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Editorial

The publication of volume 2 number 1 of citizED’s international journal is a significant turning point. The title of the Journal has been changed from the International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education to Citizenship Teaching and Learning. This change of title has been achieved following international consultation and brings an explicit commitment to what had already in practice been achieved. We are interested in citizenship teaching and learning in all contexts (social, political, economic, cultural; for all ages within and beyond schools; truly international, global and cosmopolitan) with a commitment to academic excellence within diverse democracies.

We have an excellent base to work from. The Journal is now read by people in over 40 countries, appears on the first page of major search engines and articles are increasingly downloaded. Between July and October 2005 over 1000 downloads occurred of Journal articles. Between November 2005 and February 2006 over 2750 downloads occurred. We predict further strong growth.

In this issue we are delighted to present more high quality articles that cover a variety of issues, contexts and perspectives. Alan Sears and Andrew Hughes (Canada) discuss characterizations of education and indoctrination. This article provides an excellent fundamental review of the nature of citizenship education. Separate articles by Melinda Dooly (Spain) and Robert Osgood (USA) provide insights into what is happening in teacher education programmes and through careful reflection discuss issues relevant to those who work with beginning professionals. Mark Evans (Canada) on the basis of in-depth data collection and analysis provides insights into what secondary school citizenship teachers think and do in classrooms in Canada and England and suggests what issues need our attention in the future. Kerry Kennedy (Hong Kong) uses a careful analysis of data to reflect on the nature of the ‘new’ and ‘old’ gender gaps in citizenship education. This analysis of gender and citizenship gives vitally important insights into a highly significant and under-researched area. Finally, and very usefully for allowing us to see beyond school contexts, is a fascinating piece by Judith Gill and Sue Howard (Australia) that explores perspectives about citizenship from young people and others in rural and urban locations. In these 6 articles we have thoughtful and stimulating discussions of key aspects of citizenship debates.

We are also introducing a new feature to the journal by including Ralph Leighton’s (UK) discussion piece which asks if citizenship is (or should be) subversive? Referees of this article felt that it should be included slightly separately from the other pieces that have been included in this issue. We hope that this deliberately polemical piece will serve to engage readers and to invite comment. If we succeed in stimulating readers to comment on this and other pieces we will perhaps continue with the inclusion of this type of material as well as think about ways to publish readers’ comments on our web pages.
4 book reviews have been produced by contributors from several countries and provide excellent ways to engage with developments around the world.

The journal is now firmly established. Future issues will add to an already high profile. December 2006 will see the publication of a special Asian issue and in December 2007 a special issue will focus on the IEA civic education projects (past, present and future). In between these special issues we will publish in July 2007 a collection of articles to coincide with the citizED conference that will be held in Sydney, Australia.

Correspondence: IAN DAVIES, Department of Educational Studies, University of York, YO10 5DD, UK

Articles to be submitted electronically to: Roma Woodward (rlw8@canterbury.ac.uk)
Citizenship: Education or Indoctrination?

ALAN SEARS AND ANDREW HUGHES, University of New Brunswick

ABSTRACT Here, it is argued that the recent worldwide upsurge of interest in citizenship education has been associated with a struggle between ideas of indoctrination and ideas of education. On the one hand, there has been a desire for the uncritical acceptance of doctrine without regard to evidence (indoctrination); and on the other, a desire to assess possibilities in the light of the available evidence (education). The propensity toward indoctrination, it is claimed, can be found in a commitment to slogans and dogma, a rush to reform and to find the quick fix, and in some places a tradition of didactic teaching that focuses upon an encyclopaedic coverage of details without particular regard to their meaning for pupils. An educative orientation is found in a broadening and deepening of the public discussion of the role of citizenship education, the emphasis upon a long term perspective, the development of clear conceptions and expectations, and the building of a substantive knowledge base. The authors are critical of initiatives in their native Canada and point to specific enterprises in England and Australia that they conclude are much more illustrative of the educative disposition.

Introduction

The past 15 years has seen an upsurge of interest in democratic citizenship education around the world. Significant national initiatives in countries like Australia (Curriculum Corporation, 2005), England (Cleaver, Ireland, Kerr, & Lopes, 2005) and the United States (Carnegie Corporation of New York, & CIRCLE, 2003) coupled with supra-national projects sponsored by organizations such as UNESCO (1995), the Council of Europe (2005) and the Centre for Citizenship Education at the Hong Kong Institute of Education (Lee, Grossman, Kennedy, & Fairbrother 2004) have fostered a range of scholarship as well as policy and programme development. Much of this interest and effort emanates from a context of perceived disaffection, alienation and lack of social cohesion in democratic societies.

We have been very involved in this work both at the national and international level (see, for example, Sears & Hughes 1996; Sears, Clarke & Hughes, 1999; Sears & Hughes, 2005). While we support the idea that education for democratic citizenship ought to be a core focus of public education in democratic societies and have benefited personally from the interest and funding that has accompanied the growing sense of crisis with regard to young people’s engagement in civic life, we have also become increasingly concerned about the quality of scholarship as well as policy and programme development in the field. It seems to us that what passes for citizenship education, particularly in the Canadian context, is often more akin to indoctrination. In the remainder of this paper we will set out what we mean by indoctrination and education, demonstrate ways in which citizenship education in
Canada and elsewhere is often more consistent with the former, and, finally, propose some suggestions for moving the field more in the direction of education.

**Indoctrination and Education**

Dictionary.com defines indoctrination as, “teaching someone to accept doctrines uncritically.” Similarly, Arthur (2003:37) argues, “to indoctrinate is defined as to teach something that is true or universally accepted regardless of evidence to the contrary or in the absence of evidence at all. It is a pejorative term.” These definitions capture very well two critical attributes of indoctrination: the push for uncritical, often universal acceptance of ideas and the eschewing of evidence.

If indoctrination is the closing down of alternatives through the promotion of single, unassailable views and the shunning of evidence, then it seems to us that education is the opposite; the opening of possibilities through engagement with evidence. For the purposes of argument, then, we define education as the opening up of possibilities through the exploration of alternative understandings, the critical application of evidence and argument and the development of the skills and dispositions necessary to act on the possibilities. In short, we see indoctrination as a process that narrows and limits possibilities and education as a process that broadens and opens up possibilities.

Our experience in Canada and elsewhere leads us to believe that both discourse and practice in the field of citizenship education exist in a state of tension between education and indoctrination. Over the years we have seen wonderful examples of how policy and practice in citizenship education tend toward education in the best sense of the word. The breadth and quality of current public and professional conversations around citizenship education in England is one example of this at the level of discourse, and the proposed new civics curriculum in British Columbia – and particularly the requirement for civic engagement included in it – is another at the level of policy and programmes. We will discuss both in more detail later but for us they are educative because they include informed attention to alternative possibilities for citizenship and citizenship education.

On the other hand, the propensity to indoctrinate – to push for uncritical acceptance of ideas and beliefs and to ignore or disregard evidence – shows up in the field of citizenship education in a number of ways. A number of writers, for example, have documented the tendency of citizenship education in Canada to promote what George Tomkins called “an anglo-conformist ethnocentrism … that left no room for any positive treatment of ethnicity or cultural pluralism” (Tomkins, 1986:176). This kind of narrow, jingoistic nation building shows up in the history and, unfortunately, contemporary practice of citizenship education in many democratic jurisdictions. The tendency to indoctrination also shows up well beyond school curricula and classroom practice. The critical attributes of indoctrination identified above can be found across the field including in both public policy debates and academic discourses. This tendency does not serve us well in any of these contexts.

We will now turn to examples where the trend toward indoctrination intrudes into different aspects of the field of citizenship education. With Smagorinsky and Taxel (2005:314) we recognize binaries as often “overly simplistic, reductive and unproductive except heuristically to establish points on a continuum”. We do not mean to suggest that any particular citizenship education discourses, policies or programmes match exactly the dominant attributes of either indoctrination or education; most are hybrids at some point along the continuum. We do want to
emphasize, however, that approaches to democratic citizenship education can be inclined in one direction or the other and argue that we are best served when the inclination is to education rather than indoctrination.

**Indoctrination**

The propensity to indoctrination can be found in several areas of the field of citizenship education including: public policy and academic discourse in the field; a rush to reform and quick fixes and the equally quick desertion of reforms; policy and programmes in civic education; public policy and academic discourse.

In her book *The Cult of Efficiency* Janice Gross Stein (2001), addresses the impoverished nature of public discourse in Canada concerning health care and education. She argues that public discussion of these areas has been characterized by a cult mentality committed to simplistic slogans and dogma while remaining unreflective about attending assumptions, implications and alternatives. Building on her work, Sears and Hyslop-Margison (in press) in *The Cult of Citizenship Education*, argue that similar features often characterize the discourse in our field including things like: creating false crises, sloganeering, setting up false dichotomies, grossly over simplifying both problems and solutions, and the demonizing of opponents and alternatives. The cult-like mantras that sometimes dominate our discourses are consistent with an indoctrination approach to citizenship education in that they are much more focused on creating true believers than on listening to alternatives or making substantive arguments. We will focus here on the creation of crises and the demonizing of opponents.


A number of significant challenges can be raised to any of these elements of alarm. In some cases they are quite simply wrong and in most cases almost certainly gross oversimplifications of the issues. To argue, for example, that we face a crisis of civic disengagement while at the same time evidence suggests that “young people are volunteering and participating in community activities at high rates” (Torney-Purta & Vermeer, 2004:3) – perhaps the highest ever, seems inconsistent at best.

The empirical evidence supporting an escalating crisis of civic ignorance is also rather thin. An Australian political scientist writing about the so called ‘civics deficit’ in that country argues that “ever since mass opinion surveys first began to be used in the 1940’s they have consistently shown that most citizens are anything but knowledgeable about politics. The majority know little about politics and possess minimal factual knowledge about the operation of the political system” (McAllister, 1998). Recent research in the U.S. comparing levels of civic knowledge among youth over the past 70 years concludes that that “overall, contemporary high school seniors are not demonstrably less informed about politics and government than were students in the 1930s through the 1960s” (Niemi, Sanders, & Whittington, 2005:186). A crisis perhaps, but certainly not an escalating one.

We are not contending that there are no reasons for concern about the knowledge, skills and dispositions of young citizens, but we do believe that understanding what the concerns are will involve sustained and careful analysis.
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Purveyors of crisis are almost never interested in exploring the complexities and nuances of the problems they identify; as Gross Stein points out, they are interested in advancing very particular political purposes and agendas. They wish to indoctrinate not educate.

A particularly disturbing aspect of the public policy debates is the tendency to demonize opponents. One of the best examples of this kind of polemic related to citizenship education in Canada is Jack Granatstein’s (1998) book *Who Killed Canadian History?* which became a popular best seller – very rare for a book on education in Canada. Granatstein, a prominent historian, throws aside the canons of evidence and argument that underlie academic work in history, and launches an ill-informed and manipulative diatribe against social history -- particularly that of the feminist or ethnic variety – and the historians who practice it laying the blame for the murder of Canadian History, or his version of it at least, squarely at their feet. Ironically, on the same page on which he claims that “it is stunning to see the scorn in which the ‘old’ national history is held by practitioners of the ‘new’,” Granatstein goes on to write, about the ‘new’, that “it is somehow considered improper to study a white male prime minister, but the first Jewish dentist in Nova Scotia or an unknown female doctor in northern Alberta is worth a book” (p. 63). Apparently scorn is only stunning when targeted at him. A number of authors have detailed the ways in which he mischaracterizes the field of social history and, in particular, those who engage in it (see, for example, Stanley, 2000).

Evans (2004) demonstrates the degree to which demonizing opponents has characterized debates about civic education in the U.S. dubbing conflicts around the social studies curriculum and particularly citizenship education over the past century the ‘the social studies wars’. These disputes have pitted conservative and passive views of citizenship and citizenship education against more active and progressive ones and have often been ideological and personal. Among the most virulent of these “wars” was the fight over national standards for American History in public schools. Historian and lead author of the standards Gary Nash and his colleagues faced vitriolic attacks from right of centre critics who argued that the standards told too negative a story of the American past (Nash, Crabtree, & Dunn, 1997). Similarly, Smagorinsky and Taxel (2005) argue that current clashes over character education in the U.S. are often characterized by ‘dialogism’ which they describe as a phenomenon that “enables the discourse of a particular community (Libertarian, Jungian psychologists, character educators affiliated with conservative Christians) to become normalized in terms of its ideology; that is, their historical, ongoing conversation ceases to question certain axioms that in turn marginalize other perspectives on the topic” (p.65).

Smagorinsky and Taxel provide examples of rhetoric that “assumes the marginality or foolishness of those whose ideologies follow from different assumptions” (p. 65), particularly from conservative character educators; but this problem is not limited to those on that side of the debate. A recent article in a well respected Canadian journal represents a case in point. The piece addresses the application of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to education. One section deals with minority language rights in education, in particular the right of official language minority parents to local control of schools in their own language. After reporting on a Supreme Court decision extending those rights to a group of parents in one province they quote John Ibbitson, a national affairs columnist for The Globe and Mail who disagreed. He wrote,
The Supreme Court, however, is bound to uphold the Constitution which, along with its nobler aspects, codifies the fruits of ancient grievances and unseemly political accommodations. And so this court once again affirmed the iniquitous principle that, in Canada, some citizens, for the sole reason they speak an official language in a minority setting, are entitled to rights not shared by others. . . Our greatest strength is that people come from everywhere, and everyone has an equal chance to fashion a good and just life.[1]

Acknowledging that the columnist’s position “likely encapsulates the thoughts and attitudes of many Canadians,” the authors of the article argue, “this view exemplifies the failings of our education system with respect to citizenship education; it attempts to trivialize the legitimate cultural aspirations of a significant cultural group” (p. 104). The implication is that our education system is failing because John Ibbitson, and probably many other Canadians, disagree with a provision of our Constitution and how it has been applied by the Supreme Court. While we agree with the authors that citizenship education should “foster an understanding of Canada’s linguistic duality within a multicultural framework” (p.104), we reject the idea that all well educated citizens must agree either with the provisions enshrined in the Constitution, or the policy and bureaucratic frameworks meant to operationalize them. The ability to rethink and reframe civic principles and structures is fundamental to democratic citizenship and it is neither inappropriate nor unpatriotic merely to disagree with the Constitution or particular applications of it. To characterize the view Ibbitson espouses as an indication of the failure of the education system is dismissive. Osborne (2001:14) argues that,

Perhaps the most fundamental fact about Canada is that it is a country that is continually debating the terms of its own existence. It has been doing so ever since 1763. To participate in this debate, to avoid false solutions, to accept that there might in fact not be any once-for-all solutions at all, and above all not to turn one's back on it in frustration, is perhaps the ultimate exercise in democracy.

Following from Osborne, the role of citizenship education is to induct students into this debate in an informed way, not to tell them what to think and say once they are engaged in it.

The Rush to Reform

Several years ago the Department of Education in New Brunswick employed an external consultant to assess why students in the province were scoring lower on national and international tests relative to their counterparts in other parts of Canada. Her report touched on several areas including the nature of educational reform in the province. She argued that for the most part reform had been driven by questionable ideological assumptions and commitments rather than reliable research and transparent, reasoned decision-making. She wrote (Scraba, 2002:60)

Previously proposed solutions have typically represented one interest or another. They have been based on personal experience, and on personal commitment to one model or another. They have fuelled the
divisiveness of the situation to such an extent that few will now speak candidly about the issues or about appropriate solutions. Those who venture solutions, do so with personal and anecdotal information rather than with information about the whole system.

A policy audit in Ontario reached similar conclusions about educational reform in that province (Leithwood, Fullan, & Watson, 2003:18):

The provincial educational policies introduced over the six years were developed and enacted without much demonstrable attention to empirical evidence about what would improve teaching and learning.

New Brunswick and Ontario are far from alone in their tendency to introduce poorly conceived educational reforms based on a sense of impending crisis. Hunt (2002) points out that the history of public education reform in the U.S. contains many similar examples of attempts to reshape curriculum on the basis of narrow ideological commitments.

Two examples of this ilk in the rush to reform citizenship education in Canada are the return of high school civics and some attempts at voter education. Recently implemented civics courses for grade 10 in Ontario (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2005) and grade 11 in British Columbia (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2005) are examples of the former. Civics courses, once common in the curriculum across Canada, had disappeared by the late 1980s replaced by an emphasis on citizenship across the curriculum and in social studies courses in particular (Sears & Hughes, 1996). Both these courses are, in part at least, a response to the growing sense of civic crises outlined above. Both are designed to foster informed, skilled and active civic engagement among young people in response to trends to the contrary. Milner (2002) has documented declining engagement among young people and has argued strongly for courses just such as these targeted at senior high school students close to graduation and close to the time of eligibility for their first vote. This all seems to make perfect sense except that there is a growing body of evidence that, by senior high school, students’ political attitudes and behaviours are relatively set and that in order to have impact programmes must be aimed at much younger students. Torney-Purta and Vermeer (2004), for example, argue “A variety of studies of elementary and middle school students, including the IEA Civic Education Study, shows that in democratic countries the average student is already a member of his or her political culture by age 14” (p.23). In other words, by 14 children have generally the same levels of levels of trust, cynicism, engagement etc. with regard to the political system as adults in their country. We are not opposed to civics courses generally, or the ones in Ontario or British Columbia in particular, but if we are going to target the problem high school might not be the best spot.

Another example of the rush to reform can be found in voter education programmes which have gained in popularity as concern about voting rates, particularly among youth, have risen. Many of these programmes, however, focus on two things: teaching young people the mechanism of voting - how to - and teaching them reasons to vote - why to. Recent work by our research team indicates that at least some young Canadians who have decided not to vote have very sophisticated understandings of the mechanisms of voting and the centrality of voting to democratic governance, to say nothing of a comprehensive understanding of historical struggles to secure the franchise for various groups. They know all these things yet for a number of reasons decide not to vote. We do not contend that voter
education is not necessary but rather that to be successful it must be based on a complex understanding of students' prior knowledge and go well beyond current approaches (Chareka, 2005; Chareka & Sears, in press). It is not something to be rushed into.

The kind of ad hoc approach to programme development and implementation reflected in these examples is consistent with both of the key aspects of indoctrination identified above. It discounts or ignores evidence and attempts to convince people of the appropriateness of particular programmes through an evangelical advocacy.

**Policies and Programmes**

Finally, some of the specific programmes adopted in the name of citizenship education seem much more likely to indoctrinate than educate. Torney-Purta and Vermeer (2004) point out that programmes in the US “frequently consist of encyclopaedic coverage of details of government structures or historical documents that may have little meaning to students and do not connect to their own identity as a citizen with responsibilities and rights” and “sometimes focus almost exclusively on patriotic observances, which are important but incomplete as preparation for engaged citizenship” (p. 14). Similarly, national research in England has found that traditional, didactic teaching dominates citizenship education classrooms and progress toward more open and democratic schools is very slow (Cleaver, Ireland, Kerr, & Lopes, 2005).

Our observation is that all of these features of an indoctrination (ideologically charged discourse, a rush to reform, and poorly conceived and implemented programmes) are, to some degree, characteristic of the field of citizenship education in Canada (Hughes & Sears, 2005). We will now turn to some suggestions for pushing our work away from indoctrination toward education.

**Education**

In this section we argue that taking a broadly educative approach to the field of citizenship education will be enhanced by broadening and deepening the public and professional discussion of the field; taking a long view in terms of reform initiatives; defining what is and what is not citizenship education; and building a substantive knowledge base in the field.

**Broadening and Deepening Public and Professional Discussion**

In some jurisdictions one response to the sense of crisis about citizenship described above has been to initiate and promote public and professional discussion about both the nature of the crises and approaches to address them. These discussions have taken place in the context of government commissions, the issuing of policy discussion documents by governments and/or civil society organizations, the development of educational standards, and public discourse through the popular media. In some cases these discussions have had wide impact and have fostered political and professional interest in and concern for citizenship education and have led to substantial and coordinated policy and programmes. In jurisdictions where public discussion has been limited and fragmented, such as Canada, programme and policy development has been just as limited and fragmented.
In Australia national, public discussion of citizenship education has gone on for nearly 20 years. It began with an investigation of Australian citizenship and citizenship education by the Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training of the Australian Senate in the late 1980s. The Committee’s report, *Educating for Active Citizenship in Australian Schools and Youth Organizations*, issued in 1989, painted a bleak picture of the knowledge and levels of engagement among Australian citizens generally and young people in particular. The report made a range of recommendations for improvements in school curricula, pedagogy and teacher preparation (Senate Standing Committee on Employment, 1989). The federal government responded to the report pointing out that specific educational initiatives were the responsibilities of the states but acknowledging its obligation to stimulate and support reform in civic education. The Senate maintained interest issuing a follow up report in 1991, *Active Citizenship Revisited*, assessing progress on the original recommendations and making further suggestions for moving forward (Senate Standing Committee on Employment, 1991).

This work of the Australian Senate was largely responsible for pushing the federal government to act and in the early 1990’s it formed the Civics Expert Group (1994) and gave it the task of preparing “a strategic plan for a non-partisan programme of public education on civic issues.” The goal was “to ensure that Australians can participate fully in civic decision-making processes” (pp. 3 & 5). The Group issued its report, *Whereas the People . . . Civics and Citizenship Education*, in 1994 and it garnered wide response from politicians, policy makers and practitioners. This series of reports led directly to Australian participation in both phases of the IEA international civic education study, the development and implementation of the *Discovering Democracy* programme, a national multilevel citizenship education programme, and citizenship being included in *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century* issued in 1999 (Australian Government Department of Education Science and Training, 1999; Curriculum Corporation, 2005).

England followed a similar route beginning with the appointment of the Advisory Group on Citizenship in the early 1990s, through the publication of its report, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Advisory Group on Citizenship, 1998), to the development and implementation of a curriculum order mandating citizenship as part of the National Curriculum. At every stage there was widespread public and professional consultation and discussion which continues to this day.

The United States has also had substantial national discussion about standards and programmes in citizenship education. As Torney-Purta and Vermeer (2004) make clear, discussions about citizenship education have largely taken place in the context of the development of voluntary national standards for subjects like civics, history, and social studies. These discussions have gained momentum and focus over the past several years largely through the involvement of private organizations like the Carnegie Corporation. Torney-Purta and Vermeer (2004:5) write,

*The past three years have seen a remarkable set of actions promoting attention to a multidimensional view of civic competencies and commitment to the school’s role in fostering them. Among the most important is a consensus document, The Civic Mission of Schools, issued in early 2003 by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE (The Centre for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement). Nearly every previous report on this subject began*
with an assessment of the relatively gloomy picture of youth civic engagement as rationale for proposed activities. The rationale contained in the Civic Mission of Schools represents a consensus (of liberal and conservative views, of practitioners, policy analysts and researchers) that is especially compelling. This report is beginning to be seen as a critically important reference document in this area.

In comparison, public and professional discussion of citizenship and citizenship education in Canada has been truncated and ineffective. Just after the first report from the Australian Senate in 1989 the Senate of Canada began its own investigation of Canadian citizenship and citizenship education. The Standing Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology held hearings, sponsored research, and issued its report, Canadian Citizenship: Sharing the Responsibility, in May 1993. Several of the nine recommendations in that report called for federal government initiative related to citizenship education including ones that read: “That the Federal Government promote national initiatives addressing matters of citizenship education” and “That the Government give consideration to an ‘endowment fund’ for the establishment of a Canadian Centre for Citizenship Education and Promotion” (Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs Science and Technology, 1993:28). While some of the studies sponsored by the Committee were published in academic journals, there was virtually no public or professional discussion of the work beyond a small group of federal bureaucrats. It seems clear from the experience in Australia, England, the U.S. and elsewhere that sustained and substantial discussion about citizenship education is critical in developing quality policy and programming in the area.

