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Abstract

This study examines the role of non-governmental organisations in the provision of citizenship education in England and South Korea. In-depth case studies were carried out using interviews, observations, and documentary analysis according to Crick’s three strands of citizenship education: social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy. The research identifies the aims and the practice of citizenship education both in schools and NGOs, and finds that there are common notions of citizenship education. However, this research finds that none of the NGOs in this research would fully meet the requirements of Crick’s three strands, or has equal balance between them. The study argues that the NGOs as citizenship education providers have different roles in delivering such education and these roles need to be acknowledged in citizenship education policy. The crucial aspects identified are that NGOs play a key role in connectivity between schools and community, and that non-formal settings are a significant but important influence on the development of citizenship among young people. The study proposes that more research is necessary to understand the role of NGOs in the future development of citizenship education within a global citizenship education framework.

Introduction

This study aims to compare the practice of citizenship education through Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) England and South Korea. I have chosen two different NGOs from each country to compare the provision of citizenship education in each. This study presents the four case studies of the provision of citizenship education by different NGOs and it examines the issues in the NGOs in relation to citizenship education, including the NGOs’ connectivity role more widely within the education sector, with the aim of exploring how to bridge the gap between formal education and less formal education.
The research methodology has been qualitative, involving in-depth case studies. To pursue this qualitative research, interviews, observations and analysis of NGO documents were used as research instruments.

**Wider rationales**

**The growing importance of citizenship education:**

Firstly, the choice of topic came from the growing importance of citizenship education, or of citizenship itself, as well as democratic education in both England and South Korea. This growth, however, has not been unproblematic. The terms ‘democracy’ and ‘human rights’ have been used much in relation to the political and social constraints of Korea, in order to show that democracy and human rights mirror a distinctive social context. Since independence from the Japanese occupation in 1945, the Korean education system has been used as a tool to achieve socio-economic growth, and educational development itself has been ignored in the interests of national economic development (Korean Educational Development Institution, 2002). However, Article 1 of the law on basic education clarifies the aims of education as *Hong Ik In Gan* (Maximum Service to Humanity with one another) which means that education should meet the needs of individuals as well as society as a whole, and individual persons should have the right to pursue their well being. In order to promote democratic ideals and national development, educational law has laid emphasis on the development of abilities and the forming of character as the path to personal fulfilment, since independence from the Japanese occupation (MOE, 2003).

In parallel, since September 2002, citizenship education has been launched in the national curriculum as a compulsory subject in secondary education in England and there have been ongoing debates about such provision of citizenship education (Harber, 2002). While the DfES
has tried hard to establish the new subject properly, the lack of trained teachers, materials and funding were seen to remain big problems (Harber, 2002).

Osler and Starkey (2006:4-9) argue that there is the increasing growth in interest in citizenship education over the past decades in national and international contexts. For them, the six key contextual factors which help explain such increasing interest in citizenship education are

- Global injustice and inequality
- Globalisation and migration
- Concerns about civic and political engagement
- Youth deficit
- The end of the cold war
- Anti-democratic and racist movements

Therefore, I would like to explore the reason why a society or a nation seeks citizenship education and the background to citizenship education in different contexts.

The importance of Non-formal education and NGO work

In particular, citizenship education is very difficult to fit into just a school setting because citizenship and democratic learning may require more practice outside school than any other subject. As the Crick Report (QCA, 1998) says, citizenship education should be linked with other subjects, being more a way of life, and being a step into participation in real life and experience.

On the other hand, citizenship education cannot be taught only in out of school settings because the meaning of citizenship education for young people requires balance between school life and social life. Therefore my assumption is that for citizenship education the formal educational sector or school should work together with the non-formal educational sector, NGOs and Youth Organisations. Until now, in both England and South Korea, there appear to have been few
attempts to combine formal education and non-formal education and to try to support formal education from the NGO side.

I believe that the role of the non-formal educational sector has become more crucial than ever. Santiso (2002) states that over the past three decades there has been a considerable increase in the importance of Non Governmental Organisations in developing countries as well as in developed countries. These organisations have been attracting visibility, recognition and legitimacy in the governments, international organisations and agencies, the media and the general public. These trends are possibly because of their humanitarian aid action on the ground as well as their acting as protagonists in development and social regulation on an equal footing with the state and the private sector (Balbis, 2001). Yet some NGOs have also been criticised as dangerous and radical groups locally and internationally by states and political parties and other organisations, because they are working in human rights, the strengthening and participation of civil society, preservation of the environment, the search for production alternatives, local development, the promotion of minorities, and the defence of threatened cultures (Balbis, 2001). It is very clear that NGOs’ power and influence cannot be ignored any more. It is argued that formal educational sectors should be prepared to work together with NGOs and accept their flexibilities and variety, because schools have already been burdened enough by competition for higher education and other problems (MOE, 2000).

