting for their school council representative. As OFSTED made clear, citizenship education is an entitlement of all students (OFSTED, 2003; OFSTED, 2004; OFSTED, 2005) and therefore even well developed Student Voice initiatives are not an effective means of promoting active citizenship unless they involve all students at a high level. This is quite apart from the fact that, while it may promote aspects of active citizenship, Student Voice can not provide the same well rounded understanding of politics, rights and responsibilities as formal curriculum citizenship, and therefore runs

the risk of falling into the trap, identified by OFSTED, of emphasising aspects of one of the three strands of citizenship education but failing to make clear the essentially political connections between them (OFSTED, 2003; OFSTED, 2004; OFSTED, 2005).

The Potential for Undermining Citizenship

Whilst an effective Student Voice policy has the potential to make a valuable contribution to citizenship education, through modelling democratic participation and providing opportunities for active citizenship in students' immediate communities, the initiative can also be counterproductive if it is perceived as tokenistic. Far from encouraging future active political activity, Student Voice programmes that are perceived as merely paying lip service to the idea of student consultation can leave pupils feeling disempowered and create a cynicism about participation which they will carry into adult life. There is a danger that the existence of representative bodies which lack any real ability to effect change can be counter productive, undermining the sense of efficacy which citizenship education aims to promote. Such concerns were raised by the pilot study which found that 85% of schools limited the role of the student council to one which was purely advisory). As was noted in Chapter Eight, 'These institutions must be sensitive to the transitional nature of youth but must also have an empowering element to not be tokenistic' (Rainsford, 2011 p.3).

All of the CCs were aware that there is a difficult balance to be struck with regard to student participation. On the one hand it is important that Student Voice initiatives avoid being perceived as mere window dressing, on the other, unless a school is prepared to go

down a very experimental route, the degree of student involvement in genuine

democratic decision making must be limited:

> We talk about democracy and respect, so we should model that in the classroom…but ultimately you can't run a classroom like that (CC Horsham Road).

> I do think that it's about balance, because at the end of the day… they are kids. And, hopefully, we do know best… And I think there's times when it's got to be, actually, you can't have a say… or you can have a say, but that's as far as it goes (CC Fleetwood Road).

CCs gave various examples of student proposals which were impractical, or of

disappointment that favoured candidates had not been appointed, to illustrate how

students can feel that they have no genuine input into decision making. This did lead to

an acceptance that many students did see Student Voice as merely paying 'lip service' to

their concerns:

> I think, definitely that's a danger… they say their demands, if you like, or their requests… and then they don't get everything. And they see that as a rejection of their ideas and, therefore, they're not valued. And what they don't realize is, actually, they are one stakeholder. Within an institution there are other voices and stakeholders who have to have their voices heard (CC Ivybridge Road).

The danger of Student Voice creating the very cynicism towards interaction with

decision making bodies that citizenship education is trying to overcome is a very real

one and was recognised by all of the CCs. However their responses to the problem

differed. For some the key was to emphasize the positive achievements of Student Voice

in order to try and limit any negativity from the students:

> The game is… to make sure they have a project or something… which we know can be fulfilled basically… and then they see success, and, you know… Whereas some of their slightly more outlandish ideas… you can, then, quietly, you know… So, you have to play a bit of a game. You have to let some of the stuff they decide go through. Otherwise, they think it's a waste of time (CC Jarrow Road).

However, this might be regarded as somewhat manipulative and the majority of CCs aimed to try and balance expectations through an honest appeal to the students to recognise that, whilst they could have some input into decision making, they should not expect either the final say, or for all of their initiatives to be acted upon:

> I think it's about managing expectations… and it's about giving them the feedback. That's what I found, actually, more important. Managing expectations is a big part of it, but giving them the feedback… so, they understand when they have made a difference… and they understand when they can't make a difference, when it's not appropriate… but that they have been heard and listened to. I think that's the important thing (CC Horsham Road).

Alongside this, the CCs tended to emphasize the importance of continued participation, even if you don't achieve your desired outcome. This is clearly a key citizenship lesson:

> My continual response is that, yes, it's not a perfect world, but you have got to be engaging and in it to win it. Otherwise, you cannot really criticize what goes on (CC Eastbourne Road).

The strongest response, in terms of citizenship education, was a CC who used this potential problem as an opportunity to develop an important point about the difference between participation in an essentially voluntary institution such as a school (at least in terms of the particular institution) and the compulsory nature of the state itself. You are not a 'citizen' of the school in the same way that you are a citizen of the state, you can leave the school and its decision making realm. The fact that this is not an option, short of emigration, where the state is concerned, makes your involvement in politics and participation in the democratic process all the more important, a lesson that can be reinforced, rather than undermined, by frustrations with the inadequacy of Student Voice:

> Quite often, I say, you know, in terms of if there are situations in a classroom, I'll say, my position is I cannot do that… as much as I might like to, I'm constrained by what the law says, or our local education authority, actually what the Head says, and equally the Head has to do certain things… (CC Abingdon Road).

Such an approach takes a potential weakness in the relationship between citizenship education and Student Voice, and turns it into a strength. However, this is only possible if the CC involved has a well developed understanding of the underpinnings of citizenship itself. It was very encouraging to see that all of the CCs, in one form or another, showed an understanding of the potential problems that Student Voice might cause for citizenship education, but it was also clearly the case that their ability to deal effectively with this issue was strongly related to the degree to which they had developed a clear personal understanding of citizenship's underlying purpose.

OFSTED Reports

Chapters Seven and Eight investigated the potential influence of OFSTED on schools' attitudes towards citizenship education. In particular they explored the possibility that the inspection regime of OFSTED may have pushed the delivery of the subject in a more conservative direction, as CCs attempted to ensure that measurable outcomes were available to demonstrate their compliance with the National Curriculum Order. Although I suggested that any conservative influence was primarily a consequence of the coordinators perceptions of OFSTED's requirements rather than directions provided by the body itself, the assumption was that OFSTED played a significant part in shaping provision.

With this is mind it came as something of a surprise to find that citizenship was mentioned relatively infrequently in the OFSTED reports of the ten Gloucestershire schools in my sample. Having collected all the reports of the participant schools between 1999 and 2012, I discovered that only eleven, of a total of thirty, mentioned the term citizenship. In addition, there was one school subject specific survey that was part of a national investigation into citizenship provision. The format of OFSTED reports changed in 2005 so that they no longer gave subject specific feedback. However it was not this change that prompted a reduction in focus on citizenship; references to the subject were fairly evenly spread in chronological terms, as the table below illustrates.

Table 7: References to Citizenship in OFSTED Reports of Participant Schools

Year	No. of OFSTED Reports on participant schools	Number of Reports mentioning Citizenship
1999	2	2
2000	1	0
2001	2	0
2002	1	0
2003	1	1
2004	2	2
2005	2	2
2006	2	1
2007	4	0
2008	2	1
2009	3	1
2010	3	0
2011	1	0
2012	4	1
TOTAL	**30**	**11**

In only three instances, in 2003 and 2004, were inspectors explicitly identified with a responsibility to investigate citizenship provision (although the practice of identifying individual inspectors' subject responsibility in reports was discontinued from 2005 onwards).

310

Of course the fact that citizenship is not explicitly identified in a report does not preclude judgement regarding its provision making a contribution to the overall assessment of the school, particularly in the post 2005 reports. However, given that particular subjects are almost always identified when problematic, and occasionally when they make an outstanding contribution to a school's overall provision, the relatively infrequent references to citizenship can be seen to stand in marked contrast to the concerns apparent in both the pilot study and the interviews that it was a subject area where a school might be heavily criticised due to a particular focus by OFSTED inspectors. No doubt this viewpoint can be partly attributed to a natural concern about the introduction of a new compulsory subject in which very few staff had any training, but it was also fuelled by inflammatory reports, often taken out of context, such as the references to the OFSTED Chief Inspector describing citizenship as the worst taught subject in schools (OFSTED, 2006 p.31).

A study of the reports suggests that, by and large, citizenship is treated much as any other subject, perhaps with the proviso that, as instructed (OFSTED, 2002a p.9), some allowance should be made for its status as a new subject. In other words, where it is a particular strength of a school it is identified, and its outstanding features noted, and equally, where provision is poor this is made clear. However, in many instances, like many other subjects, it will not be considered necessary to make specific reference to citizenship education when making a judgement about a school's overall standards.

Of course the reality of the inspectors' approach matters little when it comes to schools' implementation of programmes of citizenship education and their preparations for

inspection. What matters are their beliefs about what inspection of citizenship entails. Here then, is further evidence of the 'perception gap' that I identified in Chapter Eight, where CCs', and other schools leaders', approach towards their provision of the subject is influenced more by their fears about inspection than by the reality. Whilst it can not be discounted that it was a degree of paranoia that ensured that the majority of schools had adequate provision in place, and therefore minimized the need for specific criticism in reports, many of the interviewees spoke of a feeling that they had been overly concerned (and therefore perhaps been overly prescriptive in their approach) and that they would feel considerably more relaxed at the prospect of subsequent visits.

In Chapter Eight I wrote about my personal experience regarding a 'perception gap' between what OFSTED were saying in their official reports and what I felt OFSTED inspectors required in the classroom. I felt that their inspections required evidence that pushed the subject in a more traditional, knowledge based, and therefore easily assessed, direction. This seemed to be a conservative force which acted in opposition to the progressive understanding of the subject's purpose found in the work of Gutmann or Crick. However, having read the detailed OFSTED policy reports on the subject, something that most CCs are unlikely to have had the time to do, it became clear that OFSTED publications did their best to maintain the distinctive elements of Crick's vision, with the importance of political engagement, critical thinking, active citizenship emphasised (OFSTED, 2006). Whilst this does not preclude the possibility that individual inspectors 'on the ground' were adopting a more conservative approach it is clear that OFSTED as an institution can not be legitimately regarded as a threat to Crick's vision. However, it must also be understood that the actual position of OFSTED

is largely irrelevant in terms of how CCs attempt to implement their vision for citizenship, it is their perception, or often more tellingly their manager's perception, of OFSTED's position that is crucial, and, if they believe that the inspection regime runs contrary to their vision for the subject, it is likely that it will have various compromises forced upon them.

It was clear from my conversations with the CCs that most of them felt a strong pressure to provide evidence for inspection and that, in many cases this pushed them in the direction of more assessed written work:

> It was definite pressure and concern about an inspector saying, you know, can you show me some level 5 work in citizenship and that kind of thing (CC Jarrow Road).

> It isn't really what is that important at the end of the day, other than OFSTED want it, and I think it actually just took away what the actual meaning of Citizenship was… And it did, I'd say put real pressure on it as a tick, like a tick box (CC Fleetwood Road).

> I think it took out valuable time, because I did stuff to have evidence… so I used to do focused assessment tasks. Twice a year I would sit them down in a room and they would do some writing based around a built up task where I had my criteria that I could mark against. I did that to meet what I'd been told to do… Was it useful? Probably not (CC Guildford Road).

There was not, however, simply a concern with an emphasis on assessment, there was also a feeling that OFSTED were more concerned with what the students knew about citizenship than what kind of citizens they were becoming:

> I think they, in my experience, they'd more likely come in and want to see books and tests and why'd you give them this grade, and asking the kid why they think they're on this level, rather than… actually look around the school, talk to kids and see what they've achieved, or what they've done, or how they've developed over a period of time… I just think it's an absolutely ridiculous thing to be trying to do in this type of subject. I really do (CC Guildford Road).

On the other hand three of the CCs believed that OFSTED had much more of a concern for the 'whole student'. Although the first was not sure that this would necessarily be the case in the future, and the second expressed this not so much as a compliment to the inspectors, but as simply a further inspection concern:

> I would say that based on the last OFSTED they are more interested in the kind of citizens they are becoming… but of course that was under the last government, we haven't been OFSTEDed for a while, so my concern is that it will switch to what do they know, what have they written down (CC Jarrow Road).

> Actually I think I'd get absolutely punished by a decent citizenship OFSTED inspector who said, oh, great, they know a lot, but, actually, what about all the other aspects (CC Ivybridge Road).

The third provides perhaps the most compelling evidence of a 'perception gap' as they describe how attending a course, where the approach of OFSTED was discussed, has shifted their view regarding the nature of inspections:

> I think they are now more interested at looking at the student as a person, rather than their knowledge and understanding. I think it's turned on its head. It's really changed. Having gone on a recent course you know, it was really interesting that, that people who had OFSTED recently said the emphasis was placed on the individual students (CC Didcot Road).

What is interesting here is that, my study of the various OFSTED policy reports in Chapter Eight showed, there has been no change in OFSTED's position regarding the inspection of Citizenship, and the shift that the CC reports is basically to do with how their priorities are perceived.

The final question regarding this 'perception gap' must be to ask about its origins. Is it simply a consequence of citizenship immediately being subjected to an assessment and inspection regime that was unsuitable for a brand new curriculum subject, particularly

when trained staff were in short supply? My answer here is a qualified yes. OFSTED itself emphasised both the holistic nature of its inspections in the subject, and made it clear that it would be making allowances that took into consideration the difficulties of implementing a new compulsory subject (OFSTED, 2002a). However this does not seem to have been the message received by the CCs involved. Some responsibility for this might lie with OFSTED itself, who could have better publicized their intentions regarding inspections, but much more lies with senior managers in the schools themselves, who immediately put pressure on CCs to be able to provide evidence for inspectors.

My pilot study confirmed that citizenship was regarded by many headteachers with suspicion, not because of any inherent opposition to the subject itself, but because they felt insecure about the subject's provision; an insecurity which stemmed from the knowledge that its assessment would form part of their OFSTED assessment. In many ways then, citizenship was treated as any other curriculum subject; its teachers were asked to produce easily measurable outcomes that could provide good evidence for inspectors. This was the major source of pressure on citizenship teachers, and the primary cause of the 'perception gap':

> We have a lot of lesson observations by SLT (Senior Leadership Team) members… and my impression is they wouldn't necessarily be looking for the skills, as a citizen. They would be looking for that content-driven stuff (CC Horsham Road).

As a teacher I am aware that such 'teaching to the inspection' is increasingly standard practice in schools, and its rights and wrongs will not be discussed here. However, it

must be noted that such pressure was uniquely problematic for citizenship; partly because it was a subject in its infancy, that had not had a chance to establish itself, partly because there was a lack of trained teachers who could provide a significantly strong personal vision for the subject to act as a counter weight to such pressures, but mostly because it compromised many of the unique aspects of citizenship education which were central to Crick's vision for the subject.