**Taking a Long View**

Janice Gross Stein (2001) argues that important public policy debates are never easy and rarely over. Rushing to solutions with the hope they will permanently settle issues is almost never a good idea and certainly has not served us well in education generally or citizenship education in particular.

Ian Davies and his colleagues (Davies, Gorard, & McGuinn, 2005:2) argue that would be reformers often use the sense of crisis around citizenship education as a means “to gain curricular footholds.” As illustrated above, on investigation many crises prove to be less immediate than their purveyors would suggest. For example, when Osborne (2000) probed Granatstein’s claims of rapidly declining knowledge of Canadian history he found the evidence lacking. He demonstrates that low levels of historical knowledge among the Canadian population is not new but has been of concern to educators and policy makers for 100 years or more and has precipitated at least four previous ‘crises of ignorance’ in the field of history education which is often closely linked to citizenship education.

To point out that these concerns have been around for a century or more is not to say they are unimportant. It is to say, however, that there is no need to panic about them and rush to solutions. Osborne does not argue that current levels of historical knowledge are adequate, but he does contend that any substantial debate about what to do about them has to take historical context into account. Recognizing the persistent nature of the issues we face should allow time for careful data gathering and thoughtful development and implementation of policy and programmes in response.
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Taking the long view does not necessarily mean waiting a long time to act. Rather, it calls for recursive action – moving forward tentatively while continuing to collect evidence and making adjustments to reforms as necessary. Policy and programme developers in England realized full well that “the evidence base concerning citizenship education prior to 2002 was weak” (Cleaver et al., 2005:1) but they moved forward to implement the citizenship curriculum order anyway. They also put into place a multilayered system of monitoring and assessment including longitudinal and cross sectional research on school policies and programmes and student progress as well as including citizenship as an area for investigation in the regular school inspections (Cleaver et al., 2005). All of these mechanisms feed information back into the system and provide a basis for adjusting policies and programmes. It seems to us that this kind of recursive action, moving forward on what we know with careful monitoring of progress to inform adjustments down the road is a sensible model for reform in public policy generally and citizenship education in particular. We need to move away from our addiction to quick and permanent fixes pushed ahead more by ideology than informed discussion.

Defining What We Are About

In jurisdictions around the world, citizenship and citizenship education are contested concepts and Canada is no stranger to this conceptual uncertainty (Sears, Clarke, & Hughes, 2000; Sears & Hughes, 1996). Both terms are often used as slogans with deliberately fuzzy meanings by those promoting one reform or another. For example, the Character Education movement which has caught on in many jurisdictions is infused with the language of citizenship (see, for example, Davies et al., 2005; Davis, 2003; Howard, Berkowitz, & Schaeffer, 2004). Citizenship Education and Character Education, however, are not the same thing.

In England school inspectors have raised the issue of conceptual confusion particularly in regard to citizenship education and the curriculum for Personal, Social and Heath Education (PSHE). The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) has begun to address this with a handbook which delineates some of the differences between personal moral issues and civic ones – both in terms of focus and content (Department for Education and Skills, 2004:46). The document reads, in part,

Whereas PSHE focuses on issues of personal decision-making and interpersonal relations, citizenship focuses on public issues and policy. The former concerns students’ choices as private individuals, the latter... their choices as citizens – that is, as members of society with legal rights and responsibilities. The one focuses on issues of personal responsibility, and the other on issues of public – social or political – concern.

Ian Davies and his colleagues (Davies et al., 2005) acknowledge the tendency to conflate citizenship and character education but argue (p.7) that there are important distinctions between them including differences in “academic traditions; curricular organization; preferred view of the relationship between individuals and the state; curricular content; attitude toward ‘right’ answers; attitude toward stages of learning.” Citizenship education, they argue, is closely tied to academic disciplines such as history and political science, is generally implemented as a subject in
schools (or within a school subject such as social studies in Canada), is focused on public morality and ‘civic’ action, is open to alternative views of the world, and sees children as active constructors of their own knowledge. Character education, on the other hand, has no academic roots, is not tied to any particular school subject, is focused on private morality and personal action, is premised on students adopting a common and fixed set of ideas about the world, and sees them as relatively passive recipients of received wisdom.

There is considerable evidence of the conflating of citizenship and character education in Canada but no evidence of any attempts to delineate key difference and clearly define what is and is not citizenship education. Recently Osborne (2004) wrote that Canadian schools have largely misunderstood the nature of citizenship. “They have,” he argued, “equated the good citizen with the good person, the man or woman who helps others, respects other people's rights, obeys the law, is suitably patriotic and the like...[but] citizenship demands more. It requires a willingness and ability to play an active and morally principled part in the public life of one's society, at the very least by casting an informed vote in elections and, ideally, by being engaged with and in public affairs...A democratic society demands of its members that they be both good persons and good citizens” (p. 13). The key focus of much of character education in Canada is developing good persons rather than good citizens and it is time we began, as the English have, to put aside the slogans and be clear by what we mean about citizenship education. This will not always be easy, but as Stein (2001) points out “there is no escape from an admittedly difficult conversation about our values and purposes” (p.198).

Building a Knowledge Base

It is generally accepted that the research base for citizenship education is relatively weak. Still, as policy makers and professionals move forward in creating programmes there is a desire among some to be informed about and to further build upon the research and information base that does exist. From a consideration of the initiatives in several international jurisdictions, it seems that there are four types of research initiative that have been employed to support the policy making and programme development process. The first seeks to build an awareness of the previously existing evidence available to guide policy and programme development. This usually takes the form of a review or synthesis of published research. The second is an endeavour to establish a base-line of existing practice, often in the form of an audit, review or survey. The third seeks to establish a base-line of the current civic knowledge, skills and dispositions of young people. The fourth is a systematic monitoring of programmes as they are implemented. Not all jurisdictions pursue all of these avenues but in Australia, England and the United States there is evidence of some of them. In Canada policy focused research has generally been limited to a portion of the second of these types in that there have been several recent initiatives to develop a base-line in terms of intended curricula in citizenship education across the country. There have been no systematic attempts to develop the same sort of base-line knowledge about pedagogical practice or student achievement. Space does not allow a thorough exploration of initiatives in all the jurisdictions but we will mention just a few.

The first type is exemplified in the work The Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) in England. The EPPI-Centre is part of the Social Science Research Unit (SSRU), Institute of Education, University of London and has been contracted by the DfES to produce two research syntheses
addressing the impact of citizenship education upon various aspects of schooling. The intention was to provide an evidence-based framework that would inform policy and practice as the new citizenship programme is introduced (Deakin Crick, Coates, Taylor, & Ritchie, 2004; Deakin Crick et al., 2005). Another example of this sort of research is the work of both the National Center for Learning and Citizenship (NCLC) and the Centre for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) in the US. Supported by both public and private funds both centres have produced policy focused papers synthesizing research knowledge in citizenship education (see, for example, Billig, Root, & Jesse, 2005; Judith Torney-Purta & Vermeer, 2004).

The second type of research endeavour is exemplified on a national level in the work of the Australian and Canadian Senates discussed above, and on an international level in the first phase of the IEA Civic Education Study. The latter focused on developing national case studies of the intended curriculum in civic education in participating nations to provide both a base-line from which to assess developments in the field and as a basis for developing the international survey and testing instruments for the second phase of the study (Torney-Purta, Schwille, & Amadeo, 1999).

Phase 2 of the IEA work is a key example of the third research approach presented above. In that phase of the work 90,000 students in 28 countries along with significant numbers of teachers completed a battery of tests and surveys designed to establish a base-line of civic knowledge, skills and attitudes among fourteen year-olds and some sense of classroom practice in civic education in participating countries (Judith Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001). All of the international jurisdictions discussed here participated with the exception of Canada and all, again except Canada, have used the data collected to inform policy and practice.

Finally, we turn to the fourth type of research — systematic monitoring of programmes. The best example we know of this is the ongoing work of the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) in England. It is conducting ongoing national longitudinal and cross sectional research on the implementation of the citizenship curriculum in England including monitoring student progress, teaching practices and school polices and programmes (Cleaver et al., 2005; Kerr, Cleaver, Ireland, & Blenkinson, 2003). This impressive body of work feeds back information to the system every couple of years allowing for informed choices to be made about reforming current work and beginning new initiatives.

While there is research on particular aspects of citizenship education in Canada and some examples of very good work being conducted, a conclusion from a 1994 review of research in the country that work in the field is generally scarce, thin, and of mixed quality continues to hold (Sears, 1994). There is no evidence of sustained support for or use of research in citizenship and character education among policy makers and programme developers in Canada at any level. A clear threat, in our view, that the field in Canada may be dominated more by indoctrination than education.

Conclusion

In a recent report we completed for the Ontario Ministry of Education comparing policy and programmes in citizenship education across several international jurisdictions we concluded, in part, “as educational jurisdictions around the world have become involved in citizenship education, Canada has been a dabbler rather
than a player” (Hughes & Sears, 2005:3). We contend this is at least partly because Canadian jurisdictions have taken an approach to developing civic knowledge, skills and dispositions that is more consistent with indoctrination than education. In some respects this is probably true elsewhere as well but our work for the Ministry in Ontario convinced us that there are examples of jurisdictions which are working to put into place the elements of the educative approach we have described above: broadening and deepening public and professional conversations about citizenship and citizenship education; taking the long, systematic view of educational reform; beginning to define what citizenship education is and what it is not; and building a comprehensive and complex knowledge base to inform policy and practice in citizenship education. There is undoubtedly more to do in these jurisdictions but their strong beginnings provide both an example and a challenge to Canada. We hope we will go forward to meet it.
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Integrating Intercultural Competence and Citizenship Education into Teacher Training: a Pilot Project

MELINDA DOOLY, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

ABSTRACT This paper describes a pilot project designed to help student teachers explore the ways in which their cultural beliefs are linked to wider social and institutional relationships. Through reflection and experiential learning, the student teachers were made aware of the fact that their beliefs have a direct effect on the way in which their students are “socialised” by their teaching processes. As a result of theoretical and empirical exploration, future teachers became more critically aware of their general perspectives about social issues, increased their intercultural competence and learnt teaching strategies which can eventually be transferred to teaching of citizenship. The project, which involved eight partners in six different countries, allowed 160 teacher trainees to undergo intensive teaching practice in a foreign country, while at the same time participating in a programme aimed at improving their intercultural competences and understanding of what it means to be a citizen in today’s world.

Introduction

The work of teachers is not easy. Teachers are, in the every day life of school, confronted by a diversity of students whose learning and welfare to a great extent are determined by the way teachers personally and professionally are able to ‘read’ the classroom, and the student identities within it. They are expected to manage diversity, act promptly in a variety of situations and must be able to solve a variety of conflict. (Arnesen, 2000:157)

Arnesen’s assertion that “the work of teachers is not easy” becomes even more evident when placed within the context of the different cultural, ethnic, linguistic and religious groups which make up the European Union and which provides the background upon which most European teachers work. It has been pointed out that educators now work with students who probably come from widely diverse cultural backgrounds, sometimes teaching in classrooms where there are more than twenty home languages (Gay, 2003; Brown & Davis, 2004). How teachers manage this diversity will have a direct influence upon the future citizens on a local, national and international level. As Arnesen has rightly claimed, the responsibilities teachers face
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daily are daunting, especially when one pauses to reflect upon the fact that the act of teaching is

...part of the process of socialisation. Socialisation includes guidance and taking care of the individual, and having expectations of their behaviour using the formative influence of relationships (Minarovicova et al. 2004:8)

Unfortunately, many times teachers must face these responsibilities without the appropriate resources and experience, in both the professional and emotional sense (Lewis 1999, Villanueva & Gonzalo 2003) and this may influence their expectations of and attitudes towards their students (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Woods, 1996).

The fact that teachers take part in the socialisation of their pupils, combined with the fact that their classrooms are often the nexus of many different cultures means that teachers must not only be competent in their field or specialization, they must also have what Alfred, Byram and Fleming (2003) have called “intercultural competence”. Intercultural competence can be understood as the necessary skills and attitudes to suspend one’s own beliefs about cultures (both own and other) while learning about general processes of societal and individual interaction in familiar and unfamiliar cultures. Alfred et al. have called this “critical cultural awareness”. They emphasise the need to be able to critically evaluate practices and products in one’s own culture as well as other cultures and countries. With these definitions in mind, this article will describe an international teacher training project aimed at promoting the project participants’ level of “critical cultural awareness”. A brief outline of the project will be provided, along with a discussion of how intercultural awareness is closely linked to the teaching of citizenship. Results stemming from the pilot project and how the project influenced participants’ intercultural competence as well as critical awareness of aspects of citizenship education will be examined.

Intercultural competence and citizenship education

The project, called Argonauts of Europe [1], was funded by the European Union with a Socrates-Comenius grant and ran from 2002-2005. The project aimed to help student teachers see how cultural beliefs are manifested in social practices, and how these beliefs may be perceived, constructed and negotiated in schools. The student teachers were also shown how to explore the ways in which these processes operate, and how all of these factors are linked to wider social and institutional relationships as a means to exploring what citizenship means to them. As a result of their personal and professional exploration, it was expected that the student teachers would become more critically aware of their general beliefs, increase their intercultural competence and learn ways to transmit this to their students so that they might be contribute to their students’ understanding of the values of European and global citizenship.

If intercultural competence is understood as the skills to be able to deal constructively with questions arising from cultural diversity, then the development of such skills will enable to the teacher to not only constructively deal with diversity, but also allow them to find approaches to teaching issues which have to do with diversity in society as a whole. Ideally, intercultural competence will help create a body of students who are informed and critically aware. Michael Byram (2003) has argued that “It is the role any teacher should have of developing in people a
willingness and an ability to be critical, critical in the proper sense - not to be negatively critical, but to be analytically critical, and to be reflective and think about their lives.”

Importantly, in the Argonaut project, the teacher trainees’ period of theoretical study about intercultural competencies was embedded within empirical practice teaching carried out in a country different from their own. In this way, the project was able to promote intercultural communication practice and reflection and help these teacher trainees prepare for teaching education for European citizenship, based on personally constructed knowledge and personal experience. The project’s principal focus was on combining theoretical work, self-reflection and full immersion in a different culture. This helped the student teachers reach a heightened awareness of the underlying values associated with particular beliefs they held about teaching (and learning), especially when dealing with diversity. As Barrow (1991) has demonstrated, when teachers’ beliefs are personalized through critical reflection, these beliefs can change, and the teacher can construct new understandings of his or her role in the entire teaching process.

Just as the capacity for critical reflection is necessary for intercultural competence, it is also a key element for responsible citizenship. According to the Council of Europe (2000), education for democratic citizenship must prepare men and women to play an active part in public life and to shape in a responsible way their own destiny and that of their society. In order for people to live in a multicultural society knowledgeably, sensibly, tolerantly and responsibly, they must practice critical cultural awareness of one’s own and others’ practices and values. In brief, citizenship education underlines active engagement in public life; intercultural skills for living in a multicultural society; and a commitment to social cohesion and solidarity. Inevitably, to achieve quality education for citizenship, teacher training should provide resources for achieving those goals. The pilot project outlined here was an endeavour to move in that direction.

Theoretical background of the project

Abt-Perkins and Gomez (1993) have suggested that teaching about cultural values must begin with self-inquiry. Teachers must first examine their fundamental values, attitudes, and belief systems and how this relates to their teaching in order to fully understand the impact of their role in their students’ socialisation. Indeed, there are numerous studies which demonstrate that giving teachers the opportunity to reflect on both their teaching roles as well as their teaching practices can help bring about permanent change (Beyer, 1984; Buchmann, 1984; Bullough, 1989; Clift, Houston, & Pugach, 1990; Feiman-Nemser & Flooden, 1986; Smyth, 1989; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984). Teachers’ styles and attitudes are rooted in experience and are developed through interactions (action/reaction) within this experience; these attitudes will gradually become well established within each individual. This implies that each person’s attitudes can be modified only by him or herself. Inevitably, this will occur only when he/she becomes aware of the fact that new postures would lead to improved practices for dealing with the surrounding world (in this case, the classroom) and is challenged to undergo an examination of his or her underlying value system.

But what exactly is meant by a teacher’s underlying value system? Goodman’s term of teacher “perspectives” (1988) can be useful here. In his study on pre-service teachers, Goodman noted that different students might express similar beliefs about teaching, yet the image associated with the expressions of their beliefs differed,
indicating that “beliefs” are not observable. According to Goodman, pre-service teachers held guiding images from past events which created intuitive screens. These screens provide a base for their underlying value system and will serve as filters for new information. By profiling teachers as knowing, meaning-making beings, it stands to follow that their “perspectives” will serve as a reflective, socially defined interpretation of experience that serves “as a basis for subsequent action … a combination of beliefs, intentions, interpretations, and behaviour that interact continually” (Clark & Peterson, 1986:287).

Therefore, the principal aims of the project consisted of creating a theoretical and empirical educational programme that helped teacher trainees develop capacities and tools for a critical understanding of their perspectives and to allow them to critically observe their underlying value system or “screens” which guided their actions and reactions within the classroom. Of course, these aims are hardly new to educational programmes. As early as 1981, Trim stated that “personal and social development of the individual, capacity for co-operation and critical thinking, tolerance and understanding” should be included as goals for any educational curriculum.

What makes the pilot project described here unique is the fact that the programme developed an approach wherein teachers were encouraged to consider their own perspectives and conceptualisations of what they were teaching and who they were teaching within an international and empirical context. Research has shown that theoretical classes make little difference because both pre-service and in-service teachers are more likely to accept theoretical assertions only when it accords with their own perspectives (Dooly, 2005a.) It has also been shown that with more theoretical information, combined with empirical opportunities to reflect upon the way in which they categorize “diversity”, teacher trainees are more apt to innovate their way of thinking about diversity.

Thus, the project placed special emphasis on case studies which could be comparatively analysed by the trainees within an intercultural environment, combined with in-class observation, and reflective journals. All of this was carried out inside a framework of personal experience abroad. A report by UNESCO (1998) points out that quality in education depends on a multi-dimensional concept and mentions the importance of team work in intercultural contexts. Indubitably, the issue of teaching and acquiring intercultural competence is becoming a major concern in teacher education (Leeman & Ledoux, 2003), while at the same time, education for citizenship is becoming a major point of interest for primary and secondary schools. The aim of the project was to bring about what one might call ‘interculturalized education’, meaning that the student teachers achieved heightened critical understanding of connections among each educator’s self, school, home, and culture, and the world, thus helping them become better prepared to teach children about the world in which they will become citizens, at local, national and international levels.

Project outline

The pilot project was addressed to undergraduate student teachers from 8 different European countries. It was carried out during an intensive 8 week course wherein the teacher trainees were placed in primary schools outside of their own countries during 2 months, thus constructing multicultural working groups of approximately 10 student teachers in each country. This ensured that each group shared life experiences, academic work and school practice with people from different countries and cultures. These intensive courses were held twice during the
3 year project in all of the partner countries and involved a total of approximately 20 students per partner. As the project was developed in 8 different universities at the same time, the total amount of students involved was around 160.

The participants’ course work was carried out in a blended learning environment which included a web based learning platform and experiential learning based on praxis. The course had four main pillars:

1) A blended learning course using case studies which students had to analyse, discuss and ‘resolve’ through group discussion. Some of these cases were related to the school environments of the students themselves and were used to promote individual and group reflection about different issues dealing with citizenship and teaching. Students had to do follow-up work in an e-portfolio.

2) A teaching period of 100 hours in a primary school in the host country.

3) A workshop on planning and management of trans-national projects designed to make the students aware of different European Union educational programmes, especially projects which dealt with teaching European citizenship.

4) An introductory course about the host country (developed locally in each partner country). This course focused on introducing the main social and cultural features of the host country, especially those addressed to help overcome stereotypes or misconceptions.

Results of the project

Proving the value of experience abroad is challenging to quantify although some methods of collecting data to measure intercultural competence and learning have been developed. Lukinsky (1990) has used personal diaries to measure intercultural competency while Dominice (1990) employed the use of a ‘self-report’ form. In a similar vein, Jacobson, et al (1999) and Ingulsrud, et al (2002) used a portfolio to measure intercultural competence. In the end, it was decided to combine individual artefacts (reflective journals), student e-portfolios and survey questionnaires as data-gathering tools. This produced both descriptive analysis as well as summative results of the impact of the project.

The questionnaire contained 12 open-ended questions. Everyone involved in the project was invited to fill in the questionnaire by downloading it from the project’s website and then to send them to the project evaluator before 30 April 2005. Eighty-six people responded to the questionnaires, which is slightly more than half the total participants in the project. Of the trainees who answered the questionnaires, only four had finished their studies at the time of the survey. The questions for the teacher trainees were the following:

- What is the most important thing you have learnt during the course?
- What is the most important thing you have learnt about managing a school project (international) during your school practice?
- What kind of projects did you come in contact with during your school practice?
- What have you learnt about applying for a trans-national project?
- What have you learnt about running a trans-national project?
- In what way has the course inspired you to be involved in a trans-national project in the future?
- To what extent do you think this course has had an influence on you as a future teacher?
- What kind of skills does an international teacher need?
- What kind of knowledge does an international teacher need?
- What kind of attitude does an international teacher need?
What is needed to teach about world citizenship?

What more do you want to add?

The most common answer for question 1 was intercultural awareness. 93% mentioned intercultural awareness as the most important thing they have learnt from the course. One third of the respondents mentioned the importance of being open, patient, tolerant and accepting during discussions in a multicultural group. It can be assumed that the teacher trainees were referring to their own experience of discussion groups to resolve the “critical incident” cases during the course. Nonetheless, despite the overall acknowledgement of the importance of intercultural awareness, only a few of them (6) mentioned the importance of transmitting this knowledge to their future pupils, so it may be inferred that they were thinking more about their own intercultural awareness for teaching and not how these skills and knowledge might be transferred to their students in the future.

When the participants discussed the knowledge they have learnt from designing and implementing an international school project (questions 2, 3, 4 and 5) the most common answers referred to the importance of good planning, clear goals and motivating students. Several of them (38%) mentioned that teachers have a responsibility, through such projects, to sensitise their students to the dilemmas and circumstances concerning the world they will be citizens of. These answers resemble the aims of Citizenship Education for preparing people to live in a multicultural society so they live with diversity knowledgeably, sensibly, and with mutual understanding and solidarity (Council of Europe, 2000).

Questions six and seven dealt with the perceptions the student teachers had about the usefulness of such skills and whether they would be inclined to use them in the future. In answer to number six, 100% of the respondents indicated that they would indeed like to be involved in trans-national projects in the future. The course had given them ideas, contacts with future partners, along with the enthusiasm and courage to carry out such projects. Significantly, in their answers to this question, 27% of them mentioned the importance this would have for their future students by exposing them to different cultures and languages and helping the students construct their own models of their society.