There are several NGOs that are doing citizenship education alongside formal education. I would like to understand the general background of NGOs’ citizenship education provision. However, the citizenship education provision attempts from NGOs do not have a long history, and there has not been much research on NGOs working alongside formal education, especially
concerning citizenship education. The idea that non-formal education institutions can play a key role in educational goals together with formal education gave me encouragement to research this subject. In South Korea, citizenship education in relation to democratic education is still regarded as very dangerous and is seen as misused by politicians according to their agenda (Korea Democracy Foundation, 2002). Therefore I think that the role of NGOs in radical citizenship education could be very important. NGOs could help schools and pupils to understand the full potential of citizenship education and provide a variety of materials with their specialised know-how. Schools and teachers are seen as not well equipped to deliver citizenship education on their own (Harber, 2002). I hope that my research can be a bridge to connect non-formal education and formal education to promote a superior citizenship education.

**Why these particular NGOs?**

I chose for my study four different NGOs delivering citizenship education alongside schools. First of all, I tried to find good examples of citizenship organisations through documents published and websites, and by seeking expertise in the citizenship education field. The first NGO is the YMCA in Korea which has an independent citizenship education department. They have more than 120 youth clubs across the country delivering citizenship education through extra curricular activities. The second NGO is the Young Korean Academy. This has been a very well known citizenship education organisation for the last century in South Korea and is still playing an important role in delivering citizenship education with schools and other NGOs. The third NGO, in England, is Community Service Volunteers (CSV). CSV promotes and supports active citizenship education programmes in schools, colleges and universities. Each year CSV enables 45,000 young people to learn and develop in and beyond the classroom by participating in activities that enrich local communities through the arts, science and sport. CSV supports
schools in implementing citizenship education, providing quality of tuition and materials in active learning through such programmes as: Active Citizenship, Reading Together, Peer Mentoring, Learning Together-Tutoring, and Volunteering Mentoring. They also offer a number of one and half-day training sessions for teachers, students and adult volunteers. The training sessions introduce citizenship education through community involvement and provide up-to-date curriculum changes and classroom practices (Potter, 2002). Finally, the fourth NGO, again in England, is United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), which has set up a Citizenship Education Monitoring Project (CEMP). I chose UNICEF because this organisation was very supportive of my research. The aim of CEMP is to assess how citizenship is developed in schools, in particular how the human rights aspect is incorporated, and whether there is any subsequent change in the way adults and pupils relate and participate in decision making in schools. In summer 2001 and 2002 UNICEF produced reports of good practice of how schools are introducing the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child into their schools and the results.

Research methodology

Choice of methodology:

Two NGOs from each country which were involved in education for democratic citizenship, have been researched in depth. All four NGOs in this research were happy to be involved in my research, although others initially contacted did not want to be involved for a number of reasons. Some NGOs replied that they were already engaged with other research so could not help. Others did not reply at all. The research methods have included interviews with NGO staff, teachers and young people; observation of activities in classroom and in the NGOs and critical evaluation of NGO documentation and any relevant school documentation. To gain a general
idea of the implementation of citizenship education, I have studied other NGOs (such as YWCA, Citizen’s Action Network, and Amnesty International) through informal interviews and observations. This has complemented the more in-depth cases.

My research design according to the research methodology is as follows:

**Table 1 Four NGO Case Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK</th>
<th>KOREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Service Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2 Observations of extra curricular classes with school curriculum on/off premises**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSV</th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>YMCA</th>
<th>YKA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3 Number of interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK</th>
<th>KOREA</th>
<th>CSV</th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>YMCA</th>
<th>YKA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts(policymakers/academic)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (small groups of 3-4 students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4 Timeline for observations and interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YMCA (observations &amp; interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YKA (observations &amp; interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF (observations &amp; interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV (observations &amp; interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics in Korea (interviews)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research findings: overall comparison of the four NGOs

In this study of the four NGOs I analysed the research findings according to Crick’s three strands which are requirements for ‘effective education for citizenship’. Crick clarifies that the three strands are related to each other, mutually dependent on each other, but each needing a somewhat different place and treatment in the curriculum (QCA, 1988:11). The three strands are social and moral responsibility, community involvement and political literacy. The reason why I want to analyse my research findings according to these is that Crick’s three strands appear to be the most inclusive of the requirements for citizenship education. Another reason is that they are the first citizenship requirements for the national curriculum in England. Since the early 1990s Korean NGOs have been keen on delivering citizenship education, even though there were neither official requirements nor documents which can be used for assessment or guidelines for citizenship education. Therefore, my hypothesis is that the true meaning of democratic citizenship education is hardly found in Korean schools, although the Korean NGOs and Korean Teachers and Educational Workers’ Union (KTEWU) have been trying to put citizenship education into the national curriculum. The aim is to see whether Crick’s three strands for citizenship education can be a model and guideline for citizenship education both in England and Korea. Thus the first step is to determine whether they can form a useful framework for analysing practice.