The CCs who have been most successful in dealing with the weight of pressure, created by the inspection regime, fall into two categories. As might be expected those with a strongly developed personal understanding of the subject's purpose are better able to fight for a reasonable compromise between their vision and the priorities of their managers. Also, and somewhat more surprisingly, those schools who examine the subject tend to maintain a more progressive approach to the subject in line with Crick's intentions. This may be because, the knowledge that OFSTED has made clear its satisfaction with the exam route allows the CC to concentrate on their own vision:

> It's not about OFSTED for me. They turn up every, I don't know how often and although obviously I have to play the OFSTED game it's about my feeling for this subject and more importantly it's about my clients feelings for it (CC Abingdon Road).

On the other hand it may be because the exam structure itself, taking its lead from Crick, emphasises a much wider form of assessment than simply recall of knowledge:

> The composition of the course that we were following… allowed us to put emphasis onto the active side… and becoming active citizens, or trying to demonstrate active citizenship (CC Eastbourne Road).

Clearly assessment can be both the problem and the solution, when it comes to dealing with OFSTED. The misperception that OFSTED requires large amounts of written work as inspection evidence can stifle the subject, whereas adoption of an exam syllabus can both aid the development of the CCs understanding of the subject and can, by reassuring the SMT, create the space for that vision to be implemented.

13) Conclusions and Summary of Findings

<u>Overview</u>

This research has had two distinct but inter-related components, both of which have been informed, not only by my role as a researcher, but by the fact that throughout this process I have been a working citizenship teacher. This has allowed me to contextualize my academic research, into the subject's underlying philosophy, and my theoretical research, into policy implementation, in the everyday experience of a practitioner 'on the ground'. It also gave me the significant advantage, in my fieldwork, of being able to engage with my interviewees as colleagues, as well as in my role as a researcher; generally, I believe, enhancing levels of trust, and the honesty of their responses. Of course, potential disadvantages existed, primarily the fact that I came to this project with quite strong pre-existing views with regard to certain issues, but I have been clear to acknowledge this and have consistently shown an awareness of my own positionality. In some areas my research has caused me to completely reassess my own position and this I have openly acknowledged. Ultimately, I believe the advantages have greatly outweighed any concerns, and the research makes a substantial contribution to scholarship, both in terms of an academic study, of the purpose of citizenship education from the perspective of a working citizenship teacher, and fieldwork research, which examines an area that has rarely been discussed with teachers themselves, with most previous studies focusing on policy and implementation.

The central purpose of my research is to examine the underlying principles and philosophies of Citizenship Education and to explore how these are perceived by

citizenship coordinators. The primary reason why the research has a two part structure is that I wished to establish, before I conducted my fieldwork, both a clear understanding of the underlying principles and different potential interpretations of purpose concerning citizenship education, and a detailed knowledge of the potential impediments that certain policy issues might create for a consistent approach to the subject. The four research questions reflect the journey from theory to practice.

My examination of Crick's work within the context of the competing pressures at the heart of liberal democracy has allowed me to appreciate its strengths, such as finding a genuine workable compromise position on the central question of the subject's progressive or conservative nature, as well as key weaknesses, such as the pursuit of a 'light touch approach' which failed to effectively communicate the nature of this compromise in a curriculum form. It also added to my own experience of some of the policy difficulties associated with the subject a wealth of knowledge drawn from research in other schools. This allowed me to develop interview questions which focused on both the internal consistency of the CCs views on purpose, and the degree to which their ability to remain true to their beliefs was compromised by external pressures.

Primary Findings

Given the central concern of this research, to examine citizenship coordinators' perceptions of purpose, with regard to Crick model, the key findings focus on the third research question:

What do citizenship coordinators perceive as the purpose of Citizenship Education, and to what extent is their approach influenced by theory and policy issues?

Firstly, all of the interviewees had broadly progressive intentions for the subject; whilst they recognised the need to develop the habits of 'good' citizens in their students, as contemporary teachers, all were at great pains to stress the value of critical thinking and their wish to avoid any form of indoctrination.

Secondly, when their perceptions of the subject were examined in more depth it became clear that, in most cases, their understanding of what a progressive approach entailed was limited, and their commitment was often more theoretical than reflected in actual practice.

Thirdly, my research demonstrates that the explanation for this inconsistency lies partly with a lack of understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of the subject, and partly with the distortions caused by various policy pressures.

Fourthly, the major policy issues identified by the CCs in the sample schools are precisely those identified in the national policy documents; an unhelpful link to PSHE, a lack of discrete delivery, a lack of specialist teachers, low status, the difficulties of establishing and running a citizenship department, and problems with assessment. However, what is equally clear is that many of these problems can be, at least partially, overcome by citizenship coordinators who have a clear vision for the subject

These findings will be discussed below in the section 'Explaining the Disconnect'.

Underlying Principles and the Crick Report

The findings above have been informed and contextualized by work on two other important research questions, my conclusions are summarized below:

What underlying principles and philosophies exist regarding the purpose of citizenship education in a Liberal Democracy?

Most modern liberal commentators on citizenship education agree there are a number of virtues that are necessary for the health of liberal democracy; the problem is that they have very different interpretations regarding the nature and extent of these virtues, and consequently very different ideas about the legitimate purposes and desirable content of any programme of citizenship education. Broadly speaking approaches can be characterised as conservative, focusing on simply inculcating the necessary values for the state's continued survival, and therefore the support of the status quo, or progressive, stressing the importance of individual autonomy and a critical approach to political authority.

Crick's primacy of politics over democracy, and Gutmann's conscious social reproduction both aim for a compromise approach which marries support for the basic values of the state (obeying the law, paying taxes etc.) with an emphasis on active political participation which expects to see autonomous citizens regularly challenging political authority.

Which principles and philosophies did the Crick Report adopt and how are these reflected in the National Curriculum subject of 'Citizenship Education'?

A compromise between traditionalism and progressivism formed the basis of the concept of citizenship education found in the Crick Report. It combines social and moral responsibility with community involvement, but envisages both informed by a form of political literacy which is based upon active participation rather than passive knowledge.

Crick appeared to accept that the questioning of the wider status quo, the underlying nature of the political or economic system, and its dominant ideology, was either too difficult or too controversial, to form a legitimate part of citizenship education.

The most serious criticisms of the Crick Report concerned its handling of issues connected to race. Whilst the report contains some clumsy language, it is not guilty of institutionalized racism and accusations that it fails to take multiculturalism seriously stem from its critics defining citizenship completely differently (from a universalist, human rights based perspective).

The Ajegbo Report did not make any significant alterations to Crick's blueprint for citizenship education (as the report itself acknowledges); the change, which Ajegbo identifies as necessary, is not the *introduction* of discussion regarding diversity, to the citizenship curriculum, but the need to make it an *explicit requirement*.

Additional Findings

Whilst the findings above directly address the first three research questions, a number of other significant observations can be drawn from this research:

The introduction of citizenship as a compulsory curriculum subject was a significant achievement given the failure of various similar initiatives over the previous one hundred and fifty years. It was made possible by a particular combination of factors; a broad political consensus, widespread concern over the political apathy of young people, and a minister (David Blunkett) with a strong personal interest in the area.

At the same time that citizenship education was being introduced to schools they were becoming more physically isolated from their communities as high fences, security passes, swipe cards, entry by intercom and closed circuit cameras became standard measures in schools.

Six out of ten CCs had some familiarity with the Crick Report, with two having studied it in detail. This is impressive for a policy document outside the normal National Curriculum or exam support materials.

Seven out of ten CCs had no familiarity with the Ajegbo Report and the others merely expressed recognition of the name. When given an explanation of its role in the drafting of the 2007 National Curriculum, eight felt it had had no impact upon either their understanding or delivery of the subject, while the remaining two identified a small shift in emphasis regarding diversity issues.

To one degree or another all of the CCs felt that rapidly shifting government priorities were unhelpful when it came to successfully developing the subject within the curriculum (the term political football was used on more than one occasion), and many

expressed frustration that, to an extent, the subject was seen as a general 'problem solver', citing the shift from political apathy to social cohesion as the 'headline' concern as an example.

Whilst all of the CCs acknowledged that Student Voice could make a useful contribution to citizenship education, in so far as it could provide opportunities for citizenship activity and models of democratic participation, none made explicit links between citizenship and Student Voice in their schemes of work. For the most part Student Voice was seen as a separate, although complementary, initiative.

All CCs agreed that the danger of Student Voice creating the very cynicism towards interaction with decision making bodies that citizenship education is trying to overcome is very real.

All CCs recognised that schools, as institutions which are dependent upon successfully exercising authority over their students, may have a tendency to emphasize a more conservative approach to the subject and the importance of being a 'good' citizen.

The conversion to academy status was responsible for the increasing marginalization of citizenship education in several of the participating schools. This process is likely to continue in the future.

<u>Explaining the Disconnect – The Central Research Issue</u>

The key finding of this research is that while all of the CCs interviewed share the progressive intentions of the Crick Report's vision for the citizenship education, the reality of their understanding and delivery of the subject is often not consistent with their stated beliefs.

The compromise that Crick envisages involves combining the development of the habits of 'good' citizenship with an active and critical form of political literacy. There is obviously a potential conflict between the inculcation of values implicit in the former and the need to encourage an independent and critical approach to authority in the latter. As contemporary teachers, all the CCs were at great pains to stress their wish to avoid any form of indoctrination. However, when their perceptions of the subject were examined in more depth it became clear that, in most cases (eight out of ten), their understanding of what a progressive approach entailed was limited, and their commitment was more theoretical than reflected in actual practice.

This disconnect was evident in their approach to the example of protests over the Iraq war, the fact that many of them regarded 'active citizenship' as a synonym for volunteering, and, most importantly, in their failure to see the necessity of closely integrating the three strands of the subject, so that Social and Moral Responsibility and Community Involvement are always connected to Political Literacy, therefore maintaining the essentially political character of the subject that Crick believed was vital.

As Chapters Ten and Eleven established, there are two factors which help to explain this disconnect; firstly, a lack of understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of the subject, coupled with a 'light touch' approach which offered insufficient guidance to ensure the integrity of Crick's vision for the subject was maintained, and secondly, the effects of policy difficulties associated with the problems of implementation, and the pressures of the prevailing educational culture.

1) Inconsistency and the Light Touch Approach

Eight out of the ten CCs interviewed expressed opinions about significant aspects of citizenship education, whether concerning student demonstrations, volunteering, or the integration of political literacy with the other two National Curriculum strands, which were at odds with their initial statement of progressive intentions for the subject. This inconsistency can be, at least partly, explained by a failure to apply the thinking which informs Crick's carefully constructed compromise view of the purpose of citizenship education, to each individual component of their schemes of work. I would suggest that this does not really represent a failing on the part of the teachers involved; the reality is, as Chapters Seven and Eight established, that a 'light touch' approach was an inappropriate way to introduce a new and challenging subject to the curriculum, particularly in the absence of trained specialist staff.

Crick's naivety in believing that teachers would have time to supplement the reading of the National Curriculum with his report and other additional material meant that the 'light touch' failed to provide a strong enough framework to ensure consistency between teachers' intentions for the subject and their actual understanding, and approach to

delivering it. Despite its good intentions of empowering teachers to make many of their own decisions regarding the subject, it created a vacuum that was often filled, particularly in light of some of the policy pressures discussed below, by the safest and most conservative approach. More explicit instruction along the lines of 'A note on what is and what is not active citizenship' (Crick, 2002b) would have been enormously helpful.

The 'light touch' approach was ultimately problematic, in terms of both understanding of purpose and implementation of policy, not because of an inherent weakness, its internal logic that, in a subject as nuanced as citizenship, teachers should be given the space to develop their own understanding and methods, made sense, but because Crick failed to understand the educational culture with which he was dealing. What should have created space for teachers to exercise some freedom, instead caused insecurity and fear, pushing the subject in a more conservative and assessment heavy direction. The reason for this was a combination of pressures; as much as teachers might have enjoyed spending time pondering the underlying nature of citizenship education, and my discussions with the CCs suggest such an opportunity would indeed have been very welcome, the reality was that for most of them citizenship was an additional responsibility, on top of a heavy existing workload, and one which placed them immediately under pressure to provide evidence to their headteachers that they were ready for inspection.

2) Policy Issues, The Influence of OFSTED and the 'Perception Gap'

Many of the policy concerns that were highlighted in Chapters Seven and Eight were confirmed as issues 'on the ground' by the CCs and the responses of headteachers to the pilot study; an unhelpful link to PSHE, a lack of discrete delivery, a lack of specialist teachers, low status, the difficulties of establishing and running a citizenship department, and problems with assessment, were all raised as issues by interviewees (see Chapter Ten). Once again the 'light touch' can be seen to have had a somewhat counter-intuitive effect. Whilst the intention was that it would give teachers the space and opportunity to pursue a variety of exciting approaches to delivering the subject, in reality it undermined its academic status, and, by providing no clear framework, left inexperienced and untrained teachers vulnerable to the likelihood of a conservative or minimalist approach, either imposed from above, or through lack of time or knowledge to pursue any alternatives.

Whilst the 'light touch' approach created the circumstance whereby progressive intentions for the subject could drift towards a more conservative approach, when it came to its actual implementation, I was strongly of the opinion, when I began this research, that OFSTED bore much of the responsibility for accelerating and encouraging this process. Whilst this view was based upon my own experience as a teacher, as I make clear, in Chapters Seven and Eight, I was forced to revise my perspective by my investigation of OFSTED's policy documents relating to citizenship education. It became clear that OFSTED was committed to the progressive/conservative compromise, at the heart of Crick's vision, effectively balancing the priorities of Galston and Gutmann, and that it regularly drew attention to the need to keep the three learning

strands integrated and maintain the essentially political nature of the subject, as well as emphasising the importance of critical thinking and genuine active citizenship.

Where OFSTED is critical of schools' provision, and this is also true of other bodies within the 'educational establishment' such as the QCA and the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS), it is generally because they are failing to maintain the progressive elements of the subject, or at worst simply rebranding existing PSHE or community action. Over time there is a gradual tightening up of assessment criteria, most notably the introduction of the eight point end of key stage descriptors, but even this was at the schools' own request.