The trainees’ line of reasoning – that their students will learn to be critically aware of different models of society is in line with Starkey’s (2003) summary of intercultural competencies. In it, he mentioned the readiness to relativize one's own values, beliefs and behaviours and appreciate how others might perceive and interpret them as well as the knowledge of communities and their cultures, both in the learner's own society and in other societies. These intercultural competencies are transferable to the knowledge and attitudes involved in the concept of “citizenship” – knowledge and understanding which allows an individual to participate and play an effective, informed role in society at all levels – locally, nationally and internationally.

Ninety-seven percent of the respondents stated that the experience itself had had a great impact on them. Some of them mentioned that they would now be more willing to work in another country, others said that they would definitely become involved in trans-national projects and some of them mentioned becoming involved in international work in their own countries, e.g. working in schools with immigrant pupils or becoming more involved in teaching citizenship education. This is important to the final evaluation of the project, since many of the teacher trainees came from countries where citizenship education is not an explicit part of the school curriculum and therefore some of them were not even aware of the subject before the project began.
As far as skills, knowledge and attitudes necessary for an international teacher, the majority of the respondents mentioned communication as the most important skill (85%), knowledge of different cultures (91%) and open-mindedness was indicated by 94% of the trainees as the most important attitude for an international teacher. These are comparable answers to most definitions of intercultural competence. Significantly, the participants described an interculturally competent person as someone who shows affective, behavioural, and cognitive skills and knowledge to work alongside people from different backgrounds. This involves developing attitudes and ways of behaving which reflect flexibility and openness when dealing with others. These are some of the same values mentioned by Cogan and Derricott (2001) when they define the characteristics of effective citizens in the 21st century.

In regards to question 12 concerning world citizenship, the answers resembled the answers given for question 10. Knowledge of different cultures was indicated by all the respondents (100%) and open-mindedness was also signalled as important for teaching world citizenship (93%). One respondent stated that “for me, intercultural competencies are key for both the teacher and his students because they will know to develop themselves (sic) in a multicultural world”. One student remarked that there is a need for a raised awareness of school administration before education for citizenship can be aptly taught, indicating that the participant was aware of the restraints all teachers must face when trying to introduce new concepts to a school.

Kubow, Grossman and Ninomiya (1998) have suggested that there is an urgent need for a new educational framework to help face the many current challenges being faced by the world population. They suggest this might begin with the development of a "multidimensional citizenship" which acknowledges that “in an increasingly interconnected world where the issues affecting people’s lives are global and, hence cross-cultural in nature, the concept of citizenship becomes more complex” (116). Nonetheless, it is far from common that such a broad, interdisciplinary and international understanding of citizenship education is found in a national curriculum. The fact that one of the students was aware of such limitations by stating that the school must allow him to incorporate wider perspectives demonstrates that the student is aware of the limitations educators still face when they engage in teaching citizenship.

There is a pervasive vagueness about the goals of both citizenship education and globalisation which can be found in many school curriculum. How “global citizenship” is defined and implemented within school curriculum often varies (Reynolds, 1999) and does not usually make any reference to the problematic nature of the concepts of “citizenship” or “globalisation”. Similar vagueness about the concept was reflected in other participants’ answers to question 12. Fifty-four percent indicated that they were uncertain about what was needed to teach world citizenship; part of those stated that they felt that since globalisation was inevitable then education must be about facing those “consequences” or challenges. This resembles Zygmunt Bauman’s (in Smith, 1999) argument that most people feel they have little choice in the matter; indeed Smith has argued that local citizens are caught in the processes of globalisation, without any personal choice. This feeling of impotence may lead to disengagement and political inactivity. Arguably, a certain ambiguity between citizenship education on a local level and on a global level is detectable in the answers by the participants. The student teachers’ responses to the need for intercultural competencies was quite homogeneous – they all saw a need for understanding diversity in order to be able to react efficiently within a diverse classroom and many saw the benefits of international cooperation for educational
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purposes; on the other hand, specific reasons for teaching world citizenship were missing in the answers for question 12. This may be due to a ‘taken-for-grantedness’ conceptualisation of children’s apparent entry into global citizenship (their facile access to global news, media, entertainment is evident) while local challenges are seemingly much more real.

At the same time, it can be argued that aims of teaching world citizenship should be understanding conflict and conflict resolution brought about by the globalisation as well as a deeper understanding of human rights and responsibilities in circumstances affected by globalisation. This can be carried out by encouraging students to question values, both locally and in different parts of the world. Several of the answers to question 12 were focused on the practicalities of teaching world citizenship such as the need for international exchanges between students and the use of new technologies to build a sense of global community (37%). By indicating that they now saw a need for cross-cultural teaching through the very tools offered by globalisation indicates far-reaching notions for citizenship education. The students did not see it as a localised, notion to be ‘consumed’ and then forgotten, world citizenship education requires looking beyond the school and community boundaries and looking towards partnerships around the world. Ideally, these ideas of global partnership could serve as a teaching resource for exploring global economic, political, social and cultural ‘interconnectivity’. This, in turn, is another resource for exploring conflict and conflict resolution brought about by the very ‘interconnectivity’ they are able to enjoy and which is a fruit of globalisation. And inevitably, these apparent contradictions of globalisation can best be examined by teachers and students who have critical cultural awareness.

Discussion of some aspects from the qualitative analysis

Qualitative analysis of the artefacts such as journals and portfolios indicated parallel results to the questionnaire responses. The qualitative data compiled for this research consisted of audio-recordings of the group discussions (which were then transcribed) and student journals and portfolios. Significantly, at the beginning of the two-month period, most of the students indicated that they felt that dealing with diversity in the classroom was “difficult”.

Helen [2]: you have an ... if you have so many different languages and cultures you have to make a different structure in your classroom... it’s not like if you have only people from the from the same country same 
Lori: yeah
{/...}
Maud: what’s the first impressions if you come into a class and these children are sitting there? what do you think is your first impression? (pointing to pictures of school children whose physical appearance is quite varied in physical features and clothing).
Cindy: difficult
Julie: difficult (Group workshop, 4 March 2004)

This association between what has been interpreted as a classroom with a high level of immigrants (stated earlier on in the dialogue) and problems and difficulties in that particular classroom is directly related to notions the student teachers already held about diversity in the classroom (Dooly, 2005b). Arguably, these perspectives are constructed through exposure to professional discourse in teacher education, in
statistics, and the media. (For a more in depth study of the socially structured character of ideology through discourse, see Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Bourdieu, 1982; Heller, 1995; Verschueren, 1995a; Verschueren, 1995b; Woolard, 1985). This social discourse of immigration discourse, according to Pihl (1998) provides teachers with their language to describe ethnic and cultural relationships in society, and inevitably within the classroom. The link that is created between “different” or “diversity”, and potential for “problems” and “difficulties” is based on numerous reports on “problems” that schools have with immigrants. And as van Dijk has argued, the media has only helped exacerbate that apparent link (1993).

In other words, the teacher trainees’ perspectives and frames of reference which came from both personal experience and their professional training (policy documents, teacher handbooks, media) helped create the conceptual lens through which they perceived the school “reality”. This is evidenced by what another dialogue pair discusses below. These two girls go from an hypothesis of what might happen inside the culturally diverse classroom to real events in their own lives.

Sandra: it is quite difficult [they are] allowed to use hats inside the classroom or scarves or anything like that I mean ... a girl from another culture comes there and then the teacher... because it’s their culture I think
Marga: mm
Sandra: ...she is allowed to use a scarf so you have to explain it to the other children because you can’t force her to be like others, her own culture so it’s not an easy thing to do it’s very difficult because then of course the other children ... but I think it’s very good for the children; they know about the different cultures and what people are in a... that they are all different (Group workshop, 4 March, 2004)

Their first journal entries (during week 1 of their intensive practice) also indicated that the teacher trainees began the eight week period with stereotypes of the countries and cultures where they would be teaching, based on previously constructed perceptions which they held before arriving to that country.

...I think that the people in Spain are more relaxed than the people in the Netherlands and that is cultural. I think. Because in the Netherlands it is very important to have a good job and earn a lot of money for lot of people. In the Netherlands people are always in time, and they don’t like it when people are coming too late. (Karina, Czech Republic, 15 February 2004)

However, during the time spent in the eight-week empirical course, the participants began to recognise the need to re-think certain attitudes and perspectives.

So don’t ever give up before really experiencing things. And try to avoid stereotyping, because we are all anyway different from each other even inside the cultures. In my practise I found many similarities and also differences, but in the end I think that we even shouldn’t be that similar, because what would be there then to learn from each others. It would be much more boring if all the colours would be gone. (Sandra, Finland, 18 March 2004)
The next extract nicely exemplifies the growing awareness of the participants after weekly personal journals, case studies, teaching practice, journal entries and face-to-face group discussions. The entry highlights the way in which the participant gradually became more aware of her own tendency “to generalise” about cultural and social aspects.

I can see that the first time you said don’t generalise I thought yes easy to say but hard to be aware of. The second time I thought again is everybody generalizing? Than later on we where talking and Linda said don’t generalize. I thought mmmm.. And the last discussion I heard myself saying Don’t generalise please!! So one thing I learned for sure is Don’t generalise please! (Carol Anne, Netherlands, 5 April 2004)

The teacher trainees also realised the need for teaching their students about the world beyond their local environment. One trainee was quite shocked by the lack of general knowledge of her students about anything beyond their village (Sabadell, Spain).

Together with the project I was using a map of Europe, to show exactly where the countries are, what are the capitals and what are the names in English. The pupils didn’t even know the names of the continents, so I used the globe as well and tried to explain that Iraq and Iran, for example, are not part of Europe but of Asia. Some of them also go to Tunisia or Morocco on holidays but they think they are still in Europe. Also to distinguish between continent, country and city was quite difficult for them sometimes. The best answer to the question: “What is the capital of Spain?” was: “Sabadell!” (Lucille, Czech Republic, 13 March 2004)

This same teacher trainee soon discovered a teaching strategy of finding similarities between cultures to make the students understand that people were not so different, after all.

When I told one of the English teachers that we have a legendary dragon in Brno, she asked me to tell the story in English … and we talked with the children not only about this legend but also about other customs, such as upcoming Easter. We also found out that this legend is similar to the one of Sant Jordi here in Catalonia…. (Lucille, Czech Republic, 28 March 2004)

Perhaps one of the most important discoveries the teacher trainees made is the fact that diversity in the classroom means more resources for both the teacher and the students. By the end of the eight week intensive practice teaching, the participants had moved from the idea that diversity means difficulties in the classroom, to the concept of diversity as an enriching factor for everyone involved.

Terry: yeah and also it’s good because I think they all have a different background so it’s a richness for the teacher and the pupils also that have so many kinds of cultures and things like...
Lucille: so they can learn from each other about the others’ culture
Terry: mm
Lucille: so if you can come to the class and say ok today Maria is the
most important child and she will talk about her country and habits
and Rashid about a different country and then it could motivate other
pupils... (Group workshop, 14 April 2004)

Conclusion

As future teachers, these trainees have acknowledged their own stereotyping
prevalent in their value systems, faced up to those tendencies and moved beyond
them to devise teaching strategies based on increasing their students’ awareness and
understanding of the world they live in. Intercultural competence requires being able
to relativize one’s own beliefs, and ideologies, just as the teacher trainees have done.
They have also demonstrated the capacity to provide benchmarks for their own
students to help them learn how to make evaluative judgements based on explicit
criteria which can come from exploring global situations. The goals of both
intercultural competence and education for citizenship require the ability to examine
beliefs and behaviours about social identities, to be sensitive to different identities
and values and to be able to interact effectively with people of diverse social and
cultural groups. With those goals in mind, the teacher trainees in this project provide
positive examples of both future citizens and future educators of citizens.

Essentialist notions about cultures and identity are largely created through many
different sources of knowledge and information, and often provide a basis for
teachers to define and interpret ‘classroom reality’. There are different available
models for explanations of reality which not only influence teachers, but also the
students they are teaching. By highlighting how these personal and professional
discourses combine to create ‘common-sense-notions’ (Gee, 1990), the future
teachers who participated in this project were allowed to see how these notions are
embedded in their understanding of ‘classroom reality’ and in their understanding
of the world they live in. The participants in the project examined their fundamental
values, attitudes, and belief systems in order to fully understand the impact their
teaching role had in the students’ socialisation.

Arguably, by carrying out this reflection within an international context, this has
in turn led to an increase in the participants’ cultural critical awareness (Alfred, et
al., 2003) and encouraging an on-going transformative process of the participants’
internal mental system. It stands to reason that, as future educators, they can and will
prepare their own students to become interculturally competent global citizens. This
same optimism is echoed by a student teacher’s final journal entry:

At the end of the day, the children are the same everywhere – just as we
adults are under all this cultural cover we have... But the children
have not built the fence or cover yet (...) The children are less
prejudiced than adults, and I think if this is enhanced, they will remain
open-minded and interested throughout their lives. Children are our
future European – and Global – citizens! (Jana, Finland, 15 April,
2004)
Integrating intercultural ... A pilot project

Correspondence: MELINDA DOOLY, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Facultat de Ciències de l’Educació, G5-108 Campus Bellaterra, 08193, Cerdanyola del Vallès, Barcelona Spain.

NOTES

[1] The project (ARGONAUTS of EUROPE) was addressed to future school teachers and was coordinated by the Hogeschool van Educatie in Utrecht (NL). The Pedagogische Akademie des Bundes in Vienna (AT), the Masaryk University in Brno (CZ), the Universities of Linköping and Karlstad in Sweden and the Teachers Training College in Szczytno (PO) and Facultat de Ciències de l’Educació, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona were the associated members.

[2] Names of the participants have been changed
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Enhancing the Development of Teacher-Citizens in the United States through Liberal Education and Service Learning: A Case Study

ROBERT L. OSGOOD, Indiana University School of Education

ABSTRACT This article examines how an undergraduate teacher education programme in a public American university has incorporated the concepts and content of a strong liberal arts education and of service-learning in order to enhance its academic rigour and provide students with more authentic, community-based experiences that will prepare them more effectively for the profession of teaching. The article describes the rationale and structure of this programme and discusses certain challenges that its development and implementation have encountered.

Introduction

The preparation of highly skilled and dedicated teachers constitutes a fundamental priority of educational policy in the United States. Substantial research has clearly demonstrated that both an interdisciplinary approach to the acquisition of content knowledge in the liberal arts and the infusion of service-learning as well as citizenship development opportunities in teacher education can contribute significantly to the more effective training of fully qualified professional educators. In light of this, the Indiana University School of Education and University College at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) have collaborated to develop an integrated programme that provides horizontal (across courses) as well as vertical (over several years) articulation of interdisciplinary liberal arts study, service learning, and citizenship education for pre-service teachers.

Briefly, students in this programme begin their first semester as members of a themed learning community, taking courses together in academic subjects of interest; these courses are purposefully linked with an introductory course on the teaching profession and with a first-year seminar on college success. The themed learning community also provides extensive involvement in a service-learning experience designed to foster student understanding of the powerful connections between schools and communities and promote opportunities for students to put academic knowledge to practical use through civic engagement. Interdisciplinary study and service learning experiences then remain constant elements of the formal teacher education programme operated by the School of Education, consisting of the last four semesters of a student’s undergraduate work, including student teaching. The programme’s ultimate purpose is to develop teachers who learn to integrate academic study, value service to the community, appreciate and make use of a true...
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liberal education, and demonstrate an authentic understanding of the requirements, realities, and opportunities of teaching.

Effective structuring or restructuring of any aspect of teacher education is important work, and examination of all aspects of such endeavours—from planning to assessment—merits attention and interest. This paper thus describes the planning involved in preparing a carefully developed, unique approach to teacher education, one that is grounded in current research and incorporates interdisciplinary study within the liberal arts and service learning as key components of successful teacher education. Of course, planning such a comprehensive endeavour requires a variety of intensive activities: thorough review of the professional and scholarly literature; constant collaboration and honest communication among all parties; shaping and reshaping a vision of desired outcomes; and no little amount of speculation, uncertainty, and cautious optimism. Nevertheless, our conviction that quality teaching requires civically engaged professionals well versed in the liberal arts—and in the critical inquiry skills so central to its effective implementation—compels us to aim higher and further in integrating liberal and professional education for future teachers.

Context

The Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI in Indianapolis offers a teacher education programme that prepares education professionals for positions in preschool, elementary, and secondary schools. The School mostly enrols students of junior and senior standing after they have fulfilled certain course work and procedural requirements. The programme is standards-based, meaning that the curriculum is geared towards the professional standards set for beginning teachers by the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB). The programme is also field-intensive: students enrolled in Education courses spend a considerable amount of time from the first day on working with teachers and children in public school classrooms as part of their course requirements. As an urban university set in the heart of Indianapolis, the School has a strong urban mission, one dedicated to collaborating with and improving the city’s schools and enhancing the educational opportunities of the city’s racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse children.

Further shaping the School’s teacher education programme is a commitment to addressing its Principles of Teacher Education. These principles, closely linked to IUPUI’s Principles of Undergraduate Learning, consist of a set of 6 detailed statements clarifying the School’s mission as manifested in course content, professional development, personal growth, multicultural awareness, and social change. These principles include conceptual understanding of core knowledge; reflective practice; teaching for understanding; passion for learning; understanding school in context of society and culture; and professionalism. The programme’s curriculum emphasizes constructivist teaching practices and recognizes the fundamental importance of achieving social justice through social transformation on personal, community, and institutional levels.

Rationale

The rationale for emphasizing interdisciplinary study and service learning in this programme emerges from an extensive body of scholarship. That interdisciplinary study constitutes a powerful and effective approach to content mastery and effective application of knowledge has been understood at least since the writings of the
eminent American philosopher John Dewey. Written more than a century ago, Dewey’s *The School and Society/The Child and the Curriculum* (Dewey, 1990) discusses extensively the cost and ‘waste’ of fragmenting and compartmentalizing knowledge, an all-too-common practice at all levels of schooling. By facilitating students’ ability to connect their studies in meaningful ways, interdisciplinary study allows students to understand liberal arts content in its crucial relations with other kinds of knowledge while enhancing students’ skills in applying that knowledge in real-world situations that demand effective integration of skills and information. In teacher preparation the ability of students to see how different subject areas can be fused with others (in programmes such as *Writing Across the Curriculum*)—and how a broad-based interdisciplinary education enhances critical thinking and reflection—is an important part of their learning how best to teach certain subjects and invest those subjects with value and meaning for students. Moreover, the opportunity for students to connect different academic disciplines with their study of education—in itself one of the most multidisciplinary of the social science disciplines—allows them to see the multifaceted nature of both the teaching profession and the relation of schools to society. Most service learning advocates and practitioners value highly not only interdisciplinary academic course work but also the need for well-rounded, thoughtful, critical individuals; a liberal arts education grounded in the humanities arts, and sciences, it is believed, promises the most effective means to that end. (The goal of ‘transfer’—that is, the ability for students to employ perspectives and skills learned in one course to a variety of others—is thus a key feature of IUPUI’s themed learning communities.) These complex understandings are imperative if a student is to gain an authentic understanding of the purposes and practices of teaching (Dewey, 1990; Tharp et al, 2000; Malnairch and Lardner, 2003; Goodlad, 1990).

Research supporting the positive impact of service learning on classroom learning, interpersonal skills, and enhancement of civic awareness and social responsibility has been emerging steadily over recent years. At the collegiate level, service learning has been shown to improve students’ understanding of course content in a wide range of disciplines, assist in the development of dispositions conducive to staying in college, develop stronger self-esteem and personal satisfaction, and inculcate a greater sense of civic and social responsibility. Service learning has been especially effective in teacher education, where experiential learning and a positive, authentic view of the community are particularly important; in particular, social studies education has been cited as a key opportunity for teaching about service learning. In addition, the growth of service learning as a teaching strategy and as a curriculum in schools for young people from kindergarten through to grade 12 underscores the need to prepare future teachers at all levels to know about service learning and how to use it effectively in their classrooms. Moreover, service learning activities ensure multiple opportunities to apply liberal arts content and inquiry skills to a variety of real-world contexts (Root, Callahan and Sepanski, 2002; Perrone, 2001; Moore and Sandholtz, 1999; Myers and Pickeral, 1997; Wade, 1997; Maryland Service Learning Alliance, 1995; Shumer, 1997).

The potent combination of a professional preparation grounded in liberal arts and civic engagement is crucial to the vital issue of situating a strong emphasis on the civic role of teachers in pre-service professional development. The historical role of teachers as powerful—and closely observed—role models and citizens in the United States continues to this day. It becomes even more important in light of the strong connections between student achievement and students’ lives outside of school: teachers in the United States play multiple roles in the jobs, and their awareness of
and sensitivity to conditions beyond the school has a strong impact on their ability to do their job effectively. An understanding of the importance of their knowledge of and engagement with the wider community thus assumes a critical position in their professional and personal lives. As knowledgeable agents in civic life, teachers need to appreciate their responsibilities to their fellow citizens and the public world beyond the schools (Giroux, 1988; Goodlad, 1990; Myers and Pickeral, 1997).

Programme Structure

To accomplish these ambitious goals, the School has identified both interdisciplinary study of the liberal arts and service learning as key elements in sound and effective pedagogy for preparing future teachers. Interdisciplinary learning for our students takes place early on as part of a themed learning community (TLC), and it is a core feature of our teacher preparation programme. A themed learning community assumes that a cohort of learners (in this case students, but may also include instructors) engaged in an intentional, structured, collective learning experience can enhance their knowledge and understanding of academic content through common learning activities and continuous discussion and interaction. The goal is to give all members of the community a shared basis for inquiry as well as knowledge acquisition and interpretation. Doing so, according to this idea, ensures a more powerful, lasting, and sophisticated learning experience for all participants. In these first year themed learning communities, students thus engage a range of content in the social and natural sciences that is carefully selected and presented in terms of information, assignments, and intellectual themes. Depending on the particular focus or model, other courses typically include an introductory writing course and one or two other introductory courses in appropriate academic disciplines. For example, one TLC consists of a writing course, a history course, and a biology course; another offers a course each in economics, logic, and psychology. The intention is for all the courses in a TLC to make use of the world of teachers and schools in discussing and explaining their particular content.

The freshman year, first-semester themed learning communities consist of various models, but all feature a course entitled Invitation to Teaching as well as a first-year seminar that introduces students to the academic and social cultures of university life. The School of Education established the TLCs for two reasons. First, it has learned from experience that a course introducing students to the teaching profession was essential in order to ensure that as many students as possible entered the formal upper-division programme with at least some understanding of the actual nature of teaching as well as with exposure to some of the philosophy and practices of the programme itself. Second, the themed learning communities allow students to develop constructive personal and professional relationships in the context of immersion in common academic study, thus developing a mutual support system that strengthens their opportunities for collaboration and experiential learning. This starts them on the lifelong road of seeing how a liberal education can benefit one’s personal and professional lives.

Invitation to Teaching serves as the cornerstone of education’s themed learning communities. The extent to which the instructors of the courses collaborate varies and is often dependent on the number of times the instructors have worked together in the past. Links can be as formal as common readings or assignments, or as informal as references to other courses in passing, or encouraging students to seek out connections on their own. The more intentional the instructors are about drawing direct connections, the more students are likely to understand and appreciate them.
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All courses purposefully create opportunities for students to apply course content to issues related to the profession and methods of teaching. *Invitation to Teaching* instructors serve as coordinators for their TLC.