In order to analyse the four case studies, I need to set up criteria and indicators. This involves expanding and elaborating on the meaning of the three strands.

Social and moral responsibility

The Crick report explains the meaning of social and moral responsibility as:
Social and moral responsibility: children learning from the very beginning self-confidence and socially morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom towards those in authority and towards each other (QCA, 1998: 40).

Also in the report Crick himself elaborates as follows:

This learning should be developed, not only in but also beyond school, whenever and wherever children work or play in groups or participate in the affairs of their communities. Some may think this aspect of citizenship hardly needs mentioning; but we believe it to be near the heart of the matter. Here guidance on moral values and personal development are essential preconditions of citizenship. Some might regard the whole of primary school education as pre-citizenship, certainly pre-political; but this is mistaken. Children are already forming through learning and discussion, concepts of fairness, and attitudes to the law, to rules, to decision-making, to authority, to their local environment and social responsibility etc. They are also picking up, whether from school, home or elsewhere, some knowledge of whether they are living in a democracy or not, of what social problems affect them and even what the different pressure groups or parties have to say about them. All this can be encouraged and built upon (QCA, 1998:11).

Based on the passage, there are two key phrases which are important to look for in thinking about responsibility. The first is ‘guidance on moral values and personal development’ as essential preconditions of citizenship which would emanate from the teacher. The second is ‘children are already forming through learning and discussion, concepts of fairness, and attitudes to the law…’ which might be found in student discussion and group work. A further gloss on responsibility is found later in the same document.

‘Responsibility’ is an essential political as well as moral virtue, for it implies care for others; premeditation and calculation about what effect actions are likely to have on others; and understanding and care for the consequences (QCA, 1998 : 13).
Pupils’ spiritual, moral, social and cultural development requires inspectors to evaluate the extent to which the school encourages pupils to relate positively to others, take responsibility, participate fully in the community, and develop an understanding of citizenship (QCA, 1998: 40).

From the above, I interpret encouraging pupils ‘to relate positively to others’, and ‘to take responsibility’ as ‘responsible relationships’. In order to define such relationships questions can be asked about whether teachers ‘model’ respect and adult relationships and interaction and whether students respect teachers and each other. Another possible question would be whether a NGO can change existing relationships between teachers and students.

There are however different views on responsibility. Patten (2000:193) argues that a theory of citizenship involves answers to three distinct questions: the membership question, the entitlement question and the responsibility question. Patten continues that the responsibility question is ‘what the community expects of one as a full member’. This would be difficult to determine in a small research project, but one could look for the way teacher constructs ‘the community’ and its ‘expectations’ or implied duties.

Dwyer (2004:40) summarised key aspects of citizenship according to T.H.Marshall. Marshall defined rights and responsibilities in terms of duties:

*If citizenship is invoked in defence of rights, the corresponding duties of citizenship cannot be ignored...The duty whose discharge is most obviously and immediately necessary for the fulfilment of the right is the duty to pay taxes and insurance contributions. Since these are compulsory, no act of will is involved, and no keen sentiment of loyalty. Education and military service are also compulsory. The other duties are vague, and are included in the general obligation to live the life of a good citizen, giving such service as can promote the welfare of the community... of paramount importance is the duty to work.*

*The essential duty is not to have a job and hold it, since that is relatively simple conditions of full*
employment, but to put one’s heart and soul into one’s job and work hard.

It will be interesting to see what emphasis is placed on compulsory duties, and on the duty to work hard.

A discourse of work is also found later in Crick report, but more in terms of working with others: the essential elements to be reached by the end of compulsory schooling (QCA, 1998: 44) include the elements for social and moral responsibility such as: co-operation and conflict, concern for the common good, a disposition to work with and for others with sympathetic understanding.

From all the above, we can see that there can be vague and extensive concepts or definitions of ‘social and moral responsibility’. However, in this study, the concept of ‘social and moral responsibility’ needs to be understood clearly and specifically. In order to analyse the four case studies, specific criteria around social and moral responsibility on the basis of Crick’s explanation will be used: guidance and practice on moral values and personal development, concepts of fairness and mutual respect, but also concepts of ‘duty’ and of ‘work’ and ‘working together’.

Therefore, in terms of ‘social and moral responsibility’, to analyse NGO citizenship education, the possible questions are:

- Do teachers and NGO staff guide students on moral values and personal development?
  
  In what way?
- Do teachers and NGO staff ‘model’ respect and adult relationships and interactions?
- Do students show respect for their teachers and NGO staff? In what way? Do they show respect for each other?
- Are students and staff aware of concepts associated with social responsibility, such as fairness, attitudes to the law?
- Do students and NGOs staff co-operate with each other or work together?
- Do the contents of the citizenship education stress ‘concern for the common good’? How?
- Is there mention of ‘community expectations’?