Nevertheless, although two of the CCs I spoke to did suggest that their experience of OFSTED had reinforced their progressive intentions for the subject, the majority felt, as I once had, that the inspectors would show far more concern for what the students knew rather than what sort of citizen they were becoming. It is this disparity between OFSTED's intentions, and teachers' beliefs about them, that I have described as a 'perception gap'. It is this 'perception gap', in the absence of any clearly defined framework as a consequence of 'light touch', which is responsible for pushing many CCs towards 'safe' worksheets and written assessed tasks, which can easily be used as inspection evidence, and the subject generally in a more conservative direction.

Whilst the existence of this 'perception gap' suggests that many citizenship teachers have been mistaken in the assumptions they have made about OFSTED's requirements for the subject, I would be reluctant to suggest that responsibility for this

misunderstanding lies with them. The modern culture of school inspections means that senior managers increasingly insist that teachers 'teach to the inspection' and, as the pilot study indicates, focus on the most immediately visible aspect of any policy. This means having easily accessible and verifiable evidence, and managers will, as was confirmed by many of the CCs, put considerable pressure on their staff to ensure that it is immediately available. As I noted in Chapter Twelve, such pressure was uniquely damaging to citizenship due to a combination of factors; it was a new subject which was yet to develop its identity, there was a lack of trained staff that truly understood it and were in a position to defend it against management interference, and finally, such interference was particularly damaging to the vision for the subject that Crick had laid out.

Headteachers and school managers, whose concerns over facing potential criticism for their provision of the subject was highlighted by my pilot study, must bear a good deal of responsibility for the pressure that CCs have experienced. However, these headteachers do not operate in a vacuum and it is here that we return to OFSTED. While their individual policy advice regarding citizenship was largely supportive of Crick's vision, they have played a huge part in creating a general culture of fear and paranoia within which school leaders have to operate.

Whilst neither I, nor my interviewees, would ever expect a headteacher to admit it, we were united, as teachers, in our belief that ultimately the needs of inspection are the primary driving force behind all school policy. Whether this is to the ultimate benefit of the students is not a discussion that falls within the scope of this research. What is clear

is that citizenship education, as a subject area in its infancy, would have benefitted from not immediately being subjected to the same rigorous inspection and assessment regimes as other compulsory National Curriculum subjects. Unfortunately no kind of phased introduction was ever considered, although OFSTED did instruct that some informal allowances should be made during the first few years that the subject was taught. Perhaps, it was not politically feasible to suggest that a subject was so important that it should be made compulsory, whilst simultaneously exempting it from the inspection regime.

Minimizing the Disconnect

The two issues outlined above are not distinct, rather they are interrelated. A lack of knowledge, or confidence in understanding, of the theoretical issues that underpin citizenship education can lead to problems when implementing the subject; at the same time, external policy pressures can slowly erode the progressive perceptions of purpose that a teacher may once have held.

My final research question asked:

Could a greater understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of Citizenship Education among citizenship coordinators, improve its provision?

The conclusions drawn in Chapters Ten and Eleven suggest that the answer is a qualified yes. My research has suggested that a combination of a 'light touch' approach and a highly pressurized educational environment has created a set of circumstances that push citizenship education in a conservative and assessment heavy direction. It has also revealed that there are two approaches which help to counteract this.

The CCs at Didcot Road, Eastbourne Road and particularly the A-level studying Abingdon Road were much better prepared to deal with policy pressures within their institutions as they felt the exam gave the subject academic status, and the syllabuses provided a sold basis for schemes of work and allocation of appropriate staff time and resources. By contrast the citizenship PGCE trained CC of Ivybridge Road was making progress in advancing the subject, without the introduction of any exams, through strong personal advocacy, enabled by their individual understanding of its nature and purpose.

There seems little doubt that the approach seen in Ivybridge Road, where a fully qualified citizenship education teacher plays a substantial role in determining a school's policy towards the subject, comes closest to the model that Crick envisaged. Here is a school leader well grounded in the questions of underlying purpose discussed in this research, and with a wealth of training that enables them to pursue a variety of appropriate approaches to teaching, learning and assessment. With regard to the third research question it seems that the better the grasp of the theory the better the protection against some of the policy difficulties. Such an observation would certainly be borne out by my own experience as a citizenship teacher. As my knowledge regarding the subject increased I felt increasingly confident in defending its place within the curriculum.

To his credit, whilst he hugely over-estimated the amount of time teachers might have available for study of his report and associated materials, Crick did stress the importance of investment in ITT and CPD. Arguably however, this investment in training needed to significantly pre-date the introduction of the subject rather than arrive, as it did, near simultaneously. Experts were needed on the ground during the crucial early years of the

subject trying to establish itself within the curriculum, and, unfortunately many of the problems discussed in this research became well entrenched before the arrival of any subject specialists. In addition the ability of subject specialists to make a difference continues to be hampered by simple lack of numbers (figures from the ACT for the year 2014-15 show only nine institutions were offering a PGCE Citizenship course).

Many of the CCs who I interviewed had taken responsibility for developing their own understanding of the subject and had been assisted in this by some useful CPD and a strong support network of practitioners across the county. Ultimately, however, lack of time and, in most cases, other school responsibilities, meant that their opportunities to develop a really in depth understanding of the subject were limited.

Perhaps then, whilst a greater understanding of underlying purpose might be the ideal, the exam route provides the best means of protecting what is distinctive about citizenship. This seems somewhat counter-intuitive since there is an obvious danger that exam assessment pushes the subject in a more traditional and conservative direction. However both the GCSE, offered at three schools in my sample, and the A-level, offered at one, are built around syllabuses that closely follow Crick's vision for the subject, and offer forms of assessment, in terms of projects and portfolios, that go beyond simple written assessment. In the schools where these exams are taken the CCs have the additional advantage of the subject enjoying higher status amongst pupils and management alike and the reassurance that comes from knowing that OFSTED regards the exam route as an excellent way of meeting the compulsory requirement for citizenship provision.

Nevertheless, I would be reluctant to suggest that all schools should follow an exam route as the most effective means of providing citizenship education. Whilst it may raise citizenship's status, it also loses something by becoming just another academic subject. The development of our citizenship, and our relationship with the society, within which we live, should have a much wider scope than the development of our academic abilities. There is also a clear danger in allowing the perception to develop that an exam can separate out good citizens from bad citizens.

Recommendations

This research provides a unique perspective on Citizenship Education in England by combining an examination of its theoretical underpinnings alongside an investigation of how this theory is perceived by practitioners; all informed by my own perspective, which is that of both researcher and working teacher. It has established that there is a clear progressive intent for the subject amongst CCs but that this is compromised by a lack of depth in conceptual understanding and various policy pressures. In order to fully answer my final research question consideration must be given to how the current situation could be improved.

Firstly, I believe that, despite the various difficulties associated with its introduction, citizenship education has been a valuable addition to the curriculum and efforts should be made to retain it – particularly in light of the threat posed to its existence by the vast majority of schools taking up academy status (see Chapter One).

In the short term CCs could improve the consistency of their approach and their ability to resist damaging policy pressures, not least the potential removal of the subject from the curriculum by academy schools, by improving their conceptual understanding of the subject. The Crick Report itself is a good place to start, and there is a wealth of useful material available through websites such as the Citizenship Foundation. However, given my personal experience of teachers' workloads, I am reluctant to place too much responsibility onto individuals themselves.

In the medium term there is much that headteachers and SMTs could do to assist the development of the subject. Firstly the evidence of the pilot study suggests that headteachers view the subject as something of an inconvenience rather than a positive contribution to their students' education. A shift in attitude from the top would go a long way towards relieving some of the policy pressures identified, particularly in light of the 'perception gap' that I identified earlier. Such a change is only possible if they can be persuaded of the intrinsic value of the subject, rather than simply seeing it as another transitory government initiative. Those headteachers already convinced of its value can assist their staff in their own understanding of the subject by providing the resource they lack the most; time. All CCs expressed a concern at the lack of CPD and INSET time allocated to their subject. They might also consider adopting the subject as an exam option. The exams closely follow Crick's model for the subject and therefore protect a progressive vision for the subject even if the conceptual understanding of those delivering it is limited.

In the longer term, if citizenship education is going to become an established part of the curriculum, a renewing of effort is required at a government level. Citizenship education has been successful in establishing a beachhead in schools where many past initiatives have failed (see Chapter One) but this momentum is in danger of being lost. The suggestions made above are largely dependent upon government demonstrating that it values the subject. For all the benefit that it might have, neither individual teachers nor headteachers are going to look to further develop their conceptual understanding of a subject which has no future in the curriculum. The retention of the subject in the National Curriculum was a small victory for supporters of citizenship education but is relatively meaningless in an educational landscape dominated by academies.

A government that is serious about citizenship education needs to address the issues raised by this research. The Crick Report is a good basis for citizenship education but the understanding of its model is often confused or incomplete. This can be addressed in a number of ways. The 'light touch' approach should be replaced by a more prescriptive approach which ensures that Crick's expectations for the subject are met; not unlike the approach of the GSCE and A level syllabuses. However, this does not tackle the root cause of the problem, and in the longer term what is needed is more investment in the understanding of the subject. The one candidate in my sample with a citizenship PGCE was best able to maintain a consistently progressive approach to the subject and resist difficulties caused by policy pressures. It would seem obvious that if a subject is to be taught well teachers need to be trained in its delivery, but PGCE places for citizenship teachers have always been limited and are currently declining. This trend needs to be reversed. However, given that the vast majority of citizenship teachers are not new

entrants to the profession adjustments to ITT are not sufficient. A serious programme of CPD for citizenship could make a major impact on both the status and delivery of the subject. What is crucial is that such a programme such not be a short delivery focused session designed to enable a non specialist to 'gap fill' in the curriculum. Rather school staff, from the headteachers down, need to have an understanding of *why* citizenship should be part of a student's education; how the issues it raises cut across all aspects of education.

The type of CPD that is generally available in schools, particularly though INSET, is relentlessly policy, and usually inspection, focused. What I am suggesting is necessary is something of a change in culture and a re-evaluation of CPD. An opportunity for teachers, as professionals, to genuinely deepen their understanding of education at a conceptual level could bring enormous benefits and, given the level of interest and engagement shown by all the CCs, would, I believe, be very welcome. However, such enthusiasm would almost certainly evaporate if it was seen as an additional burden placed on teachers who already feel overworked. Therefore not only the culture of CPD needs adjustment but the time needs to be made available for it to be effective. There also needs to be a recognition that such professional development should function at a number of levels. Whereas some may benefit from a few genuinely engaging twilight INSETS, others might wish to engage much more deeply with the issues raised and should be supported, both financially and practically, in pursuing them through part time university study. I am certainly aware of how much my personal study has contributed to the ongoing development of my approach to teaching citizenship in the classroom.

Dissemination and Further Research

In terms the dissemination of this research I hope that there are several avenues to pursue. Firstly, all of the participant schools have been offered a copy of the research. Many of the CCs I spoke to were interested in the project and welcomed the fact that it was being carried out by 'one of us'. I look forward to getting some feedback on the research from some of the interviewees and to sharing any new materials I develop with my colleagues in the local area.

Whilst there has been a good deal of analysis of the Crick Report I will be submitting my theoretical research, in an adapted form, to journals concerned with educational philosophy. There is little material which examines Crick within the wider context of civic education in a liberal democracy, and certainly none that comes from the perspective of a working citizenship teacher.

Whilst the fieldwork research is on a fairly small scale I believe that it provides a useful snapshot of current thinking amongst CCs in the county and I intend to produce a stand alone paper which concentrates purely on the central question of the perceived purpose of the subject. Additionally, given my personal change of heart regarding the position of OFSTED with regard to the subject I am working on some INSET material on the 'perception gap' which I intend to share with local schools.

Finally, in support of their work to preserve citizenship as a curriculum subject, I will send a synopsis of my research to the Citizenship Foundation to add to their online resources.

In terms of further research I believe the most urgent area of study is to get some hard data on the impact that academization is having on citizenship education. Questions of purpose may quickly become irrelevant if the subject effectively ignored by schools for which the National Curriculum is not compulsory.

On a personal level I would like to conduct some research into the cross curricular impact of citizenship education. My own experience suggests that a commitment to encouraging critical thinking and political engagement in citizenship lessons can have a positive effect in other curriculum subjects; anecdotally I have had feedback from other subjects regarding interesting questions or approaches in their lessons which can be traced back to a citizenship topic. If a more general educational benefit to citizenship teaching could be established this might go some way towards persuading school managers and politicians to give it more support.

Bibliography

Aristotle (1948) *Politics.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Aristotle (1955) *The Ethics of Aristotle.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Arthur, J. (2005) 'The Re-emergence of Character Education in British Education Policy', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 53(3), pp. 239-254.

Arthur, J. and Croll, P. (2007) 'Editorial: Citizenship, Democracy and Education', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 55(3), pp. 233-234.

Arthur, J. and Davies, I. (2006) *Teaching and Learning Citizenship in English Schools.* Available at: www.citized.info/pdf/commarticles/JA_ID_Japan2.doc (Accessed: 6/2 2011).

Arthur, J. and Davison, J. (2000) 'Social Literacy and Citizenship Education in the School Curriculum', *Curriculum Journal,* 11(1), pp. 9-23.

Association for Citizenship Teaching (2012) *Advice for Citizenship Teachers.* Available at: http://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/page?p=32 (Accessed: 9/9 2012).

Association for Education in Citizenship (1936) *Education for Citizenship in Secondary Schools.* London: Oxford University Press.

Avery, P. (2007) 'Civic Education in the United States: Increased Challenges', *Citizenship Teaching and Learning,* 3(2), pp. 22-39.

Batho, G. (1990) 'The History of the Teaching of Civics and Citizenship in English Schools', *Curriculum Journal,* 1(1), pp. 91 - 100.

Benton, T., Cleaver, E., Featherstone, G., Kerr, D., Lopes, J. and Whitby, K. (2008) *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS): Sixth Annual Report. Young People's Civic Participation In and Beyond School: Attitudes, Intentions and Influences.* London: Department for Children, Schools and Famillies.

Biesta, G. and Lawy, R. (2006) 'From Teaching Citizenship to Learning Democracy: Overcoming Individualism in Research, Policy and Practice', *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 36(1), pp. 63-79.