A key feature of the entire TLC is the service learning experience required in the anchor education course. All students are required to fulfill a 12-hour service experience for the semester. Students work at sites arranged by the education faculty and include working at a neighborhood community centre, tutoring children from homeless families, or supporting students and teachers in a local school. The goal is to get students out into the community to see how the lives of school children—many of whom come from impoverished home situations and neighbourhoods—have a significant impact on their ability to succeed in school. Their experiences are supported by paid assistants who keep track of attendance and monitor each student’s progress.

Students typically enrol in a learning community during their first semester and do not begin the formal teacher education programme until their fifth. In the interim they enrol in various courses that the university requires as well as in a significant number of courses in various disciplines that are required or recommended by the School of Education for formal acceptance into its programme. After satisfactory completion of this course work, passing a standardized test (Praxis I), and filing the necessary paperwork, a student is formally accepted into the programme and begins her or his first semester in the ‘blocks’.

A ‘block’ refers to a set of semester-long courses; Block I refers to courses taken the first semester of the programme, Block II the second, and so on. The courses in the blocks differ somewhat for students preparing for early childhood, elementary, or secondary certification. Regardless of focus, each block consists of a set of courses that are closely articulated so that students once again experience the power and possibility of interdisciplinary study. These courses are usually integrated to a much greater extent than those in the themed learning communities: common field experiences, cross-course assignments, shared readings and journaling, and other mechanisms of collaboration are common. In all Block I sequences, material on educational psychology, multicultural education, and special education have essentially been fused into one course, *Diversity and Learning*, which is supported by extensive field experience. Courses in Blocks II consist of methods for teaching math, language arts, science, art, and music; Block II covers more language arts as well as adaptive instruction for special education. Instructors in these courses demonstrate how different subjects can be linked with each other and support each other in multiple ways. In the final year these methods courses are wrapped around the student teaching experiences in the elementary programme, so that course work and student teaching can play constructive roles in each others’ activities. The last semester’s work is grounded in a social studies methods course combined with a senior-level capstone seminar that critically examines history, philosophy, sociology, and other disciplines in their relation to education in order to develop thoughtful, competent, critically reflective citizen-teachers. Thus, horizontal and vertical manifestations of planning and integration constitute the underlying theme and structure of the entire teacher education programme at IUPUI and span the entire collegiate career of the students.

The planning process for developing and maintaining such integrated approaches to learning is as varied and problematic as it is complex. A campus-wide office for Themed Learning Communities schedules and coordinates initial scheduling and meetings for TLCs proposed by a School or department (in this case, the School of Education). Once the TLCs are built and scheduled, the TLC Office organizes a
series of meetings and two full-day retreats during the academic year. Planning includes review of assessment and evaluation data from the previous years’ TLCs; conversations with other TLC teams about best practices; and ample time to discuss the community as well as the nature and extent of collaboration and course integration. Less formal discussions also take place over email and telephone in addition to in person. A similar collaborative approach characterizes planning in the blocks, only it is organized within and supported by the School of Education. This process thus ensures sufficient structure for planning; however, given the extremely busy schedules of instructors from all over the university, attendance at such sessions is irregular at best, impeding the team’s ability to plan effectively.

Issues in Planning and Implementation

The teacher education programme at IUPUI has been built over many years of trial and error. Its present manifestation as described above, however, is quite new and is to a large extent a product of a deliberate and formal process of course and curriculum design, supported by grant funding and involving multiple levels of involvement on the part of faculty, students, administrators, and school professionals. The focus of this effort was the development of the Invitation to Teaching course, especially its role in the TLCs for first semester students, as well as its articulation with the formal “block” programmes. Since the planning process was and is by no means easy, the School implemented a few strategies to facilitate faculty work in this area. Evaluation data was provided that indicated more and less successful aspects of similar programmes; small stipends were granted to faculty to participate in this process; and the planning schedule was drawn up well in advance to ensure as much as possible that all involved would be available for the work.

In pursuing this development a number of issues, concerns, and opportunities arose that made the process more interesting and certainly more challenging in terms of integrating interdisciplinary liberal arts study in course work and in the service learning experience. Foremost among these issues was that of managing the successful and effective infusion of a challenging liberal arts curriculum as well as service learning into a programme that serves relatively inexperienced students. The students taking Invitation to Teaching are typically relatively quite young; most have graduated high school only three months earlier. These students require clear instruction, carefully organized activities and materials, multiple options for doing service learning, and a balance of structured independence and direction. Most will experience a significant degree of anxiety, uncertainty, and inexperience as they navigate the challenging waters of liberal arts education as well as effective service learning, and they must be supported in those efforts. Instructors also must assist students in sorting out the various outcomes of an experiential service learning activity, helping them distinguish among outcomes that speak to pre-professional opportunities in teaching and those necessary to the development of the civic consciousness that is key to authentic service learning.

Another problematic feature of this structure as it exists is found in the considerable gap in time between conclusion of the Invitation to Teaching course and the beginning of Block I for most students. One of the primary goals of the introductory course is to prepare students for the blocks, not only in content knowledge of education as a discipline and schools as a place of employment but also in gaining experience in the various expectations, practices, and dispositions necessary for successful work. With the considerable time gap between these two elements of the programme, there is significant concern that many of these efforts
may be unsustainable over time. Students preparing for the secondary education programme do get an additional introductory course entitled *American Culture and Education*, which is taken before entering the blocks and can serve as a bridge between the two other elements of the programme. For students in early childhood or elementary education, however, no such course exists. This is an issue that will demand close attention in assessment to see if the gap is having a negative effect on the impact of the introductory course’s ability to prepare students for study in the blocks. The option of offering the *Invitation to Teaching* course later in a student’s college career has some merit for this very reason, but it also defeats a major goal of the course: to identify very early students considering a career in teaching and set them on that road as quickly and as efficiently as possible. Even so, the opportunity for students to take courses in a wide variety of liberal arts disciplines assures that this time is well spent.

Still another issue demanding constant attention concerns the different values toward and levels of comfort with collaboration among the instructors. Both the themed learning communities and the blocks offer tremendous potential for collaborative interdisciplinary work, leading to potential near-seamlessness among courses and disciplinary content. While such an ideal is admirable, the levels to which the various instructional teams engage in effective collaboration vary widely. Since the thematic learning community is in its relative infancy, collaborative efforts therein have consisted mainly of conversations, shared syllabi and course schedules, and a commitment to explore potential areas for greater collaboration in the future. Although most instructors in the TLCs are willing to collaborate, the complicated geography and compartmentalization of lives in different academic disciplines in American higher education renders such collaboration problematic at best. Significant differences in the extent to which collaboration is valued, different needs and expectations of the various disciplinary courses, substantial differences in teaching practices and philosophy, and uncomfortable distinctions among faculty status and rank among all instructors impede collaborative efforts.

Finally, the ways in which the themed learning communities and the blocks contribute to student attitudes towards their studies, their instructors, and each other represent a fascinating and challenging aspect of this programme and others like it. As part of a themed learning community the students form a cohort, enrolling in the same courses and sharing service learning experiences while beginning to build a professional and social community of learners with similar interests. The cohort model continues as a signature characteristic of the blocks; by the time they graduate each cohort has been working and growing together professionally and personally for two years. The cohort approach generates an intensity and commitment rarely found among students who know each other only for a semester in a limited context. As a result, students for the most part take their studies and their responsibilities to each other very seriously, creating a genuine and potent bond. This model also allows for and encourages opportunities for students to engage in extended and ideally rigorous explorations of the connections between and among the various liberal arts and education as academic disciplines.

Such an approach, however, can also lead to a phenomenon known as hyperbonding, a situation that can have dramatic impact on several facets of any academic programme (Jaffee 2004). Students in such cohorts tend to be more vocal about their concerns and view the programme through the eyes of others as well as their own. Outcomes can—but not necessarily—include greater collective frustration with the programme, dissatisfaction with its content and results, a more persistent demand for greater ownership of the programme as students, and a more palpable
tension between a large number of students and one instructor. Certainly the benefits of the cohort approach—shared experiences and understandings, stronger sense of responsibility to each other and to their work, opportunities for greater appreciation of their studies and their work—need to be recognized. At any rate, such developments call attention to other possibilities that, however uncomfortable, may eventually lead to better programmes and greater satisfaction for all.

Given the high amount of uncertainty and speculation embedded in these early stages of this horizontally and vertically articulated programme, authentic assessment of all these potential outcomes is absolutely essential. The TLCs will undergo multiple assessment efforts from University College as well as from the School of Education, exploring such topics as student and instructor satisfaction, the extent of collaboration among courses and its effects on student learning, and the impact of the service learning experience on course work, career plans, citizenship education, and university-community relations. The block programme, which has been in existence for some time, employs various modes of assessment for similar outcomes. In addition, student satisfaction with the programme will be assessed both immediately after concluding the programme as well as one or two years after completion. Education professionals in schools that hire our graduates will also continue to be assessed as to their satisfaction with graduate performance. Such assessments will be directed by the School of Education, University College, and IUPUI’s Office for Institutional Research (IUPUI 2004).

Conclusion

As noted earlier, the teacher education programme at the IUPUI School of Education is undergoing constant revision. The development of the themed learning community, grounded firmly in liberal arts instruction and its deliberate articulation with the block programme in order to address some fundamental shortcomings and enhance some wonderful opportunities, represents a significant and ambitious step forward. Such fundamental change is always difficult and time-consuming, with unanticipated obstacles and opportunities arising with regularity. The inclusion of interdisciplinary study and service learning in the planning further complicates the process, due to their intensive demands on time, resources, and intellectual energy. But with a careful review of the relevant scholarship, a clear articulation of general goals and specific objectives, imaginative anticipation of complications, and especially open communication and collaboration among those involved, such sweeping efforts can be rewarded. Given the fundamental importance of preparing effective, civic-minded teachers and assuring their rigorous, expansive and intentionally integrative liberal education, it is always worth the effort.

Correspondence: ROBERT L. OSGOOD, Indiana University School of Education, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, 902 W. New York Street, Indianapolis, IN 46202-5155, USA
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Characterizations of Citizenship Education Pedagogy in Canada and England: Implications for Teacher Education

MARK EVANS, OISE, University of Toronto

ABSTRACT This study explored a sample of specialist secondary school teachers' characterizations of citizenship education pedagogy in Ontario, Canada and England. A qualitative orientation, with comparative overtones, underpinned the study. Empirical data were collected through a variety of research methods and sources in light of appropriate literatures. A case is made that this sample of teachers characterize citizenship education pedagogy in a variety of ways, reflective in very general terms of liberal/civic republican tendencies represented in contemporary conceptions of citizenship education. Further, it is argued that teachers’ characterizations tend to reveal both eclectic and distinctive tendencies that cut across various curriculum perspectives with two unique, and overlapping, orientations emerging across the sample. It is contended that these particular orientations privilege certain curricular learning goals while others are neglected (e.g. civic participation). Lastly, implications for teacher education are considered, signalling the need for a more sophisticated conceptualization of citizenship education pedagogy.

Introduction

This paper briefly documents a study that aimed to illuminate ways in which a sample of specialist secondary school teachers characterize citizenship education pedagogy in formal secondary school curriculum courses/programmes in Ontario, Canada and England and to consider implications for teacher education. Attention to this aspect of citizenship education was motivated largely by concerns raised by researchers about a general lack of empirical research on citizenship education pedagogy (Fogelman and Edwards 2000; Hébert and Sears, 2001; Hughes and Sears, 1996; Davies, 2000, 2003; Kerr, 2000, 2003; Kerr, Cleaver, Ireland and Blenkinsop, 2003; Sears, Clark, and Hughes, 1999) and a growing recognition among education researchers more broadly, that “what teachers know and do is one of the most important influences on what students learn” (Darling-Hammond 1998:6).

The central question that framed the study was: In what ways do specialist secondary school teachers characterize ‘educating for citizenship’ and why? Subsidiary questions focused on a range of themes including: learning goals, pedagogical practices and factors underpinning preferences for particular goals and practices.
Methodological Considerations

A qualitative orientation guided the study’s design and implementation. Canada and England were viewed as rich research contexts to inform and contribute to both the theoretical and practical aspects of citizenship education pedagogy given recent curriculum reform initiatives in this curricular area in both countries. Non-probability, purposive sampling was used. Specialist teachers were handpicked purposely on the basis of their perceived ability to provide the most valuable data, given the specific purposes of the study. There was no pretence to represent the wider population nor was the intent to generalize the findings beyond the sample in question.

Initially, a review of the literature was undertaken which provided a brief historical snapshot of shifting characterizations of what it has meant to educate for citizenship within the school curriculum in Canada and England throughout the twentieth century. Particular attention was given to conceptual perspectives, curriculum policy directions, and pedagogical practices in the different contexts. These were later used for explaining and analysing teachers’ characterizations of citizenship education pedagogy. Although studies that consider teachers’ characterizations of citizenship education pedagogy are rare in Canada and England, research into teachers’ pedagogical practices was also reviewed. In addition, more recent studies that focus on theoretical understandings of pedagogy were considered.

Data were collected through a variety of research methods and sources. Twenty-two specialist secondary school teachers from across England and twenty-two specialist secondary school teachers from Ontario, Canada were identified and invited to complete a postal self-completion questionnaire. Thirty-three were returned, seventeen from the Canadian teachers and sixteen from the English teachers. Six teachers were then selected from this broader sample for further investigation. Three were selected from schools in Canada (Ontario), and three from schools in England (Yorkshire). A minimum of five interviews and four classroom observations were undertaken with each of these selected teachers. Interviews were taped and transcribed. Observation notes were recorded. During visits to the schools, pertinent curriculum documents (e.g. teacher’s planning binders, school-based curriculum documents) were reviewed and notes were taken. Relevant contextual information, in which the research was conducted, was also considered.

Analysis of data focused primarily on the central question of the study. Particular attention was given to teachers’ characterizations of their learning goals, pedagogical practices, and factors that appeared to inform their characterizations. Characterizations were analysed in terms of the learning experiences provided, respective policy contexts, and broader theoretical curriculum perspectives. Attention was also given to a horizontal (across respondents’ responses) and vertical (within an individual respondent’s responses) analysis of the data.

Findings and discussion

Three main organising frameworks were used in order to present the findings and frame the discussion:

- characterizations of teachers’ learning goals and pedagogical practices across respondents’ responses;
- interpretations of specific pedagogical orientations exhibited by teachers in relation to varied curriculum perspectives; and
a consideration of factors relating to teachers’ preferred learning goals and pedagogical practices.

1) Characterizations of teachers’ learning goals

Questionnaire and interview data suggested that teachers’ preferred learning goals extended well beyond more traditional ‘Civics’ perspectives and were reflective of certain liberal/civic republican tendencies represented in many contemporary conceptions of citizenship education and of core learning strands expressed in related, official curricula in both countries. Data also revealed that teachers tend to talk about their preferred learning goals in four general areas: one, knowledge acquisition and being informed about civic issues; two, developing skills required of citizenship; three, exploring diverse beliefs, values, and notions of social justice; and four, becoming involved in civic life.

Teachers tended to agree that an emphasis on knowledge acquisition (e.g. an understanding of core concepts like rights and duties, civic involvement) and on being informed about issues related to civic life are central. Variations existed in relation to core concepts and/or public issues to be given priority, the time frame (historical and contemporary), contextual emphases (from the local to the global), and issues of depth and/or breadth. Respondents in the English group, for example, tended to put a slightly stronger emphasis on one’s duties and legal responsibilities rather than rights.

Teachers also viewed skill development as a central goal. Aspects of thinking, enquiry, and collaboration were identified as important skill areas to be nurtured. There was less emphasis on skill sets often associated with civic literacy (e.g. negotiating, mediating conflict). Variations existed in relation to skills to be given priority and emphasized (e.g. academic understanding, social critique). Canadian teachers tended to talk about a breadth of skills whereas teachers in the English sample, for instance, appeared to encourage a greater emphasis on depth of understanding of critical thinking skills.

Most teachers expressed support for the goals of exploring diverse beliefs and values underpinning civic decisions and actions and for introducing notions of social justice. Variations existed however in relation to the ‘values’ focus (e.g. value dilemmas, diverse cultural values), notions of justice (e.g. moral, legal), and perspectives of a ‘good’ citizen. Canadian teachers, for example, tended to emphasize a focus on beliefs and values related to a culturally diverse milieu whereas English teachers tended to direct more attention to other forms of diversity such as social class.

Teachers in this sample also viewed involvement in civic life as an important learning goal. Teachers tended to see the classrooms and schools as principal sites for practising participation although participating in civic life beyond the classroom was encouraged as well. Variations were apparent in relation to the nature and extent of involvement (e.g. service, political action), the purposes of involvement (learning about change through service, bringing about change through action), and the types of issues to be addressed (e.g. from the local to the global). Canadian respondents, like their English counterpart, tended to put a stronger emphasis on learning about participation through service learning. There were, however, a small number of Canadian respondents who tended to advocate a more activist intent. Interestingly, ‘voting’ as a form of political involvement, received little attention.
2) Characterizations of teachers’ pedagogical practices

Questionnaire, interview, and observational data suggested that teachers tend to express their preferred pedagogical practices through the ways in which they shape their classroom environments, use discrete and performance-based instructional practices, and approach assessment. Pedagogical practices either reported or observed, appeared to be expressed predominantly in the classroom context and there was little evidence of school-wide and/or community-based practices taking place. Ontario teachers tended to talk about educating for citizenship largely through the compulsory grade 10 Civics course or through its infusion in other parts of the History or Social Science curriculum whereas English respondents tended to talk about educating for citizenship through various subject areas as well, but mostly in Key Stage 3 History, Religious Education, and PSHE courses.

Shaping the classroom environment

 Preferred practices used to shape the classroom learning environment tended to take on the following forms: one, practices that nurtured conditions for student involvement and inclusion; two, the use of classroom space to facilitate an awareness of citizenship themes and issues; three, selective resource access and support; and four, teacher modelling democratic practices.

 Approximately one third of the Canadian respondents and about one half of the English teachers indicated nurturing conditions for student involvement and inclusion in the classroom. Activities included student input into classroom decisions and rules and expectations, seating plans that encouraged more open discussion, voting on certain issues, student choice on projects, and encouraging pupil voice through student school councils. English teachers, for example, discussed the classroom as a context to encourage multiple perspectives on different historical themes and issues and stressed the importance of teacher direction and authority. Canadian teachers, in contrast, tended to discuss opportunities for student input into such things as classroom rules and expectations.

 Approximately two-thirds of the teachers across the sample talked about how they used classroom space to nurture a sense of awareness of citizenship themes and issues. Comments from Canadian respondents ranged from using walls and ceilings to display students’ work, to highlighting current issues from magazines and daily newspapers on bulleted boards, to organising desks in particular ways to facilitate discussion. Teachers in the English sample discussed the use of classroom space to a lesser extent. Visits to their classrooms, however, revealed more attention to this practice than one might have anticipated from the questionnaire data.

 Data sources also revealed that most classroom environments included a range of newspapers, textbooks, magazine articles, and videos to support knowledge acquisition and skill development. Textbooks, in many cases, appeared to be used most often to underpin the course framework and to provide core information. Newspaper articles and videos, in particular, appeared to be viewed as important sources to complement texts, to provide information about contemporary issues, and to support skill development (e.g. reading for the main idea). It appeared that most resources were selected and organized by teachers for students. Community resources (e.g. political parties pamphlets, NGO literature, guest speakers) were identified as important sources of information by a small number of teachers and there was little mention of the use of ICT or CD ROMS. In instances where projects
were more student-directed, a wider use of community resources and Internet was apparent. Very few discussed the use of ‘non mainstream’ resource support.

**Instructional practices**

Teachers made use of an array of discrete and performance-based instructional practices when educating for citizenship. Discrete activities (e.g. a questioning sequence on rights and responsibilities, a mind map on the concept of democracy) were most evident and tended to focus on a specific learning goal. The use of more sophisticated performance-based strategies (e.g. radio interview on the concept of human rights, simulation of local government decision-making) was acknowledged by both Canadian and English teachers but evidence of these strategies was less noticeable in practice. There was a sense amongst the respondents that these types of practices, as pedagogical theorists have suggested (Bennett and Rolheiser, 2001; Joyce and Weil, 2000; Marzano, 1992; Wiggins and McTighe, 1998), would assist students to learn knowledge, skills, and beliefs and values in more integrated ways.

All teachers emphasized instructional practices that aimed at increasing student knowledge. Both groups outlined teacher-directed activities used to encourage content acquisition, conceptual understanding, and an awareness of current events. In most cases, information was largely transmitted from the teacher to the student through different mediums. Themes such as rights and responsibilities, democratic processes, forms of political participation, and current events were highlighted whereas themes often found in traditional Civics courses (e.g. structures of government, constitutional matters) were given less attention. Data revealed varying emphases amongst teachers in relation to concepts and/or issues forefronted, temporal and contextual considerations, and the relative importance of depth and/or breadth of understanding. The majority of teachers reported having students read ‘engaging’ excerpts from newspapers or view TV news for ‘pertinent content’. Many also referred to teacher-led ‘chalk-and-talk’ discussions. Only a few teachers discussed approaches that were more student-directed.

Teachers also identified and exhibited a number of instructional practices that encouraged the development of thinking and enquiry skills related to aspects of civic life. Again, rather discrete activities were identified to develop specific skills, or combinations of skills, respectively. Teachers also acknowledged using more complex instructional strategies such as enquiry-based research assignments or issue-based investigations to support not only the development of foundational knowledge but also the development of skills related to analysis and enquiry. Varying emphases, both across the sample and between national groupings, were again noted. Canadian teachers, for example, tended to put an emphasis on the use of cooperative learning structures to develop social skills whereas English teachers tended to put more of a focus on developing students’ thinking skills, suggesting a more academic emphasis.

Less than half of the teachers from either Canada or England reported using instructional practices used to encourage students to explore beliefs, values and/or notions of social justice underpinning civic decisions and actions. Teachers who did provide examples of practices in this area tended to highlight practices that they used to explore personal beliefs and values through historical and contemporary themes and issues. In most instances, variation was evident. Moral dilemmas, sample scenarios, cooperative learning structures, circle activity, and case studies reflected the eclectic range of practices used. Teaching practices identified amongst the Canadian respondents tended to infuse a considerable emphasis on cultural diversity
whereas English teachers tended to consider value dilemmas within a broader social context. Religious Education teachers, in the English sample, for example, discussed practices in this dimension much more than other teachers across the entire sample. In comments about notions of social justice some teachers highlighted moral codes while others talked more about legal codes (e.g. Charter of Rights). Observations of classes revealed even less attention to instructional practices that explored beliefs and values underpinning aspects of civic life or that nurtured understandings of social justice.

Most teachers reported using an assortment of instructional practices to nurture an ‘awareness’ of involvement in civic life and tended to view the classroom as the most important location for students to learn about and practice participation. Teachers tended to talk about strategies that allowed students to investigate and analyse ways in which citizens and groups participate in decision-making processes around current civic and historical issues and events. In practice, however, these types of strategies were significantly less prominent than those discrete activities and strategies used to emphasize knowledge acquisition and skill development. Actual involvement in civic affairs beyond the classroom, a key feature of citizenship education curricula in both contexts was even less evident. Teachers did not appear to be opposed to the business of establishing school-wide or community-based initiatives, but rather, when it gets to the implementation, certain goals appeared to be implicitly rejected by teachers because they were viewed as simply unmanageable in the current circumstances.