Blaikie, N. (2010) *Designing Social Research.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bottery, M. (2003) 'The End of Citizenship? The Nation State, Threats to its Legitimacy, and Citizenship Education in the Twenty-first Century', *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 33(1), pp. 101-122.

Brett, P. (2007) *Identity and Diversity: Citizenship Education and Looking Forwards from the Ajegbo Report.* Available at: http://www.citized.info/pdf/commarticles/Peter%20Brett%20-%20Identity%20and%20Diversity.pdf (Accessed: 21/02 2011).

Brighouse, H. (1998) 'Civic Education and Liberal Legitimacy', *Ethics,* 108(4), pp. 719-745.

Callan, E. (1991) 'Pluralism and Civic Education', *Studies in Philosophy and Education,* 11(1), pp. 65-87.

Callan, E. (2008) 'Beyond Sentimental Civic Education', in Arthur, J. and Davies, I. (eds.) *Citizenship Education.* London: Sage, pp. 1-27.

Calvert, M. and Clemitshaw, G. (2003) 'Implementing Citizenship into the English Secondary School Curriculum', *Pastoral Care in Education,* 21(3), pp. 3-12.

Calvert, M. and Clemitshaw, G. (2005) 'Implementing Citizenship in the English Secondary School Curriculum: A Follow Up Study', *Pastoral Care in Education,* 23(3), pp. 31-36.

Carr, W. (2008) 'Education for Citizenship', in Arthur, J. and Davies, I. (eds.) *Citizenship Education*. London: Sage, pp. 28-38.

Chamberlin, R. (2003) 'Citizenship? Only If You Haven't Got a Life: Secondary School Pupils' Views of Citizenship Education', *International Journal of Research & Method in Education,* 26(2), pp. 87-97.

Citizenship Foundation (2011) *National Curriculum Review Summary: Terms of Reference and Timeframe*. Available at: http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/news.php?n916 (Accessed: 11/6 2011).

Citizenship Foundation (2013) *Victory! The citizenship curriculum is improved! And schools have a whole year to bring it to life*. Available at: http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/news.php?n1071 (Accessed: 1/10 2013).

Cleaver, E., Ireland, E., Kerr, D. and Lopes, J. (2005) *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Second Cross-Sectional Survey 2004. Listening to Young People: Citizenship Education in England*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) *Research Methods in Education.* 6th edn. New York: Routledge.

Colebatch, H. (2002) *Policy. Policy* 2nd edn. Maidenhead: Open University Press, p. 9.

Crace, J. (2007) *How to be British*. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2007/jan/30/schools.uk (Accessed: 29/05 2012).

Crick, B. (1993) *In Defence of Politics.* 4th edn. London: Penguin.

Crick, B. (1999) 'The Presuppositions of Citizenship Education', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 33(3), pp. 337-352.

Crick, B. (2000a) 'The Citizenship Order for Schools', in Pearce, N. and Hallogarten, J. (eds.) *Tomorrow's Citizens. Critical Debates In Citizenship And Education*. London: Institute For Public Policy Research, pp. 77-83.

Crick, B. (2000b) *Essays on Citizenship*. London: Continuum.

Crick, B. (2002a) 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', *Parliamentary Affairs,* 55(3), pp. 488-504.

Crick, B. (2002b) *A Note On What Is and What Is Not Active Citizenship*. Available at: http://archive.excellencegateway.org.uk/media/post16/files/033_BernardCrick_WHAT_IS_CITIZENSHIP.pdf (Accessed: 21/1 2011).

Crick, B. (2007a) 'Citizenship: The Political and the Democratic', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 55(3), pp. 235-248.

Crick, B. (2007b) 'Do We Really Need Britannia?', *The Political Quarterly,* 78(1), pp. 149-158.

Crick, R. (2005) 'Citizenship Education and the Provision of Schooling: A Systematic Review of Evidence', *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education,* 1(2), pp. 56-75.

Cunningham, S., Lavalette, M (2004) ''Active Citizens' or 'Irresponsible Truants'? School Student Strikes Against the War', *Critical Social Policy,* 24(2), pp. 255-269.

Dagger, R. (1997) *Civic Virtues: Rights Citizenship and Republican Liberalism.* Oxford: OUP.

Davies, I. (1999a) 'What has Happened in the Teaching of Politics in Schools in England in the Last Three Decades, and Why?', *Oxford Review of Education,* 1(2), pp. 125-140.

Davies, L. (1999b) 'Comparing Definitions of Democracy in Education', *Compare,* 29(2), pp. 127-40.

Democratic Life (2011) *Curriculum Review: Essential Citizenship Knowledge Must Remain in the National Curriculum.* Available at: http://www.democraticlife.org.uk/2011/01/20/curriculum-review-essential-citizenship-knowledge-must-remain-in-the-national-curriculum/ (Accessed: 6/6 2011).

Department for Education (2011a) *The Framework for the National Curriculum. A report by the Expert Panel for the National Curriculum Review.* London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2011b) *The Framework for the National Curriculum. A report by the Expert Panel for the National Curriculum Review.* London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2013a) *Citizenship Programmes of Study: Key Stages 3 and 4 (Sept 2013).* London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2013b) *Citizenship Programmes of Study for Key Stages 3-4 (Feb 2013).* London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2013c) *The National Curriculum in England Framework Document* London: Department for Education.

Department for Education (2013d) *Citizenship*. Available at: http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/curriculum/secondary/b00199157/citizenship (Accessed: 2/10 2013).

Department for Education and Skills (2007) *Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review.* London: Department for Education and Skills.

Dudley, R. and Gitelson, A. (2003) 'Civic Education, Civic Engagement, and Youth Civic Development', *Political Science and Politics,* 36(02), pp. 263-267.

Eferakorho, J. (2008) *Multicultural Education and Citizenship*. Available at: http://www.citized.info/pdf/briefing/Jite%20Eferakorho%20Multiculturalism.pdf#search=%22Eferakorho%22 (Accessed: 25/4 2012).

Enslin, P., Pendlebury, S. and Tjiattas, M. (2001) 'Deliberative Democracy, Diversity and the Challenges of Citizenship Education', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 35(1), pp. 115-130.

Evans, M. (2008) 'Citizenship Education, Pedagogy and School Contexts', in Arthur, J., Davies, I. and Hahn, C. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*. London: Sage, pp. 519-544.

Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.

Faulks, K. (1998) *Citizenship in Modern Britain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Faulks, K. (2006a) 'Education for Citizenship in England's Secondary Schools: A Critique of Current Principle and Practice', *Journal of Education Policy,* 21(1), pp. 59-74.

Faulks, K. (2006b) 'Rethinking Citizenship Education in England', *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice,* 1(2), pp. 123.

Flew, A. (2000) *Education for Citizenship.* London: Institute of Economic Affairs.

Frazer, E. 'Citizenship Education; The Advisory Group On Education, And The Prospects For Curriculum Reform In England', *PSA Conference*, Nottingham, May: University of Nottingham.

Frazer, E. (2000) 'Citizenship Education: Anti-political Culture and Political Education in Britain', *Political Studies,* 48(1), pp. 88-103.

Frazer, E. (2007) 'Depoliticising Citizenship', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 55(3), pp. 249-263.

Further Education Funding Council (2002) *Citizenship For 16 -19 Year Olds In Education And Training.* London: Department for Education and Employment.

Galston, W. (1989) 'Civic Education in the Liberal State', in Rosenblum, N.L. (ed.) *Liberalism and the Moral Life.* London: Harvard University Press, pp. 89-101.

Galston, W. (1995) 'Two concepts of Liberalism', *Ethics,* 105(3), pp. 516-534.

Galston, W. (2008) 'Civic Education', in Arthur, J. and Davies, I. (eds.) *Citizenship Education.* London: Sage, pp. 97-108.

Galston, W. A. (2001) 'Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education', *Annual Review of Political Science,* 4(1), pp. 217-234.

Galston, W. A. (2004) 'Civic Education and Political Participation', *Political Science & Politics,* 37(02), pp. 263-266.

Gamarnikow, E. and Green, A. (1999) 'Social Capital and the Educated Citizen', *The School Field,* 10(3/4), pp. 103-126.

Garratt, D. and Piper, H. (2003) 'Citizenship Education And The Monarchy: Examining The Contradictions', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 51(2), pp. 128-148.

Griffiths, R. (2000) *National Curriculum National Disaster.* London: Routledge.

Gutmann, A. (1989) 'Undemocratic Education', in Rosenblum, N.L. (ed.) *Liberalism and the Moral Life.* London: Harvard University Press, pp. 71-88.

Gutmann, A. (1995) 'Civic Education and Social Diversity', *Ethics,* 105(3), pp. 557-579.

Gutmann, A. (1999) *Democratic Education.* Rev edn. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Hahn, C. L. (1999) 'Citizenship Education: An Empirical Study of Policy, Practices and Outcomes', *Oxford Review of Education,* 25(1), pp. 231-250.

Halliday, J. (1999) 'Political Liberalism and Citizenship Education: Towards Curriculum Reform', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 47(1), pp. 43-55.

Hargreaves, D. (1994) *The Mosaic of Learning: Schools and Teachers for the Next Century.* London: Demos.

Hargreaves, D. (1997) 'School Choice and the Development of Autonomy: A Reply to Brighouse', *Oxford Review of Education,* 23(4), pp. 511-515.

Haste, H. and Hogan, A. (2006) 'Beyond Conventional Civic Participation, Beyond the Moral-Political Divide: Young People and Contemporary Debates About Citizenship', *Journal of moral education,* 35(4), pp. 473-493.

Haydon, G. (2003) 'Aims in Citizenship Education', in Lockyear, A., Crick, B. and Annette, J. (eds.) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 78-88.

HC Deb 17th September 2013, vol 550, col 655. Available at http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm130207/debtext/130207-0002.htm (Accessed: 7/2/2014).

Heater, D. (1991) 'Citizenship: A Remarkable Case of Sudden Interest', *Parliamentary Affairs,* 44(2), pp. 140.

Heater, D. (1999) *What is Citizenship?* London: Polity Press.

Heater, D. (2001) 'The History of Citizenship Education in England', *Curriculum Journal,* 12(1), pp. 103-123.

Heater, D. (2004) *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education.* 3rd edn. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Heater, D. (2007) *A History of Education for Citizenship.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Hodgson, N. (2008) 'Citizenship Education, Policy, and the Educationalization of Educational Research', *Educational Theory,* 58(4), pp. 417-434.

House of Commons Education and Skills Committee (2007) *Citizenship Education Second Report of Session 2006–07* London: The Stationary Office.

Ireland, E., Kerr, D., Lopes, J., Nelson, J. and Cleaver, E. (2006) *Active Citizenship and Young People: Opportunities, Experiences and Challenges In and Beyond School. Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Fourth Annual Report.* London: Department for Education and Skills.

Jerome, L. (2008) 'Assessing Citizenship Education', in Arthur, J., Davies, I. and Hahn, C. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*. London: Sage, pp. 545-558.

John, P. and Osborn, A. (1992) 'The Influence of School Ethos on Pupils' Citizenship Attitudes', *Educational Review,* 44(2), pp. 153-165.

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).* London: Department for Education.

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.* . London: Department for Children, Schools and Famillies.

Kennedy, K. (2007) 'Student Constructions of 'Active Citizenship': What Does Participation Mean to Students?', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 55(3), pp. 304-324.

Kerr, D. (1999) 'Changing the political culture: the Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools', *Oxford Review of Education,* 25(1), pp. 275-284.

Kerr, D. (2000) 'Citizenship Education: An international comparison', *School Field,* 10(3/4), pp. 5-32.

Kerr, D. (2002) *Assessment and Evaluation in Citizenship Education*. Available at: http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003464.htm (Accessed: 5/1 2012).

Kerr, D. (2003a) 'Citizenship Education in England: The Making of a New Subject', *Online Journal for Social Science Education,* 2(2).

Kerr, D. (2013) *National Curriculum Implications for Citizenship* London: Citizenship Foundation.

Kerr, D. and Cleaver, E. (2004) *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Literature Review - Citizenship Education One Year On – What Does it Mean?: Emerging Definitions and Approaches in the First Year of National Curriculum Citizenship in England* London: Department for Education and Skills.

Kerr, D., Cleaver, E., Ireland, E. and Blenkinsop, S. (2003b) *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study First Cross-Sectional Survey 2001-2002.* London: Department for Education and Skills.

Kerr, D., Ireland, E., Lopes, J. and Craig, R. with Cleaver, E. (2004) *Making Citizenship Real. Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study Second Annual Report. First Longitudinal Survey. .* London: Department for Education and Skills.

Kerr, D., Lopes, J., Nelson, J., White, K., Cleaver, E. and 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.

Kiwan, D. (2005a) 'Human rights and citizenship: An unjustifiable conflation?', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 39(1), pp. 37-50.

Kiwan, D. (2005b) *An inclusive citizenship? Conceptions of citizenship in the citizenship education policymaking process in England* PhD, University of London, London.

Kristjánsson, K. (2004) 'Beyond Democratic Justice: A Further Misgiving About Citizenship Education', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 38(2), pp. 207-219.

Kymlicka, W. (2003) 'Two Dilemmas of Citizenship Education in Pluralist Societies', in Lockyear, A., Crick, B. and Annette, J. (eds.) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory and Practice.* Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 47-63.

Kymlicka, W. (2008) 'Education for Citizenship', in Arthur, J. and Davies, I. (eds.) *Citizenship Education.* London: Sage, pp. 128-150.

Kymlicka, W. and Norman, W. (1994) 'Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory', *Ethics,* 104(2), pp. 352-381.

Lawson, H. (2001) 'Active Citizenship in Schools and the Community', *Curriculum Journal,* 12(2), pp. 163-178.

Lawton, D., Cairns, J. and Gardner, R. (2005) *Education For Citizenship.* London: Continuum.

Leighton, R. (2004) 'The Nature of Citizenship Education Provision: An Initial Study', *Curriculum Journal,* 15(2), pp. 167-181.

Levinson, M. (1999) 'Liberalism, Pluralism, and Political Education: Paradox or Paradigm?', *Oxford Review of Education,* 25(1), pp. 39-58.

Macedo, S. (1995) 'Liberal Civic Education and Religious Fundamentalism: The Case of God v. John Rawls?', *Ethics,* 105(3), pp. 468-496.