3) Approaches to assessment

Teachers articulated a preference for two main types of assessment in the questionnaire and interview data: paper-and-pencil short answer/essay answer and performance-based types of assessment. Teachers’ use of assessment practices tended to occur within the context of specific courses taught and their focus tended to reflect context-specific curriculum policy requirements. Paper-and-pencil short answer (e.g. multiple choice tests, fill-in-the-blank tests, true-false tests) and essay answer types (e.g. analytical paragraphs, short essays) of assessment were cited most often. Paper-and-pencil types of assessment were valued because they were perceived to be able to provide useful data about student learning in two central learning goal areas introduced earlier, the acquisition of knowledge and the development of skills. Analysis of the actual assessment practices used indeed revealed primary attention to knowledge and skills strands of learning, with much less attention to the beliefs, values, and notions of social justice and participation strands.

There appeared to be increasing attention to, and use of, performance-based types of assessment (e.g. criteria-based rating scales, assessment rubrics) to complement paper-and-pencil assessments, suggesting a growing attention to the more interactive and participatory learning goals. It was believed that these types of assessment could capture a broader range of learning goals in an integrated manner (e.g. participatory criteria in combination with other learning goal areas). There was limited attention to types of assessment that encouraged self-reflection or showed evidence of ongoing personal learning (e.g. self assessment, reflective journals, portfolios).
Interpretations of specific pedagogical orientations exhibited by teachers in relation to varied curriculum perspectives

“Curriculum is not a neutral document” (Ross, 2001:1). Curriculum theorists (Eisner, 1985; Miller and Seller, 1985, 1996; Ross, 2000; Wiles and Bondi, 1998) have stressed that particular curriculum perspectives privilege particular learning goals and may guide teachers’ choices of pedagogical goals and practices. Different schools of curriculum thought have revealed various orientations. For the purposes of this study, I selected three broad curriculum perspectives that closely align with Miller’s ‘transmission/transactional/transformational’ model (1996) to help provide a sense of context for analysing teachers’ pedagogical practices and the kinds of learning experiences that are given priority. Miller’s model was selected because of its integrated nature and its infusion of many of the central ideas offered by other curriculum theorists.

Curriculum perspectives in this model, and for the interests of clarity, were treated as a loosely formulated continuum, with the transmission orientation at one end, and a transformative orientation at the other end. Transmission, transactional, and transformative orientations are briefly outlined below. The ‘transmission’ or ‘content-driven’ orientation is often associated with a functionalist perspective that involves developing or reproducing a reflection of existing societal patterns (Ross, 2001:5). Core knowledge and skills are “seen as fixed rather than as a process” (Miller, 1996:6) and to be passed on from one generation to the next generation. Curriculum is viewed in terms of a fairly limited number of academic subject-based disciplines delivered by the teacher, with the requisite expert knowledge, to the student, often represented as the ‘passive’ recipient. Teaching practices often associated with this orientation have as their aim the mastery of content and basic skills. Teaching activities and strategies that transmit information or basic skills (e.g. mini-lectures, reading or viewing for content, copying notes, practice and drill skill activities) are highlighted. Assessment practices primarily aim to assess knowledge acquisition and/or skill development.

At the other end of the continuum is the ‘transformative’ orientation. The transformative orientation is often associated with more ‘reform’ and ‘liberative’ perspectives. This orientation focuses the development of the whole person and emphasizes personal and social connectivity, not a reduced set of core knowledge or thinking skill intentions. Learning in this orientation, according to Miller (1996:4), integrates “skills that promote personal and social transformation”, “a vision of social change that leads to harmony with the environment”, and acknowledges “a spiritual dimension to the environment”. Political and social change and improvement are advocated in this orientation and it is believed that students ought to be made aware of the political, cultural, historical, and social aspects of their society and of themselves as active and responsible participants in it (Pratt, 1994). Teaching and learning go beyond the transmission of information. Students and teachers are actively engaged in all phases of learning, knowledge is constructed through varying forms of dialectic and collaborative enquiry. Teaching activities and strategies that encourage students to critically enquire into various social and political themes and issues and use their findings to bring about personal and/or social change are encouraged. Assessment practices aim to assess personal growth and integration and social awareness.

A third orientation is referred to as ‘transactional’. The transactional orientation, or what some refer to as ‘instrumentalist’, stresses individual development within the context of social and economic need. In this orientation, there is attention to
objectives that meet specific needs for competencies - of society, of the economy, of the individual - are specified in advance, and a curriculum is drawn up to achieve these objectives. Abilities and capabilities necessary to meet the needs of contemporary life are specified and used to justify the collection of subjects that constitute the curriculum. (Ross, 2001:8)

Unlike the ‘transmission’ orientation, which views knowledge as something that is largely fixed, the ‘transactional’ orientation reflects ‘utilitarian’ tendencies and views knowledge as something that is changing and can be manipulated (Miller, 1996). Teaching activities and strategies, often associated with this orientation, have as their aim the development of problem-solving, decision-making, and/or enquiry skills closely aligned with curriculum goals. Independent and group enquiry projects, case study/decision-making approaches, and moral dilemmas of real life issues and events are some of the teaching practices often connected to this orientation. Assessment practices tend to aim to assess the application of cognitive skill processes (e.g. processes involved in carrying out an investigation, resolving a conflict).

A blend of curriculum perspectives appeared to underpin the array of goals and practices communicated and exhibited by teachers both ‘across’ respondents responses and ‘within’ personal responses, confirming curriculum theorists’ observations that pedagogy is often nested within more than one curriculum perspective and rarely neutral (Eisner, 1985; Kelly, 2004; Miller and Seller, 1985, 1996; Pratt, 1994; Ross, 2000). Dominant tendencies were discernable as were disjunctions both across the sample and within personal orientations. Most teachers’ personal orientations appeared to forefront transmission and transactional tendencies while a few teachers’ personal orientations suggested a stronger transactional and transformative mixture, suggesting that certain goals and practices were being privileged, while others were being given less attention or simply being ignored.

Across the sample, teachers’ preferred ‘learning goals’ tended to forefront a blend of transmission, transactional, and transformative tendencies. Attention to the cognitive dimension of learning was particularly prominent amongst these broad tendencies, confirming findings from earlier studies (Council of Ministers, Canada, 2001; Davies, Gregory, and Riley, 1999; Hahn, 1998; Kerr, Cleaver, Ireland, and Blenkinsop, 2003). Within this cognitive dimension, goals related to deeper understanding (e.g. knowledge acquisition, understandings of contemporary and/or historical issues) and the development of thinking and enquiry skills appeared to be given preference. Goals that promoted understandings of diverse beliefs and values, notions of social justice, and civic involvement were also encouraged, tending to suggest teacher support for (at least in their stated goals) the broader learning mandate of contemporary notions of citizenship education.

Teachers’ preferred ‘pedagogical practices’ across the sample, on the other hand, reflected a more narrowly defined set of curriculum tendencies and tended to support recent findings in phase 1 of the Citizenship Longitudinal Study (Kerr, D., Cleaver, E., Ireland, E. and Blenkinsop S., 2003:48), “that teacher-led approaches to citizenship-related topics were predominant in the classroom, with more participatory, active approaches much less commonly used”. Data sources revealed that teachers’ practices tended to reflect a stronger blend of transmission and transactional tendencies. Practices that encouraged academic understanding and the development of thinking skills were highlighted. Practices that encouraged understandings of identity and diversity, forms of civic involvement, or skills of...
social critique were less noticeable than what may have been anticipated from teachers’ stated goals sets. Assessment practices, in particular, suggested tendencies towards a further deepening of transmission-oriented tendencies, revealing further levels of incongruity with stated learning goals. Transformative tendencies were notably less evident in practice. Underscoring these practices were two variant views of learning, one that appeared to view knowledge as largely fixed and another that viewed knowledge as something that is constantly changing and can be manipulated.

Factors relating to teachers’ preferred learning goals and pedagogical practices

Findings tended to confirm recent research literature that suggests that teachers’ preferred learning goals and pedagogical practices, in general, are connected to a variety of overlapping factors, or as what Cole and Knowles (2000:7) have referred to as, “a variety of ways of personal, professional, and contextual knowing” (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Mortimore, 1999; Shulman, 1986, 1987; Turner-Bisset, 2001).

Teachers across the sample identified a mixture of factors that they believed related to their preferred learning goals and pedagogical practices, albeit with variant levels of understanding and emphasis noticeable. Five main factors (in no particular order) were identified: personal understandings of citizenship education; personal background experiences; learner characteristics; views of teaching and learning; and contextual factors.

Certain factors appeared to be more evident in relation to preferred learning goals or areas of pedagogical practice amongst teachers in this study. Variations were also noted in terms of the relative emphasis put on these factors. Learner characteristics, teachers’ personal views of teaching and learning, and school-based contextual circumstances tended to be emphasized as core factors relating to teachers’ preferences for particular instructional practices. Such notions as ‘active learning’, ‘enquiry’, ‘positive reinforcement’, ‘high standards’, and ‘inclusivity’ made up the rather eclectic range of core ideas underpinning teachers’ preferences for particular instructional practices. Contextual factors related to the school (e.g. school ethos, status of citizenship education, qualified teachers) received considerable attention. Personal background experiences (e.g. immigrant background, professional learning experiences) were identified but in very discrete and respondent-specific ways.

Interestingly, there was limited reference to understandings of citizenship as a significant factor in determining one’s instructional practices. Understandings of citizenship tended to more strongly related to ‘what’ learning goals teachers’ highlighted rather than the pedagogical practices used to achieve these goals. Furthermore, data appeared to provide a rather uncertain sense of the relationship between factors and preferred pedagogical practices. There was considerable variation amongst the respondents in terms of their understandings of, and the relative emphasis placed on these factors. Certain combinations of factors were made explicit while others were less evident.

Concluding reflections: Implications for teacher education

This research study cannot lead to specific and explicit suggestions for action. The sample was not chosen to be reflective of the population as a whole and the issues are too complex for a simple and straightforward declaration. However, on the basis of work undertaken, it is reasonable to suggest that there are potential implications for teacher education - both for initial teacher education and for in-
service programmes - that ought to be considered. This section offers four broad propositions in the form of concluding reflections as a way forward.

1) Teachers’ understandings of citizenship and citizenship education curriculum

There appears to be a need to consider ways in which understandings of citizenship and citizenship education curricula can be deepened through initial teacher education and in-service programmes. While, teachers’ characterizations of ‘learning goals’ appeared to capture the core learning goal strands of the respective policy contexts and the breadth of intent represented in contemporary conceptions of citizenship education, significant variation exists amongst this ‘expert’ group in terms of the goals given priority and depth provided, suggesting ambiguity and raising questions about what types of learning might be experienced and what types might be silenced or ignored. Teachers mostly talked about concepts related to citizenship in minimalist terms with little attention to more sophisticated and contested understandings. This ambiguity, it is surmised, is likely to be even more apparent amongst those teachers with a less developed subject knowledge base in this area. Likewise, teachers’ professional learning programmes may need to more critically address the nature of ‘curricular guidance’ provided. Teachers can all work with broad guidelines and use their best intentions to provide clear meanings, workable expectations, etc., but is this enough? Findings from this study might suggest otherwise. There appears to be a strong need to deepen teachers’ understandings of citizenship, citizenship education curriculum and its relationship to student learning.

2) Teachers’ pedagogical practices

Teachers characterized citizenship education pedagogy in a variety of ways, reflecting varying levels of sophistication. Instructional practices, for example, ranged from specific and discrete activities to reasonably intricate interactive and performance-based strategies. Examples of incongruity between ‘rhetoric’ (what teachers say they do) and ‘reality’ (what teachers do through their pedagogy) however suggests the need for teacher education programmes that address more explicitly the relationship between pedagogical practices and the goals of citizenship education. Attention to assessment, for example, is a complex area in which teachers say they are working with uncertainty and in ways that reveal that assessment practices are limited mostly to traditional paper-and-pencil approaches. There needs to be a more comprehensive look at pedagogical practices that connect understandings of subject matter with an appreciation for learner diversity and learning, contextual sensitivities, and the social purposes of schooling. It may be helpful for teachers to have opportunities to critically assess their own orientations in light of pedagogical approaches that are responsive to democratic principles and contexts and that foster learning goals such as inquiry, critical thinking, and collaborative decision-making. Personal orientations in this study tended to reveal both eclectic and distinctive tendencies and a privileging of transmission and transactional tendencies. To this end, pre-service programmes and in-service professional learning opportunities perhaps need to address the pedagogical gap through a range of professional learning opportunities such as coursework and the development of professional communities and networks that cultivate practitioner learning, action, and reflection in relation to citizenship education.
3) Inadequately addressed – or ignored - learning goals

Findings in this study suggested strong support for certain curricular goals but that this support tends to diminish as goals are translated into practice, revealing that certain fundamental goals (e.g. participation) are inadequately addressed, at worst ignored. It appears that pedagogical practices that address such areas as beliefs and values underpinning civic action and decisions, notions of social justice, and participation in civic life (both ‘in’ and ‘beyond’ the classroom) need to be heightened and explored more explicitly in teacher education programmes. This exploration needs to focus on what young learners know and how they learn (i.e. what they know and what they are able to do) in these particular areas of citizenship education, informed by current thinking from a range of critical knowledge bases. Many teachers, for example, talked about local community involvement as a preferred practice beyond the classroom. Teachers in the Canadian sample, for example, tended to emphasize involvement that ranged from service contributions to political action. Respondents from England tended to highlight the value of community volunteerism (e.g. support for community events and services, raising money for a charity that helps new immigrants) and charity work as preferred emphases for encouraging participation in civic life. Yet, in reality, few respondents appeared able to move much beyond the confines of their own classroom with this intent.

4) Related factors matter

Arguments arising from a consideration of the factors relating to teachers’ preferred learning goals and pedagogical practices suggested that a mixture of factors is at work. While these findings did not suggest any clear linkages, they did provide an uncertain sense of those factors that do relate to teachers’ preferences for particular areas of pedagogical practice when educating for citizenship, adding another level of complexity to our understanding of how teachers characterize citizenship education pedagogy. Attention to the variety of factors that relate to teachers’ preferred goals and practices needs to be considered more deeply. Teachers seem to be acting in complex ways and this complexity could be explained at least in part by the tensions they have to deal with each day. Factors that encourage and/or restrict the achievement of the learning goals associated with citizenship education need to be explored in professional learning experiences. There seems to be a certain disparity, for example, between the goals and practices for democratic citizenship expressed in the curriculum and the realities presented in schools. Schools have tended to reinforce norms of hierarchical control, and in doing so, have undermined the impact of certain types of curricular reform. The teachers in this sample said significant things about context. Teachers need to understand how schools are reshaping citizenship education learning opportunities and how such reforms may be benefiting or hindering student learning.

Towards a deepened theoretical sophistication and technical competence

Cole and Knowles (2000:7) note “the act of teaching has become increasingly complex, challenging work and is informed by multiple forms of knowledge and is representative of a variety of ways of personal, professional, and contextual knowing”. “The most successful teachers,” according to Darling-Hammond (1998:7) “not only have adequate preparation in their subject matter, they have also studied
the art and science of teaching.” Recent attention to teaching for depth within some teacher education programmes connects directly with emerging conceptualizations of teaching that attend to the relationships among the technical competencies of teaching, critical knowledge bases, and contextual forces (Bennett, Anderson, & Evans 1997; Cole & Knowles 2000; Darling-Hammond & Bransford 2005; Hallam & Ireson 1999; Rolheiser & Evans 2004; Turner-Bisset 2001). Underpinning these conceptions is a sense that teaching has become increasingly sophisticated and ought to be approached in a way that respects the “relations between its elements: the teacher, the classroom or other context, content, the view of learning and learning about learning” (Hallam & Ireson, 1999:8). Turner-Bisset (2001), for example, has argued that while earlier studies of the qualities and processes of effective teaching were helpful, they were clearly just ‘tip of the iceberg’ approaches because they ignored the many dimensions of knowledge required for effective teaching. Findings from this study appear to support this direction. That is, to confront more critically the challenge of deepening theoretical sophistication and technical competence as it relates to citizenship education pedagogy in initial teacher education and in-service professional learning programmes. Furthermore, approaches to teacher education that are congruous with and connected to the broader aims of democratic citizenship need to be infused in ways that support this challenge. Teachers today face difficult choices about their professional learning (without much support) and professional learning opportunities are needed that effectively address the complexities of teaching and learning in democratic classrooms and schools.
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The Gendered Nature of Students’ Attitudes to Minority Groups: Implications for Teacher Education

KERRY KENNEDY, Hong Kong Institute of Education

ABSTRACT There is evidence to suggest that student attitudes to minority groups are gendered to the extent that girls often appear to be more tolerant than boys. Yet a more fine grained analysis of data reported here from the IEA Civic Education Study indicates that many boys are as tolerant as many girls and some girls are as intolerant as some boys. The implications of this more nuanced understanding of the gendered nature of tolerance are discussed in relation to teachers, students, classrooms and teacher education.

Introduction

Teaching civics and citizenship education is challenging at the best of times. It is even more challenging when the growing evidence about gender differences in student attitudes to minority groups is considered. These differences are not easy to explain. It may be the case that boys and girls develop their political values and attitudes through a variety of political socialization processes. These processes may exert influences differentially on boys and girls thus accounting for different attitudes to minority groups. At the very least the recognition of gender differences means that common programmes of civics and citizenship may not meet the needs of all students and the common values and skills necessary for effective citizenship may not be accessible in the same way by all students. Yet civics and citizenship education is fundamentally about knowledge, skills and dispositions that citizens share and value in common. All students need to have access to these outcomes. Thus there needs to be an emphasis on creative and innovative strategies for teaching that can meet the needs of different students as they negotiate citizenship education programmes. Such strategies must recognize the diversity of students and have the potential to mediate and respond to difference. This is a significant demand for teachers in times of ever increasing change and higher and higher expectations about the outcomes of schooling.

The purpose of this paper is to review some recent research on students’ attitudes to minorities and to assess the implications for teacher education. It is an attempt to bring together theory and practice so that the mounting evidence about the gendered nature of student attitudes to minorities can be taken into consideration in the construction and implementation of civics and citizenship education programmes.

The paper will first review a range of literature on gender differences in civics and citizenship education and then use the results of an international survey of
student attitudes to demonstrate the practical issues that have to be addressed if the needs of all students are to be met.

**Gender Issues in Civics and Citizenship Education**

The picture of gender issues in civics and citizenship education is complex and only part of it can be dealt with directly on this paper. One way to think about these gender issues is to categorize them in terms of a ‘gender gap’ understood as “attitudinal differences which exist between men and women” (Mercedes, 2002:1). It is possible to think in terms of an ‘old gender gap’ that has been recognized for some time based on civic knowledge and appears to be undergoing change; and a ‘new gender gap’ based on student attitudes to minority groups. Both are important and literature relating to both will be reviewed below. Yet the subsequent focus of the paper will be on the ‘new gender gap’ since it takes on a particular relevance in these times of social fragmentation and international conflict.

**The ‘Old’ Gender Gap**

The ‘old gender gap’ in civics and citizenship education has traditionally been associated with the differences in civic knowledge between boys and girls. Schuur and Vis (2000) identified a range of national and cross national studies from 1974 onwards involving students from primary school to university all of which indicated that when it comes to political knowledge, from a relatively young age onwards, boys had more of it than girls. The first IEA Civic Education Study (Torney, Oppenheim & Farnen, 1975:148) found significant gender differences in civic knowledge in four out of the eight countries with boys in these countries doing better than girls. Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald and Schulz (2001:45) have pointed out that similar gender differences were found in the United States’ National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) of Civics in 1988.

Yet more recent studies have started to tell a different story. The second IEA Civic Education Study dealing with a sample of 14 year old students (Torney-Purta et al., 2001:62) seemed to reverse the ‘old gender gap’ trend altogether with a lack of statistically significant gender differences in students’ cognitive performance in all but one of the twenty eight countries, Slovenia, in which females actually outperformed males. This trend was also observed in the 1998 NAEP where gender “differences were either very small or showed females to have slight superiority” (Torney-Purta et al., 2001:45).

The apparent reversal of the gender gap in civic knowledge was not repeated in the sample of 17-19 year olds tested in the second IEA Civic Education Study (Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehman, Husfeldt & Nikolova, 2002). On the civic knowledge scale there were gender differences in 11 out 14 of the countries and on the economic knowledge scale there were gender differences in every country [1]. It seems that maturity does not necessarily bring stability of knowledge and understanding with some boys at least making greater gains than some girls. This remains a key issue for the teaching of civics and citizenship. Yet it is not the only gender issue that deserves consideration as shown in the following section.

**The ‘New’ Gender Gap**

Recent research (Kennedy, 2004) based on a secondary analysis of the IEA Civic Education Study (Torney-Purta et al., 2001) has suggested there is a new gender gap
in civic education. This ‘new’ gender gap is related to students’ civic attitudes. On scales related to student attitudes to minorities (attitudes towards immigrants, support for women’s political rights) females in the majority of countries held more positive attitudes than males. This phenomenon was explored at some length using the Australian IEA data with particular attention being paid to the implications for political socialisation (Kennedy & Mellor, 2006). Husfeldt (2004) also conducted a secondary analysis of IEA data relating to students’ attitudes to immigrants using national samples from England, Switzerland, Denmark and Germany. She found that in three of these countries, Switzerland, Denmark and Germany, females had more positive attitudes to immigrants than males but that there were no gender effects in England. She also found that students who had negative attitudes to women’s rights also had negative attitudes to immigrants, thus suggesting a socialisation effect relating to negative social attitudes.

More recent research (Kennedy 2005a, 2005b) has shown that the gendered nature of students’ attitudes to immigrants and women is also reflected in other IEA Civic Education Study scales relating to ethnic minorities and anti democratic groups. First, the general pattern of results relating to the Women and Immigrants’ scales was repeated with the Ethnic Minorities’ scale. Overall, students were supportive of extending rights to ethnic minorities. Similar to the other scales, there were also gender differences on this scale. Across all participating countries, there were statistically significant differences between girls and boys with girls being more supportive of the extension of rights than boys (Kennedy, 2005b). The results for the Attitudes to Anti-Democratic Groups’ scale were different in one very significant way but similar in another way.

They were different in as much as many students, both boys and girls, found it difficult to extend rights to anti-democratic groups. The mean scores for all items on this scale were the lowest for any of the attitudinal items (Kennedy, 2005b) suggesting that these were very difficult items for students. On the other hand, the gender pattern on this scale was the same as for the other scales. Girls were more inclined to extend rights to anti-democratic groups than boys. At the same time, a large number of both boys and girls were reluctant to extend any rights at all.

Kennedy (2005a) has suggested that this reluctance might be interpreted as intolerance on the part of both boys and girls towards anti-democratic groups whereas their attitudes towards women, ethnic minorities and immigrants are more likely to be tolerant. This tolerance/intolerance dimension seems an important one to consider since it suggests the gendered nature of student attitudes is much more complex than is suggested by any simple interpretation of the gendered pattern of results. In certain contexts, girls too can be intolerant and while boys are more intolerant this does not mask the issue of female intolerance. In addition, it could also be argued that intolerance of anti-democratic groups is an important feature of democracy, especially if one adopts a classical Republican view of freedom as opposed to a traditional liberal view (Pettit, 2001). In any case, student attitudes to anti-democratic groups have served to problematize further the gender issue in civic education. They have shown that students are capable of differentiating between different groups to whom they are willing to extend rights and that while girls remain more tolerant than boys in relation to anti-democratic groups they nevertheless demonstrate a certain level on intolerance as well.