Macedo, S. (1996) 'Community, Diversity, and Civic Education: Toward a Liberal Political Science of Group Life', *Social Philosophy and Policy,* 13(01), pp. 240-268.

Marshall, T. H. (1950) *Citizenship and Social Class.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCowan, T. (2006) 'Approaching the Political in Citizenship Education: The Perspectives of Paulo Freire and Bernard Crick', *Educate,* 6(1), pp. 57-70.

Mclaughlin, T. (2000) 'Citizenship Education in England: the Crick Report and Beyond', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 34(4), pp. 541-570.

McLaughlin, T. H. (1992) 'Citizenship, Diversity and Education: A Philosophical Perspective', *Journal of moral education,* 21(3), pp. 235-250.

Menter, I. and Walker, M. (2000) 'How Would a Well-educated Young Citizen React to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry? An Examination of the Parameters of Current Models of Citizenship Education', *Curriculum Journal,* 11(1), pp. 101-116.

Miles, S. (2006) 'Citizenship Education: An Examination of the Relationship Between the Crick Report and Policy Implementation in the UK', in Ross, A. (ed.) *Citizenship Education: Europe and the World.* London: CiCe, pp. 713-720.

Miller, D. (2000) 'Citizenship: What Does It Mean and Why Is It Important?', in Pearce, N. and Hallgarten, J. (eds.) *Tomorrow's Citizens. Critical Debates In Citizenship And Education*. London: Institute For Public Policy Research, pp. 26-35.

Ministry of Education (1949) *Citizens Growing Up: At home, In School and After.* London: HM Stationary Office.

Moore, A. 'Citizenship Education in the UK: for Liberation or Control?', *Knowledge & Discourse: Speculating on Disciplinary Futures 2nd International Conference*, Hong Kong, June. Available at http://ec.hku.hk/kd2proc/default.asp: University of Hong Kong.

Morgan, J. (2000) 'To Which Space Do I Belong? Imagining Citizenship In One Curriculum Subject', *Curriculum Journal,* 11(1), pp. 55-68.

Murdoch, J. L. (1991) 'Encouraging Citizenship: Report of the Commission on Citizenship', *The Modern Law Review,* 54(3), pp. 439-441.

O'Hare, P. and Gay, O. (2006) *The Political Process and Citizenship Education.* London: House of Common's Library.

OFSTED (2002a) *Inspecting Citizenship.* London: OFSTED.

OFSTED (2002b) *Citizenship: Survey Report: Preparation for the Introduction of Citizenship in Secondary Schools 2001-2002.* London: OFSTED.

OFSTED (2003) *National Curriculum Citizenship: Planning and Implementation 2002/03* London: OFSTED.

OFSTED (2004) *Ofsted Subject Reports 2002/03 Citizenship in Secondary Schools* London: OFSTED.

OFSTED (2005) *Citizenship in Secondary Schools: Evidence from Ofsted Inspections (2003/04).* London: OFSTED.

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

OFSTED (2007) *Leading Citizenship in Schools.* London: OFSTED.

OFSTED (2010) *Citizenship Established? Citizenship in Schools 2006/09.* London: OFSTED.

OFSTED (2011) *Recent Report Example - Bishop Vesey's School.* London: OFSTED.

OFSTED (2012) *Routes to Citizenship: Bishop Auckland College.* London: OFSTED.

Olssen, M. (2004) 'From the Crick Report to the Parekh Report: Multiculturalism, Cultural Difference, and Democracy - The Re-visioning of Citizenship Education', *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 25(2), pp. 179-192.

Osler, A. (2000) 'The Crick Report: Difference, Equality and Racial Justice', *Curriculum Journal,* 11(1), pp. 25-37.

Osler, A. (2008) 'Citizenship Education and the Ajegbo report: Reimagining a Cosmopolitan Nation', *London Review of Education,* 6(1), pp. 11-25.

Osler, A. (2009) 'Citizenship Education, Democracy and Racial Justice 10 Years On ', *Race Equality Teaching,* 27(3), pp. 21-27.

Osler, O. and Starkey, H. (2006) 'Education for Democratic Citizenship: A Review of Research, Policy and Practice During 1995-2005', *Research Papers in Education,* 21(4), pp. 433-466.

Parekh, B. (2000) *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain. The Parekh Report.* London: Profile Books.

Parry, G. (2003) 'Citizenship Education: Reproductive and Remedial', in Lockyear, A., Crick, B. and Annette, J. (eds.) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 30-46.

Pearce, N. and Spencer, S. (1999) 'Education for Citizenship: The Crick Report', *The Political Quarterly,* 70(2), pp. 219-224.

Peterson, A. and Knowles, C. (2009) 'Active Citizenship: A Preliminary Study into Student Teacher Understandings', *Educational Research,* 51(1), pp. 39-59.

Phelps, E. (2004) 'Young Citizens and Changing Electoral Turnout, 1964-2001', *The Political Quarterly,* 75(3), pp. 238-248.

Pike, M. (2007) 'The State and Citizenship Education in England: A Curriculum for Subjects or Citizens?', *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 39(4), pp. 471-489.

Pike, M. (2008) 'Faith in Citizenship? On Teaching Children to Believe in Liberal Democracy', *British Journal of Religious Education,* 30(2), pp. 113-122.

Print, M. (2007) 'Citizenship Education and Youth Participation in Democracy', *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 55(3), pp. 325-345.

Pykett, J. (2007) 'Making Citizens Governable? The Crick Report as Governmental Technology', *Journal of Education Policy,* 22(3), pp. 301-319.

QCA (1998) *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools.* Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (1999) *Cirizenship. The National Curriculum for England.* Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2002a) *Monitoring Citizenship and PSHE 2001-2002* Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2002b) *Citizenship. A Scheme of Work for Key Stage 4. Teacher's Guide.* Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2002c) *Citizenship at Key Stages 1–4. Guidance on Assessment, Recording and Reporting*. Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2002d) *Citizenship. A Scheme of Work for Key Stage 3. Teacher's Guide.* Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2002e) *A Guide for Senior Managers and Governors. Citizenship at Key Stages 3 and 4*. Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2004) *Citizenship 2002/3 Annual Report on Curriculum and Assessment.* Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2005) *Citizenship 2004/5 Snnual Report on Curriculum and Assessment.* Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2006) *Assessing Citizenship. Example Assessment Activities for Key Stage 3*. Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2007a) *Citizenship. Programme of Study for Key Stage 3*. Sudbury: QCA.

QCA (2007b) *Citizenship. Programme of Study for Key Stage 4* Sudbury: Crown.

QCDA (2010) *National Curriculum Level Descriptions for Subjects.* Coventry: QCDA.

Rainsford, E. (2011) *Can We Educate Citizens?* Available at:
http://www.southampton.ac.uk/C2G2/media/Stockholm-
Soton/Rainsford%20%282011%29.pdf (Accessed: 4/1 2012).

Rawls, J. (1993) *Political Liberalism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Ross, A. (2007) 'Multiple Identities and Education for Active Citizenship', *British
Journal of Educational Studies,* 55(3), pp. 286-303.

Rousseau, J. J. (2002) *The Social Contract: And, The First and Second Discourses.*
London: Yale University Press.

Sarantakos, S. (1998) *Social Research.* 2nd edn. Sydney: Macmillan.

Schmidt, C. (2004) 'The Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews', in Flick, U., Kardoff,
E.v. and Steinke, I. (eds.) *A Companion to Qualitiative Research.* London: Sage.

Schofield, J. W. (1990) 'Generalizability in Qualitative Research', in Eisener, E. and
Peshkin, A. (eds.) *Qualitiative Inquiry in Education.* New York: Teachers
College Press, pp. 201-232.

Schrag, F. (1998) 'Diversity, Schooling, and the Liberal state', *Studies in Philosophy and
Education,* 17(1), pp. 29-46.

Scott-Baumann, A. (2003) 'Citizenship and Postmodernity', *Intercultural Education,*
14(4), pp. 355-366.

Scott, D. (2000) 'Editorial - Responses to Crick and Citizenship E', *Curriculum Journal,*
11(1), pp. 1-7.

Simon, B. (1993) 'Education and Citizenship in England', *Paedagogica Historica:
International Journal of the History of Education,* 29(3), pp. 689 - 697.

Smart, D. (2006) *Invisible, Stereotypes or Citizens ? : An Examination of Visual
Representations of People of Colour and Visible Minorities in Key Stage Three
History Textbooks in England.* EdD, University of the West of England, Bristol.

Starkey, H. (2000) 'Citizenship Education in France and Britain: Evolving Theories and
Practices', *Curriculum Journal,* 11(1), pp. 39-54.

Sturman, L., Rowe, N., Sainsbury, M., Wheater, R. and Kerr, D. (2012) *Citizens in
Transition in England: the Longitudinal Cohort at Age 19-20* Slough: NFER.

Tate (2000) 'Citizenship Education in a Liberal Democracy', in Pearce, N. and
Hallgarten, J. (eds.) *Tomorrow's Citizens. Critical Debates In Citizenship And
Education.* London: Institute For Public Policy Research, pp. 64-73.

Tate, N. and Hallgarten, J. (2000) 'Introduction', in Pearce, N. (ed.) *Tomorrow's Citizens.
Critical Debates In Citizenship And Education.* London: Institute For Public
Policy Research, pp. 3-16.

Thomas, G. (2009) *How to do Your Research Project.* London: Sage.

Thomas, G. and James, D. (2006) 'Reinventing Grounded Theory: Some Questions
About Theory, Ground and Discovery', *British Educational Research Journal,*
32(6), pp. 767-795.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. and Schulz, W. (2001a) *Citizenship and
Education in Twenty-eight Countries.* Amsterdam: International Association for
the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R, Oswald, H and Schulz, W (2001b) *Citizenship and
Education in Twenty-Eight Countries (Executive Summary).* Amsterdam:
International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J. and Amadeo, J. (1999) *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project.* Amsterdam: IEA.

Turner, B. S. (2009) 'Bernard Crick: Citizenship and Democracy in the United Kingdom', *Citizenship studies,* 13(3), pp. 289-296.

Warwick, P. (2008) 'The Development of Apt Citizenship Education Through Listening to Young People's Voices', *Educational Action Research,* 16(3), pp. 321-333.

Watts, M. (2006) 'Citizenship Education Revisited: Policy, Participation and Problems', *Pedagogy, Culture & Society,* 14(1), pp. 83-97.

Westheimer, J. and Kahne, J. (2004) 'What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy', *American Educational Research Journal,* 41(2), pp. 237.

Whiteley, P. (2005) *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study Second Literature Review Citizenship Education: The Political Science Perspective*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

Yoxall, J., Gray, E. and Organ, T. (1904) *The New Code (1904): Of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools.* London: National Union of Teachers.

Appendix 1: Letter to Gloucestershire Association of Secondary School Headteachers (GASH) regarding the Pilot Study

<div align="right">
27 Whittington,
Cheltenham
GL54 4HD
</div>

Dear GASH members,

My name is Fergus O'Sullivan and I am studying for an PhD at the University of Gloucestershire. This has party been made possible by funding from the TDA through a joint application by GASH and the university.

My research concerns citizenship teaching and I would be very grateful if you would be prepared to spare three to four minutes to answer the questionnaire enclosed. This will provide very useful background information for my study.

I should emphasize that my research will at no point attempt to make any judgments about the quality of provision in the subject, rather it is interested in the variety of interpretations and approaches to preparing young people for citizenship. This is not necessarily linked to citizenship as an academic subject and allows for the possibility that schools that have little or no formal citizenship teaching, as was the case in the majority of schools before 2002, may still provide an excellent education in citizenship.

All information will of course be kept confidential and no individuals or individual schools will be identified in the research.

I am extremely grateful for your help.

Many thanks.

Yours faithfully,

Appendix 2: Pilot Study Questionnaire for GASH Members

CITIZENSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

PERSONNEL

1. Do you have a citizenship co-ordinator?   Yes / No

2. Does your school have any staff who hold a citizenship PGCE?   Yes / No

3. Is citizenship delivered by (please tick):

   a) subject specialist teachers

   b) a team of citizenship teachers

   c) form tutors

   d) across the curriculum by subject teachers

   e) other, please specify:

   _____

4. How confident do staff feel about teaching the citizenship requirements of the national curriculum? (please circle)

   Less confident   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10   More confident

5. Professor Bernard Crick believed that his report should be read, in conjunction with the National Curriculum Order by all those involved in teaching it. Please comment on whether you believe that is this realistic expectation?

   _____

   _____

   _____

CURRICULUM

6. Is citizenship taught; (please circle)

   As a separate subject   /   With PSHE or similar   /   Across the curriculum

7. Approximately, how many hours are allocated to citizenship teaching?

   KS3:_____   KS4:_____   KS5:_____

8. Do you have a scheme of work for citizenship?   Yes / No

9. Do you have a development plan for the subject?   Yes / No

10. Do you offer GCSE Citizenship? (please circle)

    Yes (short course) / Yes (standard GCSE) / No

11. Do you offer AS/A Level Citizenship? (please circle)   AS: Yes / No

                                                                                    A2: Yes / No

12. Do you a have school council?   Yes   /   No

13. How is it elected/appointed?
_____

_____

14. How frequently does it meet? _____

15. Who chairs it? _____

16. What responsibilities does it have? _____

_____

17. Has your school introduced other pupil voice initiatives with regard to (please tick):

a) feedback on teaching and learning [ ]   b) staff appointments [ ]

c) school rules [ ]   d) other (please specify)

18. Has your school involved the local community in its citizenship activities   Yes   /   No

If possible please give examples: _____

_____

19. Below are a series of terms relating to the purpose of citizenship education. Please select the 5 that you believe are most important (and if possible rank them in order of importance)

a) political literacy [ ]   b) social cohesion [ ]

c) understanding of rights and responsibilities [ ]   d) community involvement [ ]

e) social justice [ ]   f) political participation [ ]

g) commitment to the values and institutions of the state [ ]   h) political/advocacy skills [ ]

i) critique of the values and institutions of the state [ ]   j) moral reasoning [ ]

20. Do you see citizenship as a useful part of the curriculum? _____

_____

_____

21. Any further comments on the subject of citizenship would be welcome: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you

Appendix 3: Introductory Letter for the Main Study

<div align="right">
27, Whittington,
Cheltenham
GL54 4HD
</div>

Dear (Name of Headteacher),

My name is Fergus O'Sullivan. I am a teacher at Ribston Hall High School, and I am working on my doctorate at the University of Gloucestershire. My thesis concerns the purpose of citizenship education, and you may already have been kind enough to fill in my questionnaire relating to the subject at a GASH meeting last summer.

My research includes interviewing citizenship co-coordinators, or their equivalent, and I would be grateful to have the opportunity, with your permission, to talk to whoever holds that position in your school. As a working teacher I realise how busy your staff are likely to be, but the interview will be brief, informal, and, I hope, will cover areas that will be of interest to anybody working in this field. A summary of the findings will be made available to all interested participants in the research.

I should emphasize that my research is interested in examining the ideas behind citizenship policy, not the quality of its provision, so I will not be attempting to make any judgements about whether schools' citizenship teaching is good or bad. Indeed discussion will not be confined to citizenship as a distinct curriculum subject but will rather focus on the role that schools can play in shaping students' attitudes to the relationship between the individual and the state.

The interview will last about thirty minutes, and a summary of the questions, which I have included for your information, will be provided in advance. I am relatively flexible in the summer term, so any meeting should be able to be scheduled at the interviewee's convenience.

All information will of course be kept confidential and no individuals or individual schools will be identified in the research.

I hope you feel that it is valuable to have current teachers contributing to educational research, and feel able to support this project and recommend it to the relevant member of your staff. If this is the case, I would be grateful if you could supply me with their contact details or ask them to email me at fo@ribstonhall.gloucs.sch.uk

Yours sincerely,

Appendix 4: Interview Questions Provided to Citizenship Coordinators in Advance

Overview of interview questions
The following questions will form the basis of the interview:

You and Your School

1) What responsibilities do you have as Citizenship coordinator?

2) Where does citizenship fit within the curriculum and extra-curricular activities, in your school?

3) What resources do you use for teaching citizenship?

4) What does your role involve in terms of interaction with staff?

5) How would you defend the role of citizenship education within the curriculum to a skeptical colleague?

6) Does your school use school councils or student voice as an element of citizenship education? Why, or, why not?

The Role of Citizenship

7) It has been suggested that citizenship (has) two main purposes.

   i.   to promote the values and behavior that we wish to see in young people
   ii. to encourage them to question the current structure of our society and its politics.

   Which do you believe is more important, and why?

8) The National Curriculum identifies three strands that make up 'effective teaching for citizenship',

   i.   social and moral responsibility
   ii. community involvement
   iii. political literacy.

   Please explain, briefly, your interpretation of each of these terms.

9) A so called fourth strand, 'social cohesion', was introduced with the new national curriculum orders in 2007.

   How do you interpret this term and how was the change reflected in your school curriculum?

10) How would you describe an 'Active Citizen'?

Investigating School Leaders' Perceptions of the Purpose of Citizenship

Briefly

1) **What responsibilities are associated with your position as Citizenship coordinator?**
- Is it a paid position?
- Is it a discrete job or an element of a wider role?
- Do you hold a qualification (e.g. PGCE), or have you had any formal training in the subject?
- Do you have schemes of work?
- Is there a school policy document regarding citizenship?
- Do you have a development plan for the subject?
- *Do you feel that it is part of your role to promote some understanding of what citizenship means?*
- *Do you feel confident in your understanding of the purpose of citizenship?*

2) **What provision is made for citizenship within the curriculum?**
- Is citizenship taught, As a discrete subject / With PSHE or similar/ Across the curriculum. Are you happy with the delivery method?
- How many hours are allocated to citizenship teaching at KS3, KS4, KS5 Is the time allocation sufficient?
- Do you have a scheme of work for citizenship?
- Do you offer GCSE Citizenship, AS/A Level Citizenship? If not, why not?

3) **What does your role involve in terms of interaction with staff?**
- Do you manage a citizenship department? Or just provide resources for form tutors?
- Are there citizenship team meetings?
- Have you provided/organised any citizenship PSD/Inset?
- *Have you felt the need to sell the subject / try and generate enthusiasm amongst the staff?*

In more depth

4) **How would you defend the role of citizenship education within the curriculum to a skeptical colleague?**
- *How does it fit into your wider educational philosophy?*
- *Why do we need it today when we didn't need it 20 years ago?*
- *With a free hand what changes would you make to the subject to improve it?*

5) **Have you come across the Crick Report "Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools"? (It recommended compulsory citizenship within the NC and formed the basis of the NC order)**

if so…
- Did it aid your understanding of citizenship as a subject and the rationale for its introduction into the curriculum?
- *What impression did it give you regarding the reasons for the introduction of citizenship as a compulsory subject?*
- Have you made use of it when planning the citizenship curriculum within your school?

6) **Crick suggests that citizenship has a dual role.**
   i) **to promote the values and behavior that we wish to see in young people. Traditionalism**
   ii) **to encourage them to question the current structure of our society and its politics. Progressivism**
   Which do you believe is more important?
- *Please give examples of aspects of your school's citizenship teaching which attempt to pursue each of these priorities?*
- *Do you think that the school/staff tend to emphasis one priority at the expense of the other? Why?*
- *Were school protests against the Iraq war a good or bad example of citizenship?*
- *Do you think discussion regarding the pursuit of greater social justice / equality is a proper concern for citizenship education?*
- *Is there a difference between encouraging greater political participation and greater political effectiveness?*

Crick identified 3 strands that made up 'effective teaching for citizenship'
social and moral responsibility
community involvement
political literacy
Please explain briefly your understanding of what is meant by each of these terms.
- *Crick argued political literacy should include the ability to make themselves effective in public life – what do you think that means?*
- *How do you think the 3 elements relate to the dual role mentioned above?*
- How are these priorities reflected in your schemes of work / curriculum structure?

7) **Has the need to demonstrate effective assessment of citizenship as a National Curriculum subject, and the priorities of OFSTED, played a part in shaping your priorities regarding the subject?**

- *Have you felt a pressure to deliver easily measurable learning outcomes?*
- *Is this most easily done through pupils being able to show citizenship knowledge?*
- *If you have experienced an inspection, do you think OFSTED was interested in what kind of citizens pupils were becoming as well as what they knew about citizenship?*

8) Does a school need to model effective citizenship practices, through, for example, school councils or student voice, in order to properly teach them?

- *Does the citizenship curriculum in your school make explicit links to student voice?*
- *Do you think pupils feel that student voice initiatives give them a genuine opportunity to make a contribution to the development of school policy? Please give some examples?*
- *Have you come across the attitude from students that such consultation is simply window dressing and that it has little impact? Is there a danger that this actually undermines negatively affects the perception of their own efficacy?*

9) A so called 4th strand, 'social cohesion', was introduced with the new national curriculum orders in 2007. What do you understand by this and how was the change reflected in your school curriculum?

- Is it a legitimate concern for citizenship education?
- Have you come across the adjegbo report?
- Do you think that the pre 2007 curriculum showed insufficient concern for issues such as racial, religious and sexual discrimination?
- *Do you think these developments reflected any noticeable change in the intended purpose of citizenship?*

10) What do you understand by the term 'Active Citizen'?

- How does your school encourage active citizenship?
- Give examples of some of the changes you could imagine active citizens attempting to bring about?

Appendix 6: Sample Interview Transcript

AbbingdonRoad – Interview Transcript

Responsibilities, Curriculum and Staffing

WFO'S: You are citizenship co-ordinator, or what would your title be?

CC: Yeah I'm going to correct you there because they wanted me to have that title, initially I was the citizenship co-ordinator but my colleagues are subject leaders.

WFO'S: OK.

CC: So to put this on an equal footing and I think that's really important because otherwise you become sort of like ICT co-ordinator, dance and drama and flower arranging. So I'm now and it's not a personal thing, a power quest, but it's I'm subject leader for citizenship/personal, social, health, finance, education.

WFO'S: OK, right good, that's great. And this is unlikely, but you don't have a formal qualification in citizenship?

CC: No I don't no.

WFO'S: Obviously only very, very few people do.

CC: And it's very good that the new teachers coming in who often turn up at my door and say, can I just do two citizenship lessons because I've got to tick a box on my form…. They do have some formal training don't they and I think that's really important so yeah yeah.

WFO'S: Absolutely. Schemes of work, you have those I'm assuming.

CC: Yes from year seven right the way through to year thirteen because we do whole range here, so yeah.

WFO'S: Right. And in terms of how it's delivered then do you have discrete citizenship lessons or citizenship and PSHE or how does it work?

CC: It's a Tesco's approach.

WFO'S: OK.

CC: Buy one get one free. So on the timetable it says citizenship and the very first lesson they ever do in Year 7 I always say to them you're going to get two for the price of one so incredible value you're getting. The only reason we don't put PSHFE on the timetable is Mr Allen who designs it says citizenship is a really big word, if you think I'm putting the other one on as well, forget it, so I need to tell you. So yeah they do one lesson per week, 50 minute session and it's citizenship/PSHFE and what we try to do is for the youngsters to know the difference between the two. So even things like it's grand title is public dimension or personal dimension.

WFO'S: That's really interesting, it's really interesting. Two things, one that you call it citizenship and secondly that you do differentiate between the two. Can you say something about why… lots of places I've visited are just incorporating PSHE and…

CC: My take on this and when we try and do a definition, when I have my Year 7's in September and I've explained about the two for the price of one and so on. What I always say is, we're going to put together a kind of explanation about what citizenship is all about, they use a textbook, they have a little flick through and what I hope they start to establish is there are some different topics in it, some of them are really personal to you as the individual and they're about relationships, personal relationships but the citizenship is more about this stuff… it talks about things like counsellors and members of parliament and voting, issues within society that you will choose to engage in. You are who you are so you are going to have personal issues, citizenship is that step that you take where you make a choice about whether you're going to involve yourself, whether you're going to be a participant in this or whether you're just somebody who sits back and watches. So really about active citizenship as well.

WFO'S: That's really interesting because you're… so right from the start you're making it… you've given quite a clear focus to what citizenship is and…

CC: Yeah.

WFO'S: Which is quite unusual actually, but that's, I think that's really, really good. So you mentioned they… sorry if we can just go through the key stages in terms of provision so it's one period a week at Key Stage 3…

CC: It is.

WFO'S: The same at Key Stage 4?

CC: Until this September, exactly the same and we taught a half course, a short course, GCSE on one period a week.

WFO'S: Oh right, oh wow ok. Well done.

CC: Yes quite a tall order. 40% exam, 60% coursework although going back just a couple of years ago it was the reverse of that and we had a 60% coursework and 40% was actually… yeah what was it 40% coursework and 60% exam, we've now swapped round.

WFO'S: OK.

CC: Further swaps this September. We're going to have the full course and I'll get three lessons a fortnight.

WFO'S: Right OK.

CC: So two exams and two bits of coursework in three lessons.

WFO'S: How does that compare to a regular…

CC: Well if I was teaching history, I would probably be getting five, maybe six lessons. So you're looking at 50%...

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah.

CC: So that still is an issue timetable, it's still an argument I have and when you look at the content, you also look at the coursework they'll do for a full course or even a half course, you've got to shift….

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah, absolutely.

CC: …To get through all of that.

WFO'S: Absolutely. And then it's offered at A level as well.

CC: Yes. Yeah we've been doing… because initially when I was teaching this it was AS only.

WFO'S: Right.

CC: And we've now been doing the A level, this must be our third year through, probably.

WFO'S: And that's offered on the basis of just a regular subjects option.

CC: Yeah.

WFO'S: So you'd get the same allocation for that as any other…

CC: Absolutely so I get, I teach with a colleague and we have 10 lessons a fortnight.

WFO'S: OK.

CC: So get five a piece.

WFO'S: Brilliant.

CC: Which is… the first time where you've got parity really.

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah.

CC: Oh you know, I can actually take a little bit of time teaching this in a way rather than a whistle stop tour, on your left, on your right, straightforward, here we go.

WFO'S: Yeah that's definitely what I'm doing. So effectively you mentioned another colleague, you have a little citizenship department then?

CC: Yeah. I'm trying to get it smaller initially because I've been doing this job since 2002 so from the beginning when this first came in and I was offered staff who basically had nothing else…
room on their timetable. So people that taught all sorts of different things. That is an issue because this is a subject that needs to be taught by people who want to teach it and have interest.

WFO'S: Absolutely.

CC: Because I think it's a really bad experience for youngsters.

WFO'S: Well there's so many people I've come across who you know, it's been delivered by form tutors, they don't wanna do it and there's not really enough time.

CC: No. you wouldn't ask me to teach maths because I don't wanna do it and I'm a rubbish mathematician so you shouldn't be asking. So over the years, you might wanna feedback to senior managers and so on… got a very sympathetic head, what I've always said to him is you know each year before now I speak to staff and I say, would you rather I put needles in your eyes or do you wanna teach citizenship and often they say, needles in the eyes please but no seriously we've now got a team. This year there will be seven, I have had 12.

WFO'S: Right.

CC: And the issues you've then got are department meetings. People will say, I'm sorry I'm far too busy doing… so we do them on a Wednesday not a Monday which means I'm doing double my… so staffing has been an issue. Now I've got staff that wish to teach it. we've brought someone in this year an NQT who is going to come with us in September who has been employed on the basis of history, citizenship 50/50.

WFO'S: In sort of leading those staff, have you felt a sort of responsibility to almost explain what citizenship is or the purpose of it…

CC: Absolutely.

WFO'S: ..because obviously it's very new.

CC: Once people teach it and once people are reassured you know you show them the… and you say, there is a content, this isn't sort of hairy fairy stuff because they think, if I just stand in front of 30 kids and we're going to talk about voting and then the next lesson we could talk about voting couldn't we? But if you give them something where they can build their lessons and the scheme's work. Generally speaking most people after a term will say, this is really good. It's a bit like if you look at exam papers, people think. I have a friend I'll put it on tape… "This course is citizen shite".

WFO'S: OK.

CC: You look at it, you do the paper for me, I'll mark it for you, you tell me what you think, it's quite testing and it needs, we need the rigour to get the respect.

WFO'S: So do you think the exam has definitely been important in sort of raising the status of…

CC: I wouldn't teach it. When I first took this job. One of the first things I did was to say, I want to do a GCSE in it and they went, you don't have to and I said, no, no I do because I'm going to have Key Stage 4 kids who will say why aren't we doing things about sex, drugs and rock and roll because that's what we used to do in these sessions and why aren't you doing that. So my admission now is at Key Stage 4 because of our limited time and PSHFE back burner almost definitely.