The findings of the IEA Study are not unique, since similar gender differences have been identified in other surveys (Frindte, Funke & Waldzus 1996; Living History Forum and Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, 2004) and other studies that focused on community groups (Adler, 1996; Watts 1996; Sotelo &
Kennedy, K.

Sandgrador, 1997). These findings are important and deserve further attention. Without diminishing the importance of the ‘old gender gap’, there is a good reason to focus on the ‘new gender gap’. As Kennedy and Mellor (2006) have shown, such research is concerned with the values that affect social cohesion and stability in democratic societies. This is a key issue to consider at a time when many societies are under pressure from external threats and when responses to these threats can exacerbate an already fragile social consensus. Yet it is important to understand what these gender differences actually mean and what can be done in terms of teaching and learning to address them. That is, theory needs to be translated into practice. This issue will be discussed in the following section with reference to some specific results from the IEA Civic Education Study.

What Do these Gender Differences Mean?

At one level, the identification of statistically significant gender differences in student attitudes to minority groups simply means that there is some certainty, within prescribed confidence levels, that this result is not random. The differences are real ones. While this statistical response is important, it needs to be taken further: what is the substance of these differences? This section will explore that question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean(SD)</th>
<th>Frequencies by Gender (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADGRs [3] should be prohibited from hosting a TV show talking about these (their) ideas</td>
<td>2.50 (.91)</td>
<td>2.63 (.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADGRs should be prohibited from organizing peaceful[non-violent] demonstrations or rallies</td>
<td>2.70 (.89)</td>
<td>2.78 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADGRs should be prohibited from running in an election for political office</td>
<td>2.49 (.93)</td>
<td>2.61 (.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADGRs should be prohibited from making public speeches about these[their]ideas</td>
<td>2.60 (.90)</td>
<td>2.77 (.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Item Means, Standard Deviations and Frequencies by Gender for Attitudes Toward Political Rights for Anti-Democratic Groups (ADGR)

The question can be explored empirically by looking closely at how students responded to the survey questions they were asked. Tables 1 and 2 contain three main pieces of information: the questions that were asked and that make up each scale (Column 1), the average or mean scores obtained by an international sample of boys and girls for each of the questions [2] (Columns 2 and 3) and the distribution of responses for boys and girls on each of the response categories (Strongly
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Agree/Agree/Disagree/Disagree) (Columns 4-11). Scoring procedures gave 4 for the most tolerant response and 1 for the least tolerant response. Thus, the higher the scores on both scales, the greater the level of tolerance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean(SD)</th>
<th>Frequencies by Gender (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All ethnic [racial or national] groups should have equal chances to get a good education in this country.</td>
<td>3.22 (.74) 3.40 (.64)</td>
<td>M 37 F 47 SA 47 A 51 D 47 SD 9 M 4 F 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ethnic [racial or national] groups should have equal chances to get good jobs in this country.</td>
<td>3.15 (.77) 3.36 (.66)</td>
<td>M 36 F 45 SA 48 A 50 D 48 SD 10 M 6 F 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should teach students to respect members of all ethnic [racial or national]groups</td>
<td>3.11 (.84) 3.33 (.72)</td>
<td>M 37 F 45 SA 45 A 46 D 45 SD 12 M 7 F 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of all ethnic [racial or national] groups should be encouraged to run in elections for political office.</td>
<td>2.79 (.85) 2.96 (.76)</td>
<td>M 20 F 20 SA 49 A 49 D 56 SD 22 M 18 F 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Item Means, Standard Deviations and Frequencies for Attitudes Toward Ethnic Minorities (MINOR)

It is clear from a cursory examination of the results for both scales that all students, both boys and girls, found it easier to extend rights to ethnic minorities (the usual abbreviation for this scale is MINOR) than they did to anti-democratic groups (the usual abbreviation for this scale is ADGR). The mean item scores [4] for ADGR ranged from 2.55 to 2.75, the lowest means for any of the attitudinal scales in the IEA Civic Education Study, and for MINOR from 2.86-3.28.

It is clear that across both scales, girls found it easier to extend rights to both ethnic groups and anti-democratic groups than did boys. This was also true on scales related to immigrants and women (Torney-Purta et al., 2001:115). This is one important aspect of the gender dimension relating to student attitudes to minorities: girls appear to be more tolerant than boys. Yet it is not the only dimension.

Another dimension revealed in these tables is that girls’ tolerance to ethnic minorities is not wholly generalizable, as shown by their attitudes to anti-democratic groups. The lower mean scores on the ADGR scale suggest that girls are less positive about extending rights to anti-democratic groups – perhaps more intolerant towards those groups - than they are towards ethnic minorities. While girls’ scores relating to anti democratic groups are higher than that of the boys’, they nevertheless indicate some reluctance to extend rights to this group compared to ethnic minorities. Thus girls can also be intolerant when they judge that a particular group,
for whatever reason, is not as deserving as other minority groups. This is an important issue for civic education since it indicates that the intolerance of both boys and girls, even a small minority, needs to be addressed.

A closer examination of the distribution of responses for boys and girls on each of the response categories (Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree) reveals the complexity of the gender dimension of student attitudes to minorities. As shown in the tables above, the weight of the responses on both scales is in favour of extending rights. For MINOR, on average, 82% of boys and 88% of girls agreed to the extension of rights to ethnic minorities. The weight of the responses for boys was in the ‘agree’ category rather than the ‘strongly agree’ category suggesting some hesitation on the part of the boys. For girls, the weight of responses is more evenly distributed over both categories except for the last item where the weight is clearly in the ‘agree’ category. In terms of the negative responses, there is a more convergent pattern of weights between boys and girls. The responses for both boys and girls are predominantly in the ‘disagree’ category suggesting reluctance to adopt an extreme position. Yet on average across items there are about 5% of boys and just over 2% of girls in the ‘strongly disagree’ or negative category. This story is therefore largely positive, although the small percentage of negative response cannot be ignored and will be returned to later in this paper. An analysis of student responses to the questions on the ADGR tells a somewhat different story.

The weight of positive responses for ADGR for both boys and girls was in the ‘disagree’ category accounting on average for 51% of girls and 40% of boys [5]. When the ‘strongly disagree’ category is included the weights for positive responses increases to 64% and 55% respectively. Only a small number of both boys and girls were willing to express an extreme position of support for anti-democratic groups on this scale – 15% of boys and 13% of girls. At the negative end of the scale the weight of responses for both boys and girls was in the ‘agree’ category with boys being slightly more negative than girls – 30% and 27% respectively. When the ‘strongly agree’ frequencies are added to these, the negative response for ADGR account for 44% of boys and 35% of girls. This means that 14% of boys and 8% of girls were willing to take the most extreme position against anti-democratic groups. While the weight of positive responses for ADGR came from girls and the weight of negative responses came from boys, it is important to note the relatively large numbers of girls who expressed negative attitudes towards anti-democratic groups. Boys may well be more negative than girls, but on this particular scale, the numbers of girls who are negative cannot be ignored. This has important implications for responding to the gendered nature of student attitudes to minority groups.

In drawing this section to a close, the main point to note is that while on the whole, girls are more tolerant than boys, this by itself does not explain the complexities of gender differences in relation to minority groups. Some girls can be intolerant as indicated by negative female responses on both MINOR and ADGR just as many boys can be tolerant. What is more, female intolerance seemed to increase in relation to anti-democratic groups whose values were perhaps seen to be outside the mainstream. Thus generalizations about male and female tolerance seem to be deeply embedded in specific contexts. This point has also been made in relation to right wing groups and authoritarianism in Germany (Frindte, Funke & Waldzus, 1996) Intolerance and being male are not synonymous, just as tolerance and being female are not. At the same time the majority of both boys and girls appeared reluctant to take extreme positions of either support or opposition to either ethnic minorities or anti democratic groups. The majority preference is always for the less extreme option even though that option might be negative. Nevertheless, a
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minority of both boys and girls do express extremely negative attitudes towards both ethnic minorities and anti-democratic groups and this is a cause for concern. These are a much more nuanced gender issues that require further exploration. Overall, this analysis, based on mean scores and actual student responses to questions on both scales, has shown the complexity that lies beneath statistically significant gender differences suggesting that these differences are substantial and important.

Implications for Teacher Education

What teachers need to know

Teacher education programmes need to acknowledge that just as there are gender issues in school subjects such as Mathematics, Science and English, so too there are gender issues in learning associated with civics and citizenship. This paper has referred to gender differences in both civic knowledge and civic attitudes and the focus has been on the latter. Teachers need to have a basic awareness that boys and girls may respond differently to issues of diversity and difference in their society. Based on the evidence used in this paper, they can assume that the majority of both boys and girls are more than willing to extend rights to certain groups such as women, immigrants and ethnic minorities’ but that a minority of students are not. This minority is more likely to contain boys but it also contains a small number of girls. At the same time, there are some groups in society to which students, both boys and girls, find some difficulty in extending rights. Although their general attitudes to such group are still positive, they are less positive than towards the other groups that were included in the IEA Civic Education Study. A key question to be pursued in school contexts is whether there are any other groups in specific local communities towards whom students may have similar reservations. For example, other studies have shown that students are often reluctant to extend certain rights to groups such as gays (Sotelo, 2000). Thus tolerance as an issue needs to be made a central part of the education of citizenship teachers so that they are equipped with understandings and values that will help them develop relevant and appropriate school based programmes of civic and citizenship education.

What needs to happen in classrooms

Classrooms are microcosms of the broader society of which they are apart. Very often they will reflect the diversity that is in society and this means they may also reflect the diversity of attitudes that exist within society. This means that some students will have negative attitudes to minority groups - both in the classroom and within the broader society. It is likely that more boys than girls will have such attitudes, but there will be a small number of girls as well. Such attitudes threaten social cohesion both in classrooms and society at large and they require the development of pro-active strategies that will help all students understand and re-evaluate their attitudes.

If such attitudes are not confronted, they could well deepen. Thus the citizenship curriculum and its assessment need to focus on engaging students in such a way that they can consider the contribution of minority groups in a multicultural society. This might be done at local, national and global levels. Given that a minority of students will have negative attitudes, then additional thought needs to be given to differentiated curriculum and assessment to meet the special needs of these students.
It cannot be assumed that ‘one size fits all’ in terms of the citizenship curriculum. This means that the monitoring of student learning becomes all the more important since this is the only way of identifying negative attitudes that require alternative approaches to both curriculum and assessment.

**What needs to happen in schools**

Violence and bullying in school contexts needs to be addressed in a comprehensive way since they create contexts where discriminatory behaviours can easily be considered normal. There is often a gender dimension to bullying although it is not always an easy one to disentangle since same sex harassment is often as common as that involving boys and girls. All forms of intolerance need to be opposed in schools since intolerance can reinforce negative attitudes. It can also be the case that groups rather than individuals can become the targets of bullying and this has the potential to exacerbate exiting negative attitudes towards those groups.

Teachers also need to be alert for the occurrence of domestic violence since violence in the home is seen to be a powerful determinant of negative social attitudes. This is an important point to make since schools are just one part of the social environment that affects young people and very often the problems being dealt with in schools have been created elsewhere. Schools can do much to alleviate those problems but they cannot do everything. When students come to school with negative social attitudes that are reinforced by the home, peers, media or other influences on socialization, schools and teachers have a very difficult task confronting such attitudes. At the very least, however, schools should not exacerbate these attitudes and this might be seen as their major contribution to the development of social cohesion.

**What teacher education can do**

Teachers of citizens need themselves to be exemplary citizens not only in terms of what they know but also in terms of their values and attitudes. Husfeldt and Barber (2005) have started to explore the relationship between teacher and student attitudes to citizenship issues. While they did not explicitly examine attitudes to minority groups they have indicated in a preliminary way that at least some of the variance in student attitudes to different kinds of citizenship might be accounted for by teachers’ attitudes. They also indicated that most of the variance is at the individual level rather than the teacher level. Nevertheless, in terms of teacher education, it seems important to ensure that teachers themselves do not have negative social attitudes that can be transmitted to students.

At the programme level, therefore, it seems important that teacher education programmes adopt an explicit multicultural dimension so that tolerance rather than intolerance becomes a core value. Within such programmes gender issues need to be addressed in all curriculum areas but most importantly in citizenship curriculum classes. The complexity of these gender issues needs to be highlighted as they have been in this paper – small numbers of both boys and girls can be intolerant and it is this group of students for whom teacher need to find positive solutions.

Within teacher education programmes, this may mean highlighting pedagogies that enable students to learn in small groups, where cooperative and peer learning can be utilized and where teachers can intervene at key points to focus discussion on the key expected learning outcomes. Yet it may also mean searching for new ways to think about teaching, and organizing classrooms for learning. Lo, Pong and Chik
(2005) have recently described a process whereby teachers work together using a ‘learning studies’ (a modification of the lesson study) approach to improve learning in their classrooms for all students. Such an approach is much more holistic that just focusing on particular pedagogies. It utilizes action research, collaborative teacher development and a focus on what students already know and how they can best be facilitated towards expected learning outcomes. Given the traditional isolation of teachers, such an approach seems to be well worth exploring when it is known that students will approach a learning task with different attitudes and understandings about it. It would be useful to apply learning study to citizenship education to see how it can assist in the development of positive social attitudes. This is an important area of work for future study.

Conclusion

There is mounting evidence about gender differences in student attitudes towards minorities and the evidence comes from a range of studies. Given the implications of such studies for social cohesion within societies, the differences need to be considered carefully. The *Living History Forum* and Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention (2004:10) made the point in a quite graphic way:

> According to a rough estimate, the twelve percent of students with the highest scores on the measure of general intolerance account for almost three-quarters of the total acts of threats and violence that are reported to be linked to victims of foreign background, religion or sexuality.

Husfeldt (2004) and Torney-Purta and Amadeo (2004) have called for more research into the area of gender differences in student attitudes. The main issue to be considered is the form that this research should take. Much of the research to date has made generic recommendations relating to such elements as the macro level environment (Pettersson, 2003), school and classroom environments (Torney-Purta & Barber, 2004; Husfeldt, 2004) and the need to develop positive civic attitudes (Torney-Purta & Barber, 2003; 2004; Husfeldt, 2004). Yet these generic recommendations do not directly address gender issues. This paper has been an attempt to move the agenda forward by examining in more detail what these gender differences actually mean and examining the implications for practice.

This paper has argued that special attention needs to be made to those students, both boys and girls, who are likely to develop negative social attitudes. More needs to be known about how these attitudes develop, what kinds of policies are needed to meet the special needs of students with such attitudes and what kind of curriculum and teaching will be the most useful to address the problem. Of course, these are not just issues for schools, but for the whole of society so solutions need to be found in the macro environment as well as in schools. The suggestions made in this paper now need to be taken forward into practice so that the negative social attitudes that some students, both boys and girls, bring to the classroom, can be addressed in a systematic way. This is an important contribution that schools and teachers can make to the development of a caring and just citizenry at a time of great uncertainty. Schools cannot solve the problem of social fragmentation on their own, but they can try to ensure that they do not contribute towards it.
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NOTES

[1] Not all differences were statistically significant.
[2] The standard population of 14 year olds used in the IEA Civic Education Study was used for these calculations.
[3] Defined as “groups that are against democracy”
[4] It should be noted that raw scores are being used in this analysis rather than the IRT scale scores reported in Torney-Purta et al. (2001)
[5] Notice that the “Disagree/Strongly Disagree” category on ADGR is regarded as positive because the question was phrased negatively when the word ‘prohibited’ was used (See Table 1 for the actual questions)
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Revisioning the Social: Young Australians and the Rural/Urban Divide

JUDITH GILL AND SUE HOWARD, University of South Australia

ABSTRACT The challenge for citizenship education in contemporary Australia where there have been recent radical changes in the composition of the population, raises questions about national identity, notions of shared history, language and place. In particular the older distinction between urban and rural dwellers that had shaped earlier Australians may have outlived its usefulness. This article reports on a study of young people’s understanding of themselves as Australian and their affiliation with the place in which they live. The authors contrast the responses of young rural Australians with those derived from their urban studies and draw out some of the different ‘Australias’ as described by the schoolchildren. Ultimately the paper argues for citizenship education to comprise a revisioning of Australia as a social and political entity in ways that incorporate and celebrate difference without diminishing allegiance to the country as whole.

Australia’s future depends upon each citizen having the necessary knowledge, understanding, skills and values for a productive and rewarding life in an educated, just and open society. High quality schooling is central to achieving this vision. [1]

Introduction

Despite the well developed theoretical connection between the role of the school in the construction of national identity (Willinsky, 1999; Said, 1995), Australian education has only recently invested formally in the production of an informed and active citizenry, as identified in the Adelaide Declaration above. Such an orientation presupposes a conception of Australia as a social and political entity, along with some understanding of oneself as a part of this larger whole. Given the range of possible constructions about what the new Australia is and the efforts to describe and define national identity within the broader contexts of multiculturalism and globalisation, it seems the task is far from simple.

Not only must Australian education craft a sense of national identity that incorporates and encompasses the rich mix of immigrants from Europe, Britain and, more recently, Asia, it also has to deal with ideological legacies from the past. One of the most enduring of these is the oppositional positioning of the city and the bush in the Australian imaginary. In the early days of Australia, artists and writers had presented a very British version of Australia as a country whose major division was that between the city sophisticated and the rural outback workers with the latter being depicted in terms of the joys of life in the bush, an image which has persisted
down the years. Such work celebrated a male-ordered Australian humanist ideal characterised by a freedom of spirit, being one’s own boss, answerable only to oneself, being at one with nature (Kapferer, 1990). While some of these features continue in the celebration of the sporting hero, enduringly part of Australian popular culture, the city/bush distinction against which they were constructed appears increasingly irrelevant to the lived experience of contemporary Australians. While the vast majority of Australians have always tended to live in the cities and narrow coastal fringes, the country towns are currently in serious decline. Recent projections suggest that the population in country towns is fast diminishing such that only half of those towns currently in existence will be there in 10 years time. In this paper we take up the question of the connection between schooling and national identity in the light of recent socio-cultural change. Hence we are not addressing issues specific to civics and citizenship curriculum, rather we explore the prior concepts upon which such education must build if it is to be effective.

What do children know about Australia as a social and political entity?

For the past five years we have been conducting studies of the ways in which Australian school children understand themselves as Australians and, related, what they know about Australia’s social and political conventions and practices. Our initial motivation for this work was our disenchantment as educationalists with the curriculum package known as Discovering Democracy (Curriculum Corporation, 1997) which was sent to every school in Australia in November 1998. While recognising that this curriculum development constituted a courageous response by government advisers to do something about the alarming levels of ignorance of the workings of the Australian political system that had been shown to be widespread in the general community, we were concerned that it was not based on any evidence of children’s present state of knowledge. An American researcher makes a similar point:

Reports of various test results ... provide some data about what students do not know, but very little about what they do know and believe about the United States, the nation’s history and their own and the nation’s future. (Cornbleth, 2002:520)

As educators we are committed to the principles of constructivist approaches to learning and in particular to the idea that new knowledge is always and inevitably constructed on the basis of what is already known (Hendry, 1996). Hence, our attempt to find out what primary school children do know about institutionalised systems of power (Howard and Gill, 2000).

In the course of this research we were able to establish that children were indeed aware of systematised power, although they may not have the correct words to describe the processes of government. They may not always have been able to name key figures but they did understand the concept of law and the need for civic regulation. They also showed a ready understanding of the principles of democratic practice insofar as these were enacted in their school experience. In particular we were able to show the development of children’s political understanding from a fairly crude construction of power in the junior primary years to a much more sophisticated realisation of the operations of community, state and nation by the upper years of primary school. We likened this phenomenon to that of the ‘pebble in the pond’ with the pattern of ever widening concentric circles representing their
increasing knowledge domains (Howard and Gill, 2000). This research led us to regard schooling as important in young people’s understanding of political systems, along with developing knowledge about their own place, its history and customs, a position similar to that expressed here:

*Schooling plays a key, but not exclusive, role in shaping student’s knowledge and beliefs about the nation.* (Cornbleth, 2002:521)

**How do children feel about being Australian?**

Having established that children do have, albeit rudimentary and incomplete, understandings about the workings of Australian society upon which teachers can build effective civics and citizenship curriculum, we turned our attention to questions of national identity. Our interest was in the ways children might identify themselves as being Australian. We concur with the position proposed by Haste (1987), that an affective element of cognition is centrally involved in any effective civics or citizenship education programme.

The routine ways in which young people were traditionally drawn into an understanding of place and country – the formal lessons in the geography, history and literature of Australia – have largely disappeared from the curriculum, to be replaced by subjects loosely grouped under the heading Society and the Environment which assuredly address a new set of issues, possibly with some assumptions from the older curriculum offerings. As Grundy has written, the texts and practices contained in school lessons constitute the official storylines of a society (Grundy, 1994). Frequently such storylines are laden with implicit values, sometimes explicit – such as the tales of the ‘first settlers’, the ‘discovery of Australia’ and other phrases which effectively reconstitute the eighteenth century myth of terra nullius. Similarly, the stories and poems of nineteenth century writers like Banjo Patterson and Henry Lawson enshrined the concepts of ‘mateship’, the nobility of bush battlers and the unique beauty of Australia’s rural landscape. Texts such as these are no longer favoured in many schools and the current generation of primary schoolchildren is likely to be unfamiliar with these traditional themes. Moreover, contemporary schooling practice is less likely to be intermeshed with exercises of patriotic alignment such as flag raising, anthem signing, ANZAC day observance (military history) as was the routine for previous generations.

In addition, the penetration of overseas media, most especially through television, would likely mean that today’s young Australians are equally familiar with downtown Springfield from *The Simpsons* or the New York cityscape from *Sex in the City* as they are with their own local towns and cities. There is no doubt that the burgeoning fields of children’s literature, media and social studies supply a wealth of offerings which constitute images and understanding of space and place, but the question remains: In what ways do the children construct an image of and a feeling for the country in which they live? What are the features of their Australia(s) and by what means are their images realised? With the renewed interest in citizenship as a project of education it seemed both timely and useful to find out how the current generation positions itself in relation to the country as a whole.

In the course of our research into these questions, we were able to show that young people do in general feel very positively about ‘being Australian’ (Gill and Howard, 2002). Their responses echoed the pattern established by American researchers who found that the young people in their study held to ‘an image of the
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country’s continuous and beneficial progress’ (Barton et al, 1998:3). Moreover, strongly linked to their sense of being Australian were feelings of being ‘safe’, ‘proud’ and ‘free’ – we explore what this might mean elsewhere (Howard and Gill, 2005).

This present paper addresses the question of the degree to which the division between city and country (in terms of culture and place) still impacts on the ways in which contemporary young Australians identify themselves. Are the current imaginings of the ‘Australian way’ still forged in terms of the older stories of strong resourceful bush dwellers as compared to their more sophisticated city cousins? We focus on the children’s language when talking about Australia, the images used, the words and phrases repeated and the concrete detail provided. From this material we analyse the major themes that recur in children’s talk, themes that will constitute the current ‘songlines’ through which they understand the country and variously position themselves more or less as part of it.