WFO'S: Oh right. That's really interesting.

CC: You know I'm waiting for OFSTED to come in and catch me out on that one. [laughter] destroy this tape won't you, OK.

WFO'S: On that sort of question, if, imagine I was a sceptical colleague in the school, how would you defend citizenship to me? I mean you might…

CC: In a school such as ours. I don't know whether you know very much about us where many of our youngsters have much lower aspirations than they should, where many of them are going to go out into a world where things will be done unto them, talking about citizens advice bureau, knowing where to go to get the right advice, understanding your rights but equally understanding that you have duties and responsibilities is incredibly important and they'll often come from backgrounds where maybe that input has not happened at home. Normally when we do talk about voting, the majority of kids in my classes say, I'm not gonna bother, my mum don't and you know, we get our benefits and it's all alright. But equally you know you've gotta explain who put those benefits in place.

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: Now current government may decide that some of those benefits actually are going to go… are you happy with that? So do you get a free school meal? Perhaps our new government are going to decide that's no longer necessary, be a really good cut to make, you're going to lose your meal, what else are you likely to lose and are you gonna let that happen? So putting across arguments and saying, this is an entitlement that you have and it's really important in terms of the progress that your life is likely to make and the fact that you can bring about change.

WFO'S: So you would strongly emphasise the sort of direct elements to their lives?

CC: Absolutely.

WFO'S: Why do you think we need it today when we didn't need it 20 years ago? Or maybe you think we did need it 20 years ago.

CC: Well strangely enough I do sometimes have some parents who will sit at parents' evenings and say, I did citizenship and you are looking at people who perhaps, 20, 30, 40 years ago did an element. So it's not entirely new.

WFO'S: No.

CC: So the argument is that I think maybe 30 years ago timetable restraints and squeezes, there was an idea of looking at what can we actually get into tutor time and I think some of the things that perhaps happened in citizenship lessons in the 1970s got pushed aside or simply there was a lip service that was paid to them and I think Crickk's idea when he talked about citizens because most people to be honest are good citizens but I think the vision was to have a country where people are active citizens.

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: Because the English, the British are very good aren't they at sitting back and thinking someone else will do this whereas actually if you don't and I don't, no-one's going to do it. So I think you know from that point of view it's important…

WFO'S: Do you think to a certain extent it's kind of taken up slack from how other maybe humanity lessons have changed?

CC: Yes.

WFO'S: I know that you know that lots of people feel there used to be more time for kind of exploring things more in the round in their humanities lessons.

CC: Yeah I mean I've taught history GCSE and A Level history as well and certainly when you look at the history GCSE much of it is looking at the modern world, it's Nazi Germany which in itself, you know more about Nazi Germany than you probably do about when women got the vote. In fact, that hey not even all guys had the vote at one point strangely enough. So I do think you're right when we look at how exam boards have designed the way in which our youngsters are tested. Very specific.

The Crick Report

WFO'S: You mentioned a Crick report so you've clearly sort of come across it, has it played an important part in you, when you were sort of beginning teaching citizenship, was that something that was influential or was it something that existed kind of you know in the background because obviously the major concern was the national curriculum order which it informed but how important was the Crick report?

CC: I think initially the Crick report was something I was aware of but didn't really bother too much about. In more recent years I used it a lot with the Lower 6th, our Year 12's and they actually find out who was this guy Crick?, what did he say, what was revolutionary or different or radical about what he said. Do you agree with it, does it have any value and I'll show that later on but there's a comparison now between what Crick said in the 90's and what Cameron's saying now, I'm mean they're at opposite ends aren't they but what Cameron's saying about the Big Society. Are there some parallels there? Possibly.

WFO'S: That's really interesting actually that you use him to kind of, as part of teaching, that's really you know that's really interesting.

CC: And it's important, I think you know the 12's understand that it wasn't a brand new idea but it's a very different spin on…

…something that had existed and it was looking at society and saying, well what are some of the things that we can do to make a difference and you have to start when people are quite young and you have to empower them when they're quite young because otherwise we're not going to get councillors who come from Tufley, who represent Tufley and MP's that are actually maybe closer to those they represent….

WFO'S: Absolutely. Ask a little bit more about Crick, he kind of suggests that citizenship has this dual role, which I'd ask you to comment on, so firstly this quite kind of traditional take on it if you like which is that it's there to promote the values and behaviours that we want to see in young people, so I guess paying tax and obeying the law, and then on the other hand, he identifies this more progressive element which is to encourage them to be critical thinkers, to question the current structure of society and to a certain extent those two are in opposition because one's very pro-status quo and one is you know much more about sort of changing or challenging the status quo. Where do you see the sort of balance lying between those two? I mean I would ask which do you think is more important but I think that's maybe a little bit crude but…

CC: I don't think it is really, I think when you look at Crick you've first of all got to think about, and when we talk about Crick I don't tell them anything about his political leanings, I think it's quite important and generally one or two bright students will say, well I think… and they will realise that there may well have been a slight political agenda going on here at the same time, and that's really good for them to understand but I think it's the bigger message that Crick sends that's important and the idea and I mean the news has played so much into our hands recently with things like student riots and protests and so on and civil disobedience, we've talked about that. Isn't this a type of active citizenship and no political party really wants that do they? So I think it is, you are right, it is in opposition to each other but I think the bigger comments that Crick makes about our society, they're the important things.

WFO'S: Right.

CC: And about having people that are willing to be advocates.

WFO'S: Yeah. No, that's really interesting. Do you think that, it sounds like it's unlikely to be the case here but do you think that in schools, there's maybe a tendency to emphasise the first of those, the more traditional sort of we want you to behave and conform because it just makes running the school easier that way.

CC: Yeah. I hope not and I hope if you want established critical thinking in youngsters. I'm trying to get 6th form, they should be wise enough to realise that in society we are managed and if you look at any report that is released you've got to look for this element of political buy off and maybe a message that's being sent across.

WFO'S: Yeah. Okay, no that's great, thanks. So this one particular example which sorts of speaks to this question which… and it's similar to one you've just said that but I'm thinking particularly about the Iraq war, the demonstrations about the Iraq war which happened in various schools sort of in the run up to that war, quite soon after citizenship had been introduced. Some people saw students deciding they were going to walk out of school in protest as a positive example of citizenship and some saw it as a very negative example. I guess dividing roughly along that sort of basis so where would you stand on that?

CC: Last year when we had staff actually taking time, strike action, it was useful to use that with classes because what you were saying to classes were, the school will be closed tomorrow, lots of youngsters saying, my mum thinks this, you lot get paid enough pensions blah, blah, blah, so you know, we talked about that in relation to their experience here in school and it relates to this idea again of, do you allow youngsters to walk out of lessons because they want to protest which is a very positive thing and it's a political right that you have in this country.

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: You have to respect that. I always think the better way is to say, yes you need to protest but if you pick the moment, so if you want to protest, do it in your lunch hour. Show the world that we're really upset about this, so upset we'll give up our 45 minute lunch hour, we want to have a sit in then we will go back to class.

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah.

CC: It's a little bit like doctors strike, teachers strike, there are ways in which you need to have, because we talked about public sympathy. When teachers go on strike, we never get public sympathy, right or wrong. When doctors go on strike, there will be no sympathy because the service is so essential or if you're going to leave people high and dry, exactly the same as schools, people at Tufley say, that (School A) all marching down the road causing trouble. So you've gotta be a bit…

WFO'S: So if you can show your motives are pure by doing it in your lunchtime…

CC: And you've also got to do it… yes. At the appropriate time…

WFO'S: That's great. The term "social justice" crops up sort of from time to time, but it's quite controversial as to whether or not that's a legitimate part of our citizenship teaching, I wonder where you stand on that? In terms of I suppose promoting greater equality.

CC: Yeah. I think the wonderful thing about young people they have a much more acute awareness of fairness than you and I, we've been around too long now, so you and I both know that the world isn't fair. However, they are idealistic and they should be because if you're not we won't change things, people accept that that is the way it is so social justice has to come in, and we will have very heated debates about how people should be and they would hang a lot of people given half a chance. It's only later on when you say, well the mark of a civilised society might be to find alternative ways of sanctioning or punishing but I think social justice has to be part of what you do.

WFO'S: Sure.

CC: You're not gonna agree on it by any means but again that debate and discussion is really important and it's part of allowing them to mature so their ideas to perhaps grow.

WFO'S: Would you include discussion of I guess economic social justice. So I guess our current system is quite, it's relatively unopposed now in sort of world terms ideologically I suppose, so would that be something that you would have them consider?

CC: Absolutely because for the Year 13's they, Paper 4 is about global issues and making a difference. So I do say to them if you'd have been born in a different country, you might not even be alive now because childbirth is a really dangerous business, how fair is that? You live in that kind of world, how fair is it that in this country we have problems with weight issues now and health issues with enough food to feed people three times over in this world and yet when you've been in this lesson how many people have died? Where is the social justice there? So it has to come up. Solving it is another…

WFO'S: Yeah course.

CC: That's the big one.

WFO'S: Be nice if we could, have answers in these lessons as well wouldn't it? The three strands that Crick identifies for effective teaching for citizenship. I wonder if I just go through them one at a time if you could just briefly comment on what they mean to you. So social and moral responsibility is the first one.

CC: Morality's an interesting one because quite often, people have morality and may not be aware of it so I think that's something that again in lessons you've got to tease out what is morality, it is different things to different people and it is important to understand that you may have a moral position that could be quite different to somebody else's so morality is an interesting one and you have to explore it and social responsibility is key because we live alongside each other, we don't live on islands alone so I think the social side is important as well but there's certainly a lot of debate. With social responsibility I think most youngsters ultimately will understand but the morality is very much, well this is mine you must therefore be wrong. That's… and because we will in a multi-cultural country as well. Human rights is something which they approve of until you talk about maybe a paedophile in prison having human rights and then you know, that that's completely unacceptable.

WFO'S: Sure.

CC: Because you have committed a crime which we might find abhorrent it doesn't stop that person being human even though you may think…

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

CC: So it's very difficult.

WFO'S: Absolutely. The second one then is community involvement.

CC: That's a tougher one. We're a community school and I always try and play up that you know is it just, we've tacked this sort of thing into our title, what does it actually mean to us. I think our current economic situation has highlighted community more than maybe five years ago when most people were of a mind, well I'm doing OK thank you very much I'll shut my front door I don't need to get involved. So the upside of maybe our economic position at the moment is that people are more aware of community, more likely to speak out for others and help each other out which is an odd situation isn't it? But it is difficult to get youngsters wanting to commit community activities.

WFO'S: And in the context, where do you try to sort of place it in the context of citizenship for them?

CC: It is important because that's what active citizenship is about. I mean we can do it, if it's purely academic in these four walls then really it's achieved nothing, if they go out of here, they've got an awful lot of knowledge but we never actually play on that knowledge then really it's….

WFO'S: So this knowledge is only useful if you use it for some…

CC: Yeah, it has to work in a community as well.

WFO'S: Yeah fantastic. And the last one is, political literacy.

CC: Again really important because for some of our youngsters especially understanding how the voting system works not just for your MP's but when you talk about members of European parliaments as well so we need to have an idea of that but looking at a grass roots, things like your local councillor and the fact that hopefully I will say to them, one day you're gonna be a councillor and that's gonna be important role for you and if you represent, if your heart is in your representation you will do far more for Tufley than anyone else is likely to do.

WFO'S: Sure.

CC: So understanding how the political system works. We use it in classrooms, I've just got numbers dotted around here. They stand by them, 1, 2, 3, 4 and you know I say to them, that's democracy 4's got the biggest group, they're the winners unless of course I can persuade 2 over there you know, so if a few of you want to swap places so they do. I think you have to make it a very visual thing just talking about votes and individuals. If they can actually see that if a few people shift around that makes a big difference.

WFO'S: It sounds like you put a strong emphasis on being able to make yourself effective as well, because Crick talks about this within political literacy so it can't just be about knowing stuff about politics, you've gotta know how you can make a difference, how you can personally be effective. So you see that as a very strong part I would imagine?

CC: Yeah.
And we've tried to bring in a variety of different people. We've had our local MP as you probably have, he's come in and we've had a House of Commons style debate. We had the speaker of the House of Commons bloke who came in about 18 months ago, just to get some faces and for these youngsters to think, actually they look an awful lot like us except he's shorter. No you know but they're just ordinary people like you and I and there is no reason why you shouldn't aspire to do such things.

WFO'S: Absolutely.

CC: It's having that passion that is important but you need to understand how the system works otherwise you'll get thrown out of the House of Commons if you're just chanting at the opposition.

OFSTED

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah, yeah, that's great. I wanna ask a little bit about OFSTED and about assessment. So the question is, has the need to demonstrate effective assessment of citizenship as a national curriculum subject, and the priorities of OFSTED played a part in shaping your priorities regarding the subject? And just to sort of clarify what I mean by that question. I've certainly come across people who have felt you know, Crick said it should be kind of light touch and you can do what you want and schools have flexibility to explore things, but they get the pressure immediately from their sort of superiors saying, we need to have clear identification in terms of assessment and targets and things that we can show inspectors when they come in, and partly that's dealt with for you by having exams which I think, I know from looking at the stuff makes a massive difference to OFSTED because they feel it kind of takes care of it if you do that ,but maybe even sort of lower down the school.

CC: Yeah, it's not about OFSTED for me. They turn up every, I don't know how often and although obviously I have to play the OFSTED game it's about my feeling for this subject and more importantly it's about my clients feelings for it. So if they think we're not assessing, I'm not inspecting, what I expect, it doesn't have parity with other subjects.

WFO'S: Right.

CC: It doesn't sit alongside English or Maths and it must do.

WFO'S: Right.

CC: So they know at end of Key Stage, well at the end of Year 7 they will get a level from me and they will have an end of Key Stage 3 Level from me, that will determine the set that they're going to go in next year. Whether they do a full or a short course. If you don't get a C at GCSE I'm not gonna take you on for A Level. So it isn't really the OFSTED question, although I'm sure it's nice to please them when they come in.

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah.

CC: This is about my everyday experience with youngsters and parents. I need to have respect for this, and if I can say, well of course we test people and of course I can show you and yes we have levels and attitudes to learning alongside so it sits exactly alongside every other subject in the school. So the light touch I think it's not a particularly wise road to go down.

WFO'S: Right yeah sure and I understand that. Given that because I think we've already established that you know you're very passionate about the kind of enabling part of it. How do you manage, because again there's potentially a tension there between it kind of being like other subjects where the emphasis is largely upon knowing stuff, making sure you can recall it in the exam but still keeping that really important element of citizenship which is the you know that actually it's about you as a person and how you're developing and you've spoken very positively about both of those things so how do you manage to keep that balance because I would say there's always a temptation if you are doing assessments and setting the targets that they tend towards knowledge.

CC: Yeah. What we've done at Key Stage 3 is design a structure whereby the assessment is based on a written activity, a spoken activity so that's a debate, a discussion and then also a research activity. You go away and find out for me please, come back and talk about it. So using new technology, kids are very happy to do PowerPoint presentations, they show me their knowledge hopefully and even if it's missing someone else has said we can fill in but it's about someone standing on their own two feet and I found this out, relating their own experiences as well. I love still using newspapers whereby you cut bits and pieces up and they will read things and again I say to them, fold it up, now tell me the story you've just, just explain it to the rest of us. So it's actually using this ability, not to say that everything in citizenship has to be written down and tested, it would kill it and we do not have the time, so we don't have the luxury of the heavy lessons per week or fortnight, so 50 minutes you're trying to do an awful lot but you are right, you must have that balance. I must be able to see the evidence of what you are capable of doing. I mean I resisted quite strongly previous senior manager said, well what we can do with levels is you can have exactly the same as English.

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: Well no. I can't have exactly the same as English because the skills, there are similarities in some ways and even for English, the spoken side of it is quite important so I could see where she was coming from, but it's quite different in many ways so it's important that the youngsters go out and do their own research that it's current and it's relevant, that they're able to relate some of the knowledge they may have picked up in class to what's going on today, tomorrow.

WFO'S: Yeah. So it's about creative assessment.

CC: Yeah. It's constantly changing. I mean one of the things at A2 there is no textbook and I know initially my colleagues said, no textbook what are we gonna and I was….

WFO'S: Frightening.

CC: Oh my word you know but actually having done it for several years now it will be a waste of time from the minute it was written it would be out of date. The knowledge base is very much what you do in Year 12 having the internet, it changes by the moment and the Arab Spring was just great news for us.

Student Voice

WFO'S: Yeah, fantastic. I wanna ask about how citizenship fits into the sort of wider picture of engaging with the students. So does the school need to model effective citizenship practices through for example, school councils or student voice in order to properly teach them? Do we need to be consistent if we're saying it's really important that you have voice and you get involved?

CC: I think you do but I don't think citizenship subject leaders necessarily have to be the ones doing it.

WFO'S: No.

CC: And I think that's a really… because if you're not careful…

WFO'S: Would you make connections between them?

CC: Yes, yeah. We certainly had last year a youngster who represented I think it was Gloucester and Forest, the youth parliament. I mean I was involved in that but I didn't run it but certainly what I did was Craig came into lessons and he talked to citizenship classes and sold himself and we allowed other youngsters to come in as well, it was really important that they didn't think he was the only one running.

WFO'S: Sure.

CC: Yeah I think you have to have models in schools that demonstrate what's going… you know amnesty international groups and project groups so it's not just about making fairy cakes and raising funds for charity.

WFO'S: Sure.

CC: But you need all sorts of things going on I think.

WFO'S: I appreciate that you don't sort of control this but would you feel that student voice initiatives, that the students here do feel they have a real ability to have an input into the development of the school?

CC: Some do, and some are still probably unconcerned. So…

WFO'S: Right.

CC: Which is a shame. I think we've still got a battle to win there and we've still got to say when things happen in your school you have to have a voice and recently we swapped to vertical tutoring and I think many of the youngsters felt that that went through because it was what staff wanted and…

WFO'S: Right.

CC: You've got to be very careful in this situation but I'm not saying either way here but it is important, but they said, it happened anyway and I said, but it can unhappen then. If you are desperately unhappy about it, you now need to start speaking, we'll have a new Head in September and you know, you've gotta campaign, it's not gonna happen this year I can promise you. It may not happen the next year but if it's a big enough issue eventually. So I think there is an instant gratification attached maybe to some of our youngsters that if it doesn't happen tomorrow then obviously it's not gonna happen at all.

WFO'S: Sure.

CC: And it's learning that process that a lot of these changes I'm afraid are slow coming.

WFO'S: So do you come across a certain amount of cynicism towards these institutions, a feeling that sort of lip service if you like is being paid to consulting them, but that they don't really have a say?

CC: I think so. Yes and I think that very much depends on possibly senior management team and to what extent. As you say, we're seen to be showing but…

WFO'S: I mean we know there are very good reasons why students shouldn't have input into every decision in the school but it can be a problem if students feel that way.

CC: Yeah.

WFO'S: Can you see how potentially that can undermine some of the work that we do in citizenship?

CC: I think I can yes.

WFO'S: Because they feel disempowered if you like.

CC: Most certainly.

WFO'S: And how do you attempt to deal with that?

CC: It's quite tricky because I know that youngsters are now encouraged when new members of staff are being interviewed, to a certain extent they get involved but you could take that a step further, they're not allowed to devise their own questions for example, so you know. I mean you would need to look at these and I'm sure they could come up with a sensible set of questions not based on, can we all have Friday afternoon off? And what you also have to be aware of, is it's not the same type of people always involved in the same projects, you need to have that variety and I know that's something that we probably don't, we have probably the same sets of students that will be…

WFO'S: Is there a case of sort of managing expectations if you like in that, you know, in the outside world it's a democracy you really do have a say in everything, but schools aren't democracies they're a bit like democracies in certain ways and we want to give you a say in certain things but you need to understand, you know, it's not compulsory in the same way for example you can move between schools, it's much harder to move your state. So is there a sense of we're best off being honest about you know, you will have some input here and you probably won't have so much input here because this is something that we actually need to manage?

CC: Quite possibly, although I think you need to explain why that is the case.

WFO'S: Absolutely.

CC: And quite often, I say you know in terms of if there are situations in a classroom, I'll say you know my position is I cannot do that.

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: You know as much as I might like to, I'm constrained by what the law says or our local education, actually what the head says, and equally the head has to do certain things so as much as we might like to say…

WFO'S: But would you ultimately and I think most people I've come across, that's the sensible way of looking at it isn't it but some schools make such a big deal about you know our students are involved in everything but there's a danger that they're undermining the… Yeah so that's…

CC: And I think in the areas where they do have control they have to see that they do make a difference.

WFO'S: Yes.

CC: That has to…

WFO'S: Yeah, so it's a combination kind of honesty about where you can make a difference and showing that you really do make a difference in these areas where we say that you do.

CC: I was at a conference the other week and there's a school in Plymouth you might be aware of the **XXXXXX** school, it was one of the first schools to link with a co-operative trust.

WFO'S: Oh right.

CC: And it was interesting because a member of staff was talking about how she was an AST, she's gone to **XXXXXX**, in fact they talk about **XXXXXX** way.

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: Scary, but anyway, they talk about this particular method in which lessons are taught and a structure in which things are done and having taught a Year 11 geography lesson, first lesson, lots of experience, three students had gone off to the assistant head and said, she's not doing it right.

WFO'S: Right.

CC: She's not doing it the **XXXXXX** way and like any member of staff she was totally horrified and actually as a member of staff she was sent for and had to be kind of very gently trained to ensure that it would be done the **XXXXXX** way and I just went away slightly… because I mean you know kids at doors kind of controlling everything I do now. Is it the world gone mad, but it was an interesting view of it and we're certainly as a school now looking at this idea of co-operative involvement and the values that the Co-op wants to bring into schools which I don't have a problem with. There's nothing there not to like actually.

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah.

CC: But I'm not sure I want to go down that particular route, I think that's somewhat further than maybe I'm prepared to go

WFO'S: Yeah sounds quite scary.

CC: Yeah.

WFO'S: But I'm sure it has its own merits.

Social Cohesion

WFO'S: The question of social cohesion, this in the new national curriculum obviously of 2007 they introduced a so called fourth strand which they called social cohesion.

CC: A tricky one.

WFO'S: Yeah, I wonder what you sort of understand by that and how it's reflected in what you teach?

CC: I always start by looking at this idea of who are you, and often youngsters think your completely mad so you don't know who I am, neither do you anyway but we actually we look at identity and what identity means, and how actually we're all incredibly different so we end up with a classroom full of people saying, different gender, different names, different this so there's no social cohesion, we've got nothing in common actually and then you kind of do it in the reverse and we say, well what you lot have in common, your age, I don't, I'm on a different level to you, okay. So we've got all the girls, you've got all the boys over here and so on but then we also look at things like value. So in a multi-cultural society I always say that you know we live in a country where there are so many differences but actually, what the British do is they share values, they appreciate fairness. There isn't anyone out there who says, fairness, no I do that, okay. Democracy, that one they often don't get but I do, people having a say, equality.

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: Really, so I tend to do it from that direction but it's tough. I mean we'll forget the phrase, not that it matters, but they'll forget the phrase "social cohesion".

WFO'S: Sure.

CC: I always talk about glue. Social glue. What binds us together? You can be different parts but you're essential to the working of the whole and we stick together so it's a bit like a glue.

WFO'S: That's great. Have you come across the Ajegbo report at all? Sort of in name really, no…

CC: In name, yes.

WFO'S: OK so this, you're the first person who has. This I guess was the sort of report which preceded these changes and came about I think largely as a result of the bombings, the London bombings and you know the fear that we had home grown terrorists…

CC: I totally… the only reason I came across it was I had a police officer who worked with me last year and we were looking at extremism and he drew it to my attention.

WFO'S: OK.

CC: To be absolutely honest.

WFO'S: Yeah, yeah.

CC: But we were looking at hate crime and I think is it the David Copeland story, the youngster that was nurtured and was involved in attempted bombing attempts, so…

WFO'S: OK, yeah, yeah. No, it's really interesting because it's made much less of an impact than the Crick report in terms of…

CC: Yeah, yeah and I only got it by…

WFO'S: Exactly the name's sort of not out there. One of the ways of looking at it is that you know this was a new thing within citizenship in 2007 and to a certain extent people had criticised the first version of the national curriculum for not doing enough on racial, religious, sexual discrimination issues, these kind of things. Now some people you talk to say, to be honest we're doing pretty much the same thing as we were doing before, it hasn't really changed much as a subject, we were always looking at those things regardless of what exactly the national curriculum said. Other people do see it there as being a change in 2007, which did kind of bring a refocusing on particular issues. I wondered what your experience was on that?

CC: I think there has been a refocus hasn't there and even tomorrow with the 7/7 anniversary… moving on from that, so no I think you have to be aware of and certainly when I was looking at the A Level mark English, lots of youngsters talk about Islamaphobia, they talked about issues within communities. Most of them acknowledged that media plays a large part here and so on but I think you know, we need to be aware of extremism and… but you have to avoid labelling and stereotyping.

WFO'S: But do you think really, in that case, citizenship to a certain extent always reflects sort of contemporary issues, which largely come about because of that. I'm interested in the sort of political view of citizenship if you like, so if we take when it was first sort of introduced and we look at Crick then the real headline thing if you like was political apathy, not enough people turning out in elections and this kind of thing.

CC: It hasn't changed a lot, if you look at the numbers.

WFO'S: That's right and then there seem to be so after 2005 sort of refocusing on social cohesion, there's a sense or some people would argue that there's a sense in which the government use citizenship as a way of saying, we are doing something about this, you know don't panic but often experience of schools is they, yes they pay attention to what are the major issues at any particular time but in terms of the kind of values and the kind of things that they're trying to teach the students, it doesn't change so much, would you agree with that?

CC: I think it's very convenient for any political government isn't it to use citizenship and as you say reassure people, we will have better citizens in the next five years and so on, and it does take time to remember this since 2002, it is 10 years on so you should start now to see some results you know youngsters are coming out.

WFO'S: Is there a danger that because that happens now we're really focused on social cohesion and we've forgotten maybe as much about political literacy or the problems of political apathy and you know like you say, that hasn't really changed that much, that's still there.

CC: No.

WFO'S: So you have that slight sort of political football effect.

CC: Yeah. Although I do think the current situation, you have the coalition government which lots of people possibly feel uncomfortable with, when there is a next election it's a real opportunity there to bring about the change you want to see.

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: So many of those youngsters will be out there hopefully voting and making a difference. The current 11's and 12's for a generation now they're the worst off, they're going out there and there are no jobs. What is their government doing about this?

WFO'S: Yeah.

CC: Something? Nothing? So it's their opportunity isn't it perhaps for the first time to think about, well who's gonna put forward a deal for us?

WFO'S: So the challenge is I suppose to make that connection between because they kind of know there aren't jobs because they see that around them but they don't necessarily connect that to these things that I'm learning about what's going on in London, so I guess, yeah that's the challenge.

Active Citizenship

WFO'S: Last question, what do you understand by the term "active citizen"? This does get sort of thrown around a fair amount.

CC: Good citizens obey the law, do what they should do, they're the people who you generally see out on the street. An active citizen is someone that is actually involved in their community, participates, has a level of knowledge, understands how they can bring about a difference, that's an active citizen, it's participation.

WFO'S: OK. It's amazing how, that's one question where there's a massive difference, some people who have done an exam and people who haven't, they tend to be very clear idea about it and I think that's why, so you'd see it as, because a question I also ask at this point is, how is it distinct from the kind of volunteering or community programmes that schools have done in the past?

CC: It's lifelong isn't it? It isn't just about saying, well we can get you to sell some cakes at break time, raise some money for McMillan and that makes you an active citizen. Well it does but there are so many ways in which you can be an active citizen.

WFO'S: Yeah and it's the context, that slightly wider understanding.

CC: And it's your membership of things like pressure groups or NGO's or your affiliations are gonna determine how active or inactive you are likely to be. The kind of things you buy tickets for at concerts and so on, whether you buy charity Christmas cards, understand that actually only tuppence of that really is gonna go where it should you know, so why not buy or create a Christmas card of your own and send a donation, that's much more active than buying something pretty… so you know looking at those types of things.

WFO'S: OK.

CC: I think that's the important bit and staying up to date with what's going on. Having a different perspective on today's news from different angles… different newspaper, you can be canny about what you're absorbing, who's selling it to you.