Methodology, methods and processes

As with our earlier work (Howard and Gill, 2000, 2001, 2002; Gill and Howard, 1999, 2002) our study was conducted as a qualitative investigation through small group interviews with upper primary school children. We chose this approach as most likely to allow us insight into features of the young people’s attitudes that may not be revealed in other methods of investigation (Patton, 1990). Hence, we used a semi-structured interview schedule with groups of between four and five children in a range of schools in distinctly different regions in rural South Australia. In the most recent investigation we deliberately chose rural schools because our earlier studies had involved only urban children and we wished to discover if ‘being Australian’ carried different meanings for rural children as compared with those from the city. In this part of the study we interviewed some 250 young people spread across schools in South Australia’s famous wine making region, the Barossa Valley, the industrial steel works regions north of Adelaide known as the Lower and Mid-North, the Riverland and the farming districts of the South East.

The students were generally in their final year of primary school (year 7 in South Australia) and they were nearly all 12 years of age. The study has thus far included some 400 children – the original 150 from urban schools and the more recent 250 from rural locations. The rural children comprised 124 girls and 130 boys from 14 different schools. In terms of cultural mix there was a definite presence of indigenous children in the rural groups – one of the schools was 80% indigenous whereas the city schools had fewer indigenous students. In certain areas, such as the Riverland and the South East, the rural children were predominantly non-indigenous Australians whose families had farmed the area for generations. In other cases there were children from German backgrounds in the Barossa Valley and in the Lower North market gardening districts there were significant numbers of children with Vietnamese backgrounds.

Procedures

Considerations of language are very important in generating free-flowing discussions with young people. As interviewers we deliberately avoided using more abstract concepts such as ‘national identity’, ‘culture’, ‘nation’ and so on, preferring to speak in terms of concrete features of their daily living and to gently probe their
felt responses to these aspects. Only in the few cases when informants invoked more abstract terms did we pursue them in conversation.

The discussions began with some general icebreaking techniques designed to get the children talking easily. All discussion groups met at their regular school and as interviewers we took time to reassure the participants that the discussion was not part of the formal school requirements. Early on we made clear that there were no right answers to the sorts of questions we were looking at - and that all opinions were of value and interest to us. Then we moved to issues raised in the deliberate effort to get at the children’s felt responses to questions of place and nation. Among the questions we asked are:

- What’s it like to live here? What do you like about it? And what’s not so good?
- We sought ways of uncovering the images that conveyed meanings to our participants in questions such as:
  - If you were asked to make a collage which showed the way you felt about Australia, what would you put in it?
  - With this question we were using a familiar task – primary students are familiar with the idea of collage making – to move to the more abstract level of representation and felt response. We also used hypothetical questions such as:
    - If you had to go to live in another country, apart from family and friends what do you think you’d miss?
- During the course of the discussions the researchers sought clarification of key terms or words that the children had used. Probes were often used to ascertain that the meaning was clear.

All discussions were subsequently transcribed and organised for analysis using the NUD*IST data management software. The analysis was conducted in terms of the words and phrases used, their meanings and affective connotations and the frequencies of occurrence in the partial and entire data set. No actual names of students or schools are reported in this paper. All names are pseudonyms, although the general region is identified.

Results and discussion

In the following paragraphs we identify themes that emerged during our discussions and give examples of the ways in which the children’s thinking about their place is framed by particular features of their home environments. Direct quotations are used as examples of the children’s speech, sometimes an individual representation and elsewhere as an excerpt of conversation in which the reader can observe the negotiation of meaning between the group members. Indications of the frequency of a particular feature are also identified in order to substantiate our claim for its thematic status.

The place to be

Compared with city children, country students exhibited a strong sense of place, for example they frequently alluded to the name of their particular town whereas the city children rarely named the neighbourhood, suburb or the city in which they all lived and went to school. While some rural children felt themselves to be possibly less significantly located when compared to city dwellers, they were sure their place was more desirable than a city location. They knew they were not-city whereas the urban children had never identified themselves as being not-country. This phenomenon is consistent with the sociological insight that the inferior location (in
this case rural populations are numerically inferior and also less likely to have concentrations of status and power) usually experiences itself as marked, whereas the superior other is the unmarked norm (Connell, 1983). Several of the rural children volunteered their fears of what they would have to go without if they were to move to the city:

Carey (Mid-North): We’ve got a very big property and if we had to move into a town or a city or something we probably wouldn’t be able to take all the animals because we’ve got tons.

Int: OK and Greg, what’s good about living here for you?

Greg: I would miss all the trees. I’d miss doing burnouts and that on the motor bike and because you can’t do them in the town without getting caught with the cops ... and I’d miss rounding up sheep, going shearing ... and them things.

Clearly the thought of life in the city was for these youngsters a fate they would gladly do without. In the above quotation they use the city as the negative reference point from which they go on to establish what is good about their own situation. Another rationale for living ‘in the country’ was developed in terms of the clean green environment with lots of space, as in the following comment from a boy from the Barossa Valley:

Jack: It’s good living here ‘cos it’s not cramped. And you don’t have to go down a street and there is a stink of car fumes and all that like it is in the city.

Being ‘in the country’ was intimately connected with the themes of safe and free – two key themes in the children’s emotional response to being Australian (Gill and Howard, 2002). Whereas many of the rural children, along with their city based counterparts, appeared to regard other countries as different and inherently dangerous, for these country dwellers the city itself became the dangerous other too.

Bob (Riverland): The thing I like about Rivertown is that when you go places you can just leave your door open and no one goes in your house, not like in Adelaide. And when you go to bed you don’t hear cars go past. And it’s nicer weather...

And Lara from the Riverland also suggested that the country is safer than the city:

There’s no wars and most of the people are happy most of the time. And there’s no real bad things happen. Like if you were living in the city it would be like murders and drugs and drinking and stuff. But here it’s not.

Their sense of freedom was often expressed in being able to do things they thought city kids could not, such as:
Mary (Mid-North): If I moved to Adelaide, right, I wouldn’t get the chance to scream. Like in here it’s remote. We live near the town and not too far from the city. It’s the outback actually a very remote area.

Int: And what about you Steve? What’s good about living here for you?

Steven: Like Mary said you can just scream. I live here and I’ve got a big paddock and then it’s my next door neighbour’s house. And I just scream over to her.

For many rural children, the sense of freedom was associated with space, not being on top of other people and having room to move. The term space appeared repeatedly (99 hits in 76 documents) in conversations with the children as they offered a rationale for the joys of country life. In the above examples space is associated with being able to raise your voice whereas the city in their construction is a place where you have to limit your bodily movements, your voice and your impact on the environment generally. Perhaps the ultimate expression of this sort of freedom was given by Dan from the Lower-North:

Dan: Oh, and if you live out in the farms and that or if you go out there like – you could actually, if it was a really hot day, you could walk around in your underpants.

The sense of feeling free in the safety of the country was echoed throughout the different locations. For instance from the South East:

David: There’s lots of open space and you can ride the motor bike around and there’s not many thieves, because when we went to West Beach [Adelaide beach suburb] someone stole my pair of thongs and I was upset.

Nick: I just like the freedom and you can do lots of things without worrying about stuff.

Int: Such as?

Nick: Such as like lots of like kidnappers and everything like that.

Working with young adolescents in the U.S., Cornbleth (2002) had found that the term free was frequently connected with the U.S. or America but was used as a symbol or a slogan by most students as in ‘land of the free’. These young rural Australians tended to express their sense of freedom in terms of being able to do things because they lived in the country. Their freedom was expressed in personalised and localised ways as an enabling capacity for action in addition to being seen as a question of rights.

For others it was the sense of friendliness that was a source of pleasure in country life. In this feature the children echoed the idea of Australian ‘mateship’, a mythologized quality associated with life in the bush (Kapferer, 1990) frequently referred to with pride by the current conservative Prime Minister. Whereas none of
the city children had spoken about the friendliness of their particular neighbourhood communities, it was a theme frequently invoked by the rural children:

Jim (Riverland): It’s a friendly place and you can walk down the street and you’d see someone and you’d be able to go ‘Hi’ and you’d know who they are.

Anna: Yeah, just knowing everybody in town and becoming friends with as many as you can ... that’s good.

Michael: Friends and you’re close to family because my Gran lives here too and apart from my Pop practically all my other family live close by.

Once again this theme provided a way of establishing themselves as not-the-city with the city being associated with strangeness, lack of friendly faces, danger. And from a group of Aboriginal children in the Mid-North for whom the city represented loneliness and dread:

David: All of Kaloomba, they basically know you and you get on with everyone goodly and then if you get taken away to the city it would be heaps different and there would be robberies and that and you wouldn’t know how to stop them.

Ali: Yeah you know everyone round the town, except for new people and it’s easy to get to know them and stuff ... if you move to a city you won’t know anyone.

But a hint of bitter personal experience too in:

Alan: The only bad part about living in a small town like this is news spreads really quickly. So if you do something wrong the whole town will know in an hour or so.

In many respects the children, in their estimation of the joys of country living and the miseries of the city, echo the sort of fundamental division that was constructed a hundred years ago by the first wave of writers and artists in crafting a vision of Australia. Certainly their ways of expressing the differences they believe to exist between life in the city and life in the country are less poetic and rather more influenced, one suspects, by local attitudes and the nightly news than anything they have heard or read. But their sentiments are remarkably similar to one another across their very different rural locations. Thus the idea of being not-the-city appears to be widely shared and celebrated in ways decidedly similar to those earlier voices in the bush ballads of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Like the urban children had done in the earlier investigation, many of the rural participants affirmed a sense of delight in nature, in Australian flora and fauna, as part of their reason for enjoying life in the country. Boys and girls spoke easily about their emotional response to the place they understood as their part of the world without any sentimentality or jingoism.
Nick (Mid-North): Big space – we’ve got three very big farms and the possibilities of having hundreds of lizards is quite high – I love the lizards.

Charlie: Oh yeah, I love the mallee trees and making cubbies. I forgot to mention that ... and I love this place because it’s just perfect. It’s nice in summer but in the winter I hate it when it starts to rain real hard and it’s windy and really cold.

Int: Ok what’s good about living here then?

Charlie: Knowing that this is your home and nothing else can take it away.

In many cases these children affirmed a belief in the uniqueness of Australia and its flora and fauna, a belief which does not reflect reality (there are gum trees in other parts of the world!) but which undoubtedly contributes to the sense of the children’s pride in their country.

Int: So you want to put native animals on the collage?

Nancy (Barossa): They are an emblem

Chris: They belong to us and no one else.

Nancy: Like the kangaroo and the emu or the ostrich or something

Int: Anything else for the collage?

Bruce: Oh you’d put wombats

Diana: Koalas

Nancy: Dingo because that was already in Australia before.

Their responses here centre on a sense of the uniqueness of the country and their sense of themselves as its rightful owners – ‘they belong to us and no one else’. They name the animals they believe to be unique to Australia – with Nancy’s note that the dingo ‘was already in Australia before’. The interviewer did not pursue the meaning here but it would be most probable that she meant ‘before European settlement’ or ‘before the white people came here’. And so in talking about what is meant by being Australian the children reveal some understanding of the notion of pre-history, a pre-existing Australia before European settlement, an ancient land with unique and sometimes weird animals.

The place of education

The rural children were much more likely to offer favourable comments about their education than had the city children of our earlier interviews. Some country
children see a good education as one of the privileges associated with being Australian, for instance:

*Int:* Why would you put pictures of schools in your collage of Australia?

*Lily (Riverland):* ‘cause there’s a lot of people that don’t get education like us.

*Tom:* Put the words ‘good education’ because education is strong here and in some countries education is very poor.

And from the South East

*Lara:* [If living in another country, I would miss] ... the good education. I would miss Australian food too because it would be different food there.

Nor did the children limit their idea of education to the schooling alone:

*Billy (South East):* I was going to say that some countries can’t have cars and that because they haven’t got TAFEs [Institutes of Technical and Further Education] and that to make people become engineers and all that.

They evidently understand the purposes of a good education in functional terms, and the idea of good education emerges very clearly as one of their values.

*Joanna (Barossa):* And we’ve got schooling where some other places haven’t. We’ve got classrooms and they have to sit outside and do their lessons.

For educators it is heartening to note that the ideal of good education was widely shared by these rural children. In these discussions there was no talk about choice of school – you lived in a particular place and you went to the nearest public school. For most of them their experience of schooling was grounded in terms of the one institution they had attended all their schooldays. They readily admitted to a sense of privilege about having a good education and also they were almost universally positive about their schools.

**Symbols of place**

In their quest to identify symbols of Australia for the collage, the city children had almost all offered examples of Australian icons derived from features of the built environment associated with the eastern states and in particular with Sydney. Thus they nominated the Harbour Bridge and the Opera House as preferred images of Australia, reflecting perhaps the dominance of Sydney in terms of population and its more frequent appearance in representations of Australia with which they are familiar. (South Australian buildings or city features were rarely mentioned if at all, despite the fact that all the children were from SA.) The rural students, on the other
hand, were more likely to nominate natural icons – Uluru, Flinders Ranges, McDougall Ranges, Murray River – many of which belong in their home state, others such as Uluru and the Olgas lying just across the border in the Northern Territory.

**Jill (Lower North): Uluru and the Olgas**

**Michael:** Because we are proud of them

**Jill:** Because people like to see them

**Tim:** Because we are proud that they are natural and they are not all man made like some countries are and we are proud of them

**Van:** Yeah ... like temples and stuff

A rejection of the built environment and awareness and positive valuing of the natural environment came through many of the rural children’s choices in terms of ways to represent Australia. For example:

**Denise (Lower-North):** And I’d put pictures of like all the different environments because that’s part of Australia, like deserts, and rainforests and mountain ranges.

Another notable difference between urban and rural respondents concerned the fact that the rural children were much more likely to nominate ANZAC day and Gallipoli as possible inclusions on their collage. In other words they appeared more aware of Australia’s military past than had the city children. In seeking to explain this difference we noted the presence in every country town of the war memorial as a built feature and the annual services that take place around this structure in which the townsfolk are routinely involved. For these children such rituals enabled a sense of history and served to ‘create a sense of collective identity’ (Barton et al, 1998:1) as Australian citizens, regardless of their own particular origins.

**It’s my place**

Virtually all the children expressed positive concepts of Australia and wanted to demonstrate this pictorially, but there were some interesting differences too. While all the children, both rural and urban, suggested the inclusion of happy smiling people – all sorts of people, young and old, black and white and so on - in their collage of Australia, the rural children were much more likely to nominate pictures of themselves as well in their list of worthy and desirable inclusions. In talking about this they affirmed a sense of self as Australian and therefore affirmed their right to be featured in any representation of the country. Just as the American children had used the pronoun ‘we’ and ‘ours’ when talking about the American revolution, regardless of their own particular ethnicity or gender (Barton et al, 1998:3), so too did these rural young Australians describe their country as ‘our place’. 
Conclusions

The storylines/songlines that were evident across the different locations of the children reflect some of the dominant ways of thinking about contemporary Australia. The differences between rural and urban children described above should not be seen to mask the very real and notable similarities between the groups. All the children expressed positive feelings about Australia and some of these broadly shared responses to the idea of being Australian are developed elsewhere (Gill and Howard, 2002). In this too they echoed the findings of the American study in which the young people said “From all over the world people come here. Straight to America. Better than any other country.” (Cornbleth, 2002:531). Like the American students, our young informants shared in an evident desire to claim their place as ‘best in the world’.

In the absence of the traditional songlines/storylines that once filled the curriculum in Australian primary schools, the rural children’s sense of their country remains highly congruent with the older traditional images, although the country no longer appears quite as abundant as it once used to be. Urban children constructed their storylines around global themes such as the evident multiculturalism in their lived experience, sporting achievements in an international arena and east coast icons of the built environment. On the other hand for rural children the iconography is more linked to natural symbols, sky, weather, geography, landscape and above all space. Space also had connotations over and above room to move. It signified freedom, lack of constraint at a spiritual and psychological level, as well as the physical level. The nature/culture binary is reflected in these responses. The urban children saw themselves as part of the current scene in their ready acceptance of other cultures and their capacity to identify with aspects of their culture and the man made environment. The rural children, on the other hand, construct themselves in terms of the natural environment in which they are positioned as free to be themselves, unfettered in movement and capacity for noise making, unrestricted by rules and regulations that they see as constraining the urban dweller – for example the capacity to do burn-outs on one’s motorbike in the back paddock.

Most interestingly perhaps was the way in which the rural children positioned themselves within the landscape in terms of their ready nomination of natural icons, their repeated avowals of their love of animals and trees and their insistence on presenting themselves pictured within the collage. They were key players within their understanding of what it meant to be Australian whereas the city children had more readily engaged with the idea of principles binding a society together, ideals of inclusiveness and multiculturalism. While many of the rural children also affirmed these principles, for them a sense of the land itself in terms of the physical environment was the more dominant theme.

In conclusion it would appear that the old storylines are being to some degree recycled in these rural children’s accounts of Australian ways. Like Patterson’s fictional hero in Clancy of the Overflow, they affirm a sense of space and freedom associated with life away from the city. A similar feature of the old storylines being recycled in current students’ interpretations was revealed by studies of Canadian students’ accounts of social change (den Heyer, 2002). Currently popular media have contributed to the celebration of the good life in locations removed from the city (viz: Sea Change and McLeod’s Daughters) suggesting that this mind-set is not limited to rural youth.

Similarly too Australian rural students have negative associations with the idea of the city in terms of its polluted environment, its crime, its crowdedness and they
describe a sense of danger permeating city life. They delight in the natural environment in which they experience themselves as properly located. The point here is not simply to suggest that the older storylines are being seamlessly recycled by rural youth. It could be that they are building a construction of the joys of country living from the truths of their daily experience and that the image of the crowded and polluted city serves simply to legitimate this position. However the frequency of their negative allusions to the city across the different rural locations would seem to indicate a shared need to represent the city as other in order to validate their claims.

Implications for civics and citizenship education

In terms of the educational project of developing understandings of citizenship and national identity there are some worrying trends that emerge from the data. Neither rural nor urban children appeared to have a sense of the country as a whole. First there is a sense in which the children’s negative views of the city and life in the city run counter to the current population movements which record a shrinking of country towns as country people move to the cities seeking work and livelihood. Given that most of these children will spend their adult lives as urban dwellers such negative associations are potentially dysfunctional.

Secondly their reiterated sense of their place as not-the-city appears to have emerged without the mediation of school learning but rather as a random amalgam of community attitudes augmented by media reports on the nightly news of crime, killings and mayhem. Without the attention to a sense of the country as a whole that used to be delivered through traditional social studies, these rural youth appear to have elevated the local in ways that are perhaps not congruent with the reality of life beyond their immediate neighbourhood. Their general concept appears as a non-school based cultural construction of ‘here’ which is essentially and fundamentally defined as ‘not there’ – not the other, dangerous, unknown city. Whereas the city children had tended to view themselves as incredibly better off than the people from other places whom they saw on television amidst war, famine and cultural and religious persecution, for these country children the city itself had become the frightening ‘other’.

For educators there are some concerns that this binary distinction between city and country, this regenerated ‘false dichotomy’ (Kapferer, 1990, p.87), may preclude young Australians from a more accurate appreciation of the range of lifestyles possible in contemporary Australia. After all, our cities may not warrant the negative associations offered by the rural children. Moreover it seems that the city children are largely unaware of the space and freedoms associated with life in the country. Education should avoid reinforcing simplistic perceptions and work instead to break down misconceptions and promote informed choice. Some schools have implemented programmes deliberately designed to overcome the sort of stereotyping we describe here. In some cases this has involved outlying and country schools operating a ‘city year’ for their students during the course of their schooling. In others, there is the option of spending time at a rural location for at least one half the school year so that students gain an awareness of life in the country grounded in sustained experience and not simply as tourists. And of course, in some wealthy schools, there are travel programmes for senior students who can learn from experiences of life in different societies to regard difference as neither threatening nor necessarily wrong.
Schooling has a responsibility to facilitate a revisioning of the social for young Australians in ways that contribute to social inclusion and avoid the traps of the urban/rural divide. The whole country stands to gain by education programmes that promote real understanding of the many different ways in which people choose to live in Australia. The ideal is not to eradicate regional differences but rather to celebrate them within a general understanding of the country as a whole, a ‘political imaginary’ (Hall, 1996) in which people can come together to make decisions for all Australians. And from this broad understanding comes the basis from which to educate for national and global citizenship.
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DISCUSSION PIECE

Revisiting Postman and Weingartner’s ‘New Education’ – is Teaching Citizenship a Subversive Activity?

RALPH LEIGHTON, Canterbury Christ Church University

ABSTRACT  This article revisits many of the characteristics of the ‘New Education’ as identified and discussed by Postman and Weingartner (1976), and considers them as central in the development of citizenship as a National Curriculum subject in England. The content of the original is briefly reframed to address this suggested centrality within a specific and specified meaning of ‘subversive’. In being influenced by a number of contemporaneous contributions to the sociology of education such as those of Bernstein (1973), Illich (1973), Goodman (1975), Bowles and Gintis (1976), and Willis (1977), reference is made to the significance to current educational developments of what was described some thirty years ago as the New Education. The paper concludes that, if citizenship education in English schools is not being subversive, it is not achieving its objectives.

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

Chris Woodhead, former Chief Inspector of Schools for England [1]

"Load up on guns and bring your friends, it’s fun to lose and to pretend
She’s over bored and self-assured: oh no, I know a dirty word.
With the lights out it’s less dangerous. Here we are now, entertain us."

Nirvana ‘Smells Like Teen Spirit’ [2]

Introduction

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

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

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

Evidence that there might be an intended subversive edge to the Citizenship Education National Curriculum can be found in the Final Report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship, now commonly referred to as “The Crick Report” after the chair of that group, Professor Sir Bernard Crick. The advisory group was established by the then Secretary of State for Education David Blunkett immediately after the Labour Party election victory of 1997, with terms of reference requiring advice ‘on effective education for citizenship in schools’ (Crick, 1998:4) and expecting ‘a broad framework for what good citizenship in schools might look like, and how it can be successfully delivered . . . [including] the involvement of pupils in the development of school rules and policies’ (Crick, 1998:4). In the introduction to their report, the Advisory Group stated that its aim was ‘no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally: for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in the public life and with the critical capacities to weigh evidence before speaking and acting;’ (Crick, 1998:7). There might be a rationale for concern that enabling people to perceive themselves as active members of their society, able to exert influence and to develop critical awareness could be viewed as a change in political culture in a modern democracy. There can be little doubt that expectations of increasing pupils’ influence over their schools and encouraging them to question from their own experiences and perspectives was a radical departure from the National Curriculum
of the previous ten years. These priorities would indeed lead to the concerns raised by Woodhead at the beginning of this article.

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

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

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

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

**Postman and Weingartner (1976) revisited**

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

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

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

Citizenship Education should be about being critical, learning that learning can be fun, that there are as many right answers as there are people searching for them. It is therefore the antithesis of what Postman and Weingartner (1976:32) disparage as ‘The Vaccination Theory of Education’ – the perception that the professional knows what is best, and that substance and dosage are both outside of the recipients’ control.

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

The approach that it doesn’t matter who teaches Citizenship denigrates both the subject and the staff involved, and limits the opportunities for school students to understand and to make progress. It reflects the politicians’ lip-service to public accountability and is equally unsuccessful. It is tantamount to saying ‘it doesn’t matter, you don’t matter’, accepting the moderate and the mundane rather than seeking to excel – ‘it is okay to be medium’ seems to be the message. To say anything else while failing to implement legal and educational obligations is bound to be uncovered by the crap detectors, and that failure is symptomatic of the social reality citizenship seeks to subvert.

As Postman and Weingartner (1976) assert, much of pupils’ involvement in the processes of education has been based on guesswork – guess how apparently disparate strands are interconnected, guess what answer the teacher wants, guess what is RIGHT and TRUE – but with the valued questions, values behind the questions, and arbitration on validity of guesses, being in the sole remit of teachers.

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

Dedication to ‘older learning media’, Kuhn’s perception of dominant but unshifting paradigms, might here reflect a fear of inquiry or a fear of uncovering inadequacy amongst decision makers and commentators, a preference for their own feelings of security and superiority rather than looking to develop and enhance the prospects of future generations. Bowles and Gintis’ (1976) Correspondence Theory leads us to conclude that such decision makers and commentators are determined that young people are not encouraged to have questioning, enquiring and critical approaches but, instead, should be acquiescent and accommodating.

However, citizenship is about being questioning. It is about being informed enough to know which questions to ask and of whom they should be asked, and alert to the consequences as well as the content of any answers. Asking directed and informed questions has been derided by Woodhead as a “utilitarian skill”; he places an emphasis on knowledge which assumes either that teachers can give pupils all the answers or that teachers and the National Curriculum for England must have absolute control over what constitutes appropriate knowledge. He also seems to forget that young people are asking questions and probably always have done.
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In England, Citizenship is about involvement – one of the three National Curriculum strands requires that students are enabled to develop skills of active involvement and participation. Where the teacher is considered “an authority in a particular subject whose job it is to teach it” [1], the words resonate with the description CW Mills (1980) offered of professionals as people of narrow interests and narrower specialisms. There is nothing new in the idea of involving pupils in the curriculum nor in developing independent learning skills, but there is some opposition to this approach.

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

From observation of the teaching of citizenship, and in discussion with practicing teachers of Citizenship – both subject trained and non-specialists – it is clear that non-specialists regularly adopt and adapt ideas from student teacher specialists in order to make their own delivery of citizenship more relevant to their pupils. These trainees and teachers have indicated some commitment to citizenship and to ensuring its relevance to pupils as well as adhering to the National Curriculum. However, other research (Leighton, 2004a, 2004c) indicates that not all teachers of citizenship see the subject requirements and their professional obligations in the same light. That school management teams consulted with staff in only 29% of the schools where the subject has been introduced (Cleaver et al, 2003) does not bode well for any inquiry into the extent and outcomes of pupil consultation. When established teachers expect specialist trainees to work with non-specialist materials or wholly in conventional ways, lessons are rarely as successful, nor placements as successful, as when there is collaboration and innovation. Nonetheless such expectations are commonplace. It is also becoming clear that some schools welcome and develop a critical and questioning approach, welcoming pupil contributions and striving to make sure that citizenship is not only taught in innovative ways but that its content remains relevant.

One concern of the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted, 2003, 2005; Bell, 2005a, 2005b) - the inspectorate for education in England, directly accountable to Parliament – is the way in which citizenship is delivered, often cross-curricular provision with only a cursory relationship with National Curriculum requirements. Structures of delivery have been addressed elsewhere (Leighton, 2002, 2004b), but a common approach is to see the subject combined with Personal Social and Health Education (PSHE), or with Careers education, perhaps once a fortnight. It therefore becomes a subject perceived as of little academic value and little valued by the school, taught largely by non-specialists, an irrelevance and often a distraction from the ‘proper’ business of schooling. At least one school has changed from ‘Citizenship’ to ‘Life Skills’ as the pupils changed the final letter to a ‘t’, others offer PACE (Personal and Citizenship Education) or some other locally created but not necessarily even locally understood name. Bell (2005b) expresses particular
concern over the misunderstandings which lead to and develop from such misplaced provision.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. A 5 year moratorium on the use of textbooks – the rapidly changing nature of citizenship ‘knowledge’ and the wealth of resources being produced means that, although there are many books available, these are often used sparingly to aid learning, rather than as a substitute for learning.

2. Teachers teaching outside their own specialisms – with most citizenship teachers trained in other subjects and specialist trainees being graduates in other disciplines, all teachers of citizenship teach outside their specialisms.

3. Teachers who claim to ‘know’ their subject well should have to write a book on it – the introduction of citizenship education has seen a plethora of books produced, not always by teachers who could justify a claim to know the subject well. This has made the observation of principle 1 above all the easier to achieve.

4. Prohibit teachers from asking questions they already know the answers to – if only.

5. Requirement of evidence that a teacher has had a loving relationship with at least one other human being – the word ‘other’ being crucial here.

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

7. Citizenship pupils are expected to consider issues from a range of viewpoints other than their own, to have and respond to opportunities to communicate their own ideas, to recognise and celebrate diversity. This explicitly includes ethnic, local, regional national and international diversity; it also includes the expectation that ‘diversity’ is a theme, not a topic. Whatever topic or issue is being considered in class or in other environments, pupils should be enabled to understand that there is a range of perspectives, each based on particular experiences and values which may not be their own and, crucially for those who are or who feel marginalized (Labov,
1969; Torrey, 1970), which may indeed be their own but shared with others not in
the immediate vicinity.

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

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

Day (2004) writes of passion for one’s subject, for teaching, and for the future of
young people as essential emotional characteristics for teachers. It may be that there
are people who have drifted into teaching or while teaching who never had or no
longer have such passions. People get jaded. Their attitudes, interests, talents,
preferences, passions can change. If a person is no longer committed to upholding
the law, one might expect them to cease to be a police officer. If a person no longer
cares about the health of others, one might expect them to cease being a doctor. If a
person is no longer committed to the principles of learning and personal
development, goes this argument, one expects them to recognise their new or
previously submerged commitments, and give up teaching. If a person no longer
cares, or never did care, about Citizenship Education, it would follow that they
should not be involved in it. Previous research discussed elsewhere (Leighton
2004c) suggests that there are at least six identifiable positions regarding teachers’
views on teaching citizenship: commitment; conversion; co-existence; colonisation;
compliance; conflict. It was found that those teachers who fit the first two categories
felt best equipped to deliver an active and critical Citizenship Education curriculum,
and could demonstrate their effectiveness, but that many teachers were to be found
in the other categories. Such teachers were not engaged with their subject, and
neither, in the main, were their pupils.

Finally

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

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

Correspondence: RALPH LEIGHTON, Old Sessions House, Canterbury Christ Church University, North Holmes Road, Canterbury CT1 1QU
   email: rl38@canterbury.ac.uk
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Book Reviews

Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives

Last year my graduate class on comparative multicultural policies visited a multiracial, multilingual high school in Toronto, Ontario. Arguably the most diverse city in North America, Toronto is only 90 miles north of our post-industrial rust belt city but a world away. This school exhibited many of the problems we associate with urban schools in the U.S. (i.e. a high truancy rate, sporadic school violence, with only a minority of students who were college bound). Yet the students we observed debated Canadian human rights policy, spoke proudly of their 30 hour fast to dramatize world hunger, and commemorated the U. N. Declaration Against Racial Discrimination. As one Buffalo teacher noted, ‘These urban high school students see themselves as global citizens. How come our kids in Buffalo don’t?’

One explanation may be the current approach to diversity issues and citizenship education in post 9/11 America. Because public schools are “ideological templates revealing and organizing national aspirations, myths, symbols, and standards” (Finkelstein, 1984:275), educating for citizenship in the United States has become reduced to ‘patriotism based on fear’, with the official discourse about building ‘walls’, patrolling borders, and narrowing the definition of who ‘counts’ as a citizen. This renewed American xenophobia is occurring within an increasingly global neo-liberal context that links education to ‘market values’ and marginalizes many groups world–wide (Carnoy, 1999:17).

Happily, there is a powerful counternarrative to these narrow notions of citizenship and globalization that explores and promotes multicultural citizenship globally. In Diversity and Citizenship Perspectives: Global Perspectives, James Banks and his colleagues from Canada, Britain, South Africa, Brazil, Israel, Palestine, Russia, Japan, India, and China push the boundaries of mainstream multicultural education beyond the ‘politics of recognition’ in particular nation states to a global conversation about justice and equality in a transnational arena. The authors lay bare a number of issues in the process: the importance of students developing cultural, national, and global identifications (Banks, Introduction); the conflict between domestic multiculturalism and ‘cosmopolitan multiculturalism’ where diversity is viewed as ‘good for business’ (Ong, Chapter 2); the historical development of multicultural and citizenship policies and programs in Canada (Joshee, Chapter 5); ethnic identity development in Japan (Murphy-Shigematsu, Chapter 11); and working for social justice as an intrinsic part of citizenship for oppressed groups in Brazil (Gonçalves e Silva, Chapter 7) to name a few.

Stephen Castles (Chapter 1) begins the collection with an insightful essay that asserts that multiculturalism must include both the recognition of cultural diversity and the promotion of social equality. Walter Parker (Chapter 16) concludes the volume with a description of the thoughtful curriculum work needed to implement a citizenship education program that promotes democratic values, including
historiography, comparative constitutional studies, comparative ethnic studies, comparative poverty studies, and deliberation. Other chapters provide rich, thick descriptions of how diversity and citizenship issues play out in particular national contexts.

I’ve successfully used this book in my multicultural policy courses to help my American students reconceptualize diversity issues from alternative perspectives and de-centre their thinking. Democracy and Diversity, available free from the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington[1] provides a helpful accompanying checklist and bibliography for integrating effective multicultural citizenship principles and concepts in K – 12 classrooms. Imagine, if you will, a world where students and their teachers from Buffalo, Beijing, and Beirut learn to deliberate and work for social justice and equality in a globalized world. This book will help us get there.

Notes

References

Reviewer: Dr. Lauri Johnson, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA. Email: lauridj@buffalo.edu

International perspectives on citizenship, education and religious diversity

The last quarter of the 20th century has witnessed the proliferation within the public realm of religious discourses contested by globalization’s intense flow of peoples, ideas, technologies, and goods; modernity’s attachment to scientific and rationalist certainties; and late modernity’s celebration of uncertainty, multiplicity, difference, and particularity. Against this backdrop, the book’s questions such as “can people from different cultural, political or religious backgrounds live together in peace?” on page 204 are authentic. Rich in content and sophisticated in language, this well-structured edition of 11 chapters about the complex relationship between religious and citizenship education is divided into an analytical and a practical section.

Jackson’s introduction, followed by the volume’s first section, portray the various philosophical and historical perspectives on the concepts of citizenship, religion, and identity. These discussions highlight both the tensions and the opportunities they create for education about global justice. For example, can religion and religious education nourish both societal cohesion and pluralism, if “multicultural societies are to be conceived not as a patchwork of five or ten fixed cultural identities, but as an elastic web of cross-cutting and always mutually
situational identifications” (p. 11); Should religion and religious education be part of public schooling, remain confined to private, faith-based separate schools, or be provided outside school? Issues like these are central to the volume.

Unlike David Hargreaves (1994), this volume’s authors endorse religious education’s inclusion in public schools as “important for development of intercultural communication, tolerance and peace…” (p. 205). They warn that leaving religious education to others has proved to be too perilous. More so, as an important aspect of students’ background and as a complex phenomenon, religion can be engaged to enrich citizenship education. It can reinforce the humanistic values and ethics and create balanced, informed, and tolerant citizens who are neither embarrassed to meet the ‘other’ in their workplace, nor ashamed of ignorance while travelling to and living amongst people from different countries and cultures. As one Muslim mother articulates “A school that refrains from inter-religious education is evading its social responsibility. I do not want my child to be ‘foreignized’. I want her to live in calm and in diversity of colour.” (p. 206).

Grounded in culturalist, feminist, and South-African contexts, Chidester, Tobler, and Steyn in their chapters illustrate how modern concepts of citizenship and religion (e.g., Marshall’s (1950)) with Eurocentric and masculine agendas are becoming irrelevant. They propose to reconstruct these concepts to develop more inclusive, just, and empowered citizenship and society at local, national, transcultural, and global levels.

Leganger-Kronstad’s review of innovative practices in Scandinavia and Chidester’s critique of the ‘world religions’ course elsewhere are accompanied by an array of alternative pedagogies described by Ipgarve, Leganger-Krongstad, Weisse and Blaytock. These innovative pedagogies and classroom and community-related projects embrace experiential ethnography and personal interpretation, dialogue and diapractice, critical inquiry and research, reflection and debate, and open mindedness and tolerance.

Although the volume included an entire section dealing with practical issues, I wish the volume had included more detail about how controversial issues and extremist views are handled; how students, parents, and clerics react to these innovations; whether the learning materials represent religions pluralistically; how teachers cope with forces of cultural clashes and divisions; how the ‘incompatibilities’ within and between various religious doctrines and practices, as well as between religious, secular and atheist worldviews are overcome. Finally, while the emphasis on Islam is understandable given recent events, the volume would have been more balanced by more attention to other religions and the inclusion of more internationally diverse scholarship. These additions could help this otherwise wonderful book to provide teachers, teacher educators, and proponents of interfaith and intercultural dialogue with richer portrayals and more realistic hopes to draw from in enriching their practice. I highly recommend the volume to all those interested in creating a more inclusive and just world.
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Participatory Citizenship: Identity, Exclusion, Inclusion

Edited by Ranjita Mohanty & Rajesh Tandon. Published 2006 by Sage Publications.

Citizenship educators perhaps have a tendency to see ‘participation’ as a relatively uncontentious ‘good thing’ as they seek to promote the knowledge, skills and experiential practice of effective and democratic citizenship in their work with young people. It is thus salutary and thought provoking to have the concept of ‘participatory citizenship’ problematized and exemplified in this collection of case studies drawn from different parts of India. As George Orwell might have put it – all people can participate, but some participate more equally than others. For low caste ‘dalits’, women in different settings, tribal nomads, shantytown, pavement or slum dwellers, participation means unequal competition with those who are better equipped socially and materially.

The editors pose some key questions: “In a country like India, which is diverse, hierarchichal, complex, faction-ridden and where a large number of people are still deprived of the basic necessities of everyday living, can the marginalized citizen be [change agents]? What are the structural barriers to this? What enabling environment is required to make the citizen act and engage? How is development to be executed so that includes and not alienates people?” (p.13). The essence of this book focuses on examples of projects which seek to turn what can often be an exclusive citizenship experience into an inclusive one.

There are fascinating case studies relating, for example, to the ‘marginalised citizenship’ of various nomadic groups in Rajasthan and the obstacles to ‘citizen action’ as villagers sought to campaign against the sitting and operation of a controversial power plant near the port city of Vizag in Andhra Pradesh. Two chapters focus upon projects that actively support an increasing role for women in grass-roots democracy. The first explores the work of the organization Mahila Samakhya in Uttar Pradesh in seeking to overcome significant barriers to women’s participation in political processes at various levels. The second looks closely at the roles of women elected representatives in local government committees Kerala, the southern-most state of India (the 73rd Amendment of 1992, mandating 33 per cent reservation of women as members and heads of Panchayat (local government) bodies has created an opportunity for large number of rural women in India to take part in the public institutions). The final chapter is a rich comparative study of three formerly largely excluded groups in West Bengal – two tribal groups, the Hill Kharia and the Santals and ‘low caste’ villagers. This is a qualified success story of ‘Citizenship as practice’ enabling the marginalised to participate – “in all the three situations possession of cultivable land and through it food security led the people to seek for themselves and their future generations better life chances” (p.228)

On a critical note, in places the book bears evidence of its roots in a thematic academic conference – the sociological jargon gets rather impenetrable in places and there is quite a lot of repetition of key themes in relation to the discussions around identity and inclusion. This reader found the evocative details, stories and struggles for participation in the essays in Section 2, much more engaging than the theoretical studies focused respectively upon identity, participation, inclusion in development projects, and governance which precede them. Moreover, the book would have benefited from more critical proof-reading – there are too many inaccuracies in the ways in which arguments are communicated for comfort.
This is not a book that has been written for educationists. Indeed it is rather quiet on the role of education in India – for young people and adults – as an emancipatory agent. Rather it is aimed at social policy-makers and those with an interest in development studies. Nevertheless, readers will leave this book better informed about fascinating and complex civil debates in the world’s largest democracy and less complacent about the participation of marginalized groups in society.

Reviewer: Dr. Peter Brett, St. Martin’s College, Carlisle, UK. Email: p.brett@ucsm.ac.uk

Citizenship and the Challenge of Global Education

By Audrey Osler & Kerry Vincent (foreword by Glenys Kinnock). Published 2002 by Trentham Books, Stoke on Trent.

It is now common to read that the forces of globalization have so thoroughly transformed how ‘citizenship’ is being experienced that we need to construct new ways of relating to other citizens around the world, and that for the sake of democracy we must re-imagine and redefine the term itself. Related to this is the massive increase in attention now being paid to citizenship education globally, including major initiatives being implemented in several countries. Writing from a position of deep commitment to equity education, Audrey Osler and Kerry Vincent in this volume address head-on the question of how educators ought to prepare students to participate as (reconstructed) citizens of our (transformed) world.

Osler and Vincent have written this accessible and well-organized book primarily to support teachers, student teachers, and teacher educators charged with the development of citizenship education programmes. They suggest that it would also be of interest to researchers of comparative and international education policy—along with policy-makers themselves. Perhaps their sense of what these audiences need or want is what causes them to avoid a more explicitly critical or radical political approach. Still, the authors are guided by the conviction that young people need to learn how to live together as interdependent members of local and global communities through schooling that rises to ‘the challenge of teaching for equity, justice and solidarity’.

The volume is composed of seven chapters, written in three parts. In the two chapters of part one, the authors draw on various international policy documents to define global education and then argue for the need to mainstream it within national citizenship education initiatives. It is a broad definition, inclusive of strategies, policies, plans, and principles that helpfully emphasizes the need to teach for, and with, and not merely about, human rights and social justice.

Working with a narrative that recognizes multiple (political, technological, and cultural, as well as [not only] economic) dimensions to the globalization process, Osler and Vincent outline their rationale for developing ‘cosmopolitan’ (rather than more nationally-oriented) citizens. Citing the terrorism of September 11th 2001, the Social Forum in Porto Allegre, Brazil, in 2002, and the work of David Held, the authors suggest that ‘overlapping communities of fate’, and the need for democratic solutions and institutions at local, regional, and global levels, de-centre the nation state as ‘the most appropriate locus of democracy’ and hence citizenship. They
recommend, therefore, a future-oriented educational process that recognizes more fluid citizenship based on multiple shared identities and allegiances. It is one that ideally emphasizes peace, development, and sustainability; develops the skills of political literacy; and hopefully and ultimately enables youth to influence and shape globalization in pro-democratic ways.

The second part of the book (chapters three to six) focuses on case studies of global education, again broadly conceived, within Denmark, England, the Republic of Ireland, and the Netherlands. The authors analyze the extent to which governments promote and support, through policy and its imperfect implementation, school age learners' understanding of global interdependence and their capacity to participate in democratic ways. In the final chapter and part, the authors seek to apply their findings to the British context, exploring implications from the case study analyses for cosmopolitan citizenship and citizenship education, particularly for English schools.

There is much to appreciate about this book. To their readers’ great benefit, Osler and Vincent are willing to take firm positions; for example, they are unwavering in their conviction that students need to be taught the skills of political literacy in strategic ways that promote democracy and human rights on a global scale. To cite another of several strengths, their analysis of the gap between policy and practice, and the descriptions they provide of the types of supports teachers require to implement both the good (and the better parts of the not-so-good) global education policies and initiatives are particularly practical and helpful. For the most part, readers benefit from writing that is jargon-free and straightforward.

What is missing is a full and explicit interrogation of how key concepts, such as cosmopolitanism, identity, and indeed even political literacy/action, relate to less commonsensical/more radical narratives of globalization. Such analyses of globalization would, in my view, of necessity take the market, militarism, class politics, neo-liberalism, and the role of the nation state in international political economy very seriously. Such analyses would also likely lead to the acknowledgement that there are deeply uneven human interests in preserving and challenging the status quo--surely a prerequisite for political action capable of producing real and significant democratic change. This kind of theoretical engagement might enable citizenship educators committed to social justice to analyze more effectively who materially benefits and who pays the costs associated with the persistent problems of institutionalized racism and classism, etc., in British education (and elsewhere).

When ‘globalization’ is named as a key rationale for re-imagining ‘citizenship’, it is important to be unambiguous. How we conceptualize both of these terms has important practical as well as theoretical implications. If we have an incomplete appreciation of how and why political, cultural, and economic globalization shapes and constrains the decision-making capacity of citizens (and the social groups and nation states to which they belong), then our capacity to act to promote popular sovereignty and educational equity is certain also to be limited.

Reviewer: Terezia Zoric, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. Email: tzoric@oise.utoronto
Notes for Contributors

By accepting publication in the Journal contributors grant the right to the editorial committee to publish contributions electronically and in hard copy. Contributors should bear in mind that they are addressing an international audience and so must avoid the use of jargon, acronyms without explanation or the use of specialist terms (especially in relation to grades, ages, phases of schooling). Please ensure that writing is, as far as possible, free from bias, for instance, by avoiding sexist and racist language.

Articles and Book Reviews should be sent by e-mail attachment to the administrator of the journal, Roma Woodward (rlw8@canterbury.ac.uk). It is important that articles are not sent direct to the editor as this would disallow the possibility of anonymous review. The articles that have been submitted will be passed to the editor by the administrator. The editor will send submitted articles for anonymous review. Two referees will review each submission. Should there be disagreement between the reviewers the editor will approach a third person for a judgement. Proofs will not always be sent to the author.

Articles should be of between 4000 and 6000 words, double spaced with ample margins and bear the title of the contribution, the name(s) of the author(s) and the name to be used for correspondence together with e-mail and surface addresses. Each article should be accompanied by an abstract of 100-200 words on a separate sheet, and a short note of biographical details. Book reviews should be of between 400 and 600 words in length. Please enclose a note with your review, stating that the review has not been submitted or published elsewhere.

All material must be submitted in Microsoft MS Word format, as intended for publication. Tables and captions should appear within the text. Tables should be numbered by Roman numerals and figures by Arabic numerals. Captions should include keys to symbols. The editor will not normally accept figures. However, if they are absolutely necessary they should be submitted in a finished form suitable for reproduction at the size that will be used in the published version of the article and in any case not to exceed 125mm in width. The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) should be used as a guide for spellings. Permissible alternative spellings should follow the OED, eg verbal forms which can end in –ize or –ise should be given the –ize form.

References should be indicated in the text by giving the author’s name, with the year of publication in parentheses. Please note that use of ‘op cit’ and ‘ibid’ is not acceptable. If several papers by the same author and from the same year are cited, a, b, c, etc. should be put after the year of publication. Where a page number is to be referenced, the style should be (Author, Year: PageNumber) eg (Hahn, 1999:232). The references should be listed in full at the end of the paper in the following standard form:


Quotations from texts should be supported by a page number in addition to the usual text reference. Where the quotation is more than a short sentence, it should be presented as a separate paragraph without any quotation marks and followed by the reference. Short quotations should be included in the same paragraph surrounded by quotation marks ie double inverted commas. Where the quotation is not from a particular source then the words should be surrounded by single inverted commas eg In what ways do specialist secondary school teachers characterize ‘educating for citizenship’ and why?