This leads into the second area, of community involvement.

**Community involvement**

Crick explains the meaning of community involvement as:

*Community involvement: pupils learning how to become helpfully involved in the life and concerns of their neighbourhood and communities, including learning through community involvement and service to the community* (QCA, 1998:40).

He also elaborates the meaning of community involvement in the essential elements to be reached by the end of citizenship education in compulsory education with a few examples such as commitment to voluntary service, the interdependence of individuals and local voluntary communities, and the economic system as it relates to individuals and communities (QCA, 1998:44). The voluntary aspect clearly relates to skills:
This, of course, like the other two branches of citizenship, is by no means limited to children’s time in school. Even if pupils and adults perceive many of the voluntary groups as non-political, the clearer meaning is probably to say ‘non-partisan’: for voluntary bodies when exercising persuasion, interacting with public authorities, publicising, fund-raising, recruiting members and then trying to activate (or placate) them, all such bodies are plainly using, and needing political skills (QCA, 1998:12).

The examples of community involvement appear more easily defined than responsibility, although the nature of ‘involvement’ needs care. It would mean helping young people to participate in community issues and concerns, and encouraging them to continue. It would mean a concern to create change or improvement, not simply participating.

Therefore, the hypothetical questions of ‘community involvement’ for citizenship education are:

- Do NGOs encourage young people to be involved in their community around current issues? How?
- What organisations or aspects of ‘community’ are connections made with?
- What activities do young people engage in?
- Is interdependence stressed?

Community involvement will require skills, and there will be overlap with the third strand.

**Political literacy**

The following statements comprise the explanation of political literacy in Crick report.

*Political literacy: pupils learning about and how to make themselves effective in public life through knowledge, skills and values*  (QCA, 1998: 41).
Pupils learning about and how to make themselves effective in public life through knowledge, skills and values - what can be called ‘political literacy’, seeking for a term that is wider than political knowledge alone. The term ‘public life’ is used in its broadest sense to encompass realistic knowledge of and preparation for conflict resolution and decision-making related to the main economic and social problems of the day, including each individual’s expectations of and preparations for the world of employment, and discussion of the allocation of public resources and the rationale of taxation. Such preparations are needed whether these problems occur in locally, nationally or internationally concerned organisations, or at any level of society from formal political institutions to informal groups, both at local or national level (QCA, 1998: 13).

The key point is that ‘literacy’ is more than knowledge, and requires complex skills and orientations, such as conflict resolution and decision-making around economic and social issues.

In terms of preparation for participation in public life, further skills are elaborated as follows:

*Citizenship education:* It should enable children and young people to develop discussion, communication and teamwork skills. It should help them learn to argue cogently and effectively, negotiate successfully and co-operate with others. It should also enable them to think for themselves, solve problems and make decisions effectively (QCA, 1998: 19).

From the above quotation, key skills also include discussion, communication, teamwork, negotiation and problem-solving.

Throughout the Crick report, the teaching of controversial issues is a concern as an important matter for citizenship education and I think teaching and dealing with controversial issues are crucial parts of political literacy. Further reading reveals also among the essential elements (QCA, 1998: 44) a number of that can be categorised as part of political literacy. These are democracy and autocracy, freedom and order, willingness to be open to changing one’s opinions and attitudes in the light of discussion and evidence, civility and respect for the rule of law,
ability to make a reasoned argument both verbally and in writing, ability to tolerate other view points, ability to develop a problem-solving approach, topical and contemporary issues and events at all levels, the nature of democratic communities, including how they function and change, and sustainable development and environmental issues.

It seems that among the essential elements (QCA, 1998:44) there are more elements for political literacy than for social and moral responsibility and community involvement but also that there are interrelated elements for all three strands. Specifically I found that ‘social and moral responsibility’ and ‘community involvement’ overlap with each other. This overlap will be shown in this section of case studies later.

In order to analyse how NGOs’ citizenship education provision meets the third strand of ‘political literacy’ possible questions are:

- Do NGOs provide basic political knowledge and concepts of democracy and autocracy during the citizenship education programmes?
- Do NGOs encourage students to practise political skills such as decision making, problem solving, use of evidence, negotiation and teamwork?
- Is the provision of citizenship education itself democratic? Are the relationships between NGO staff and young people, and between young people and teachers democratic?
- Are controversial issues raised? How?

Therefore, in this research, using the questions raised above as a framework, I analysed the research findings to explore how NGO activity meets the citizenship education requirements as
defined by Crick’s three strands. For each organisation I give a brief general description and identify their aims or mission before looking at actual activities.

**Comparison of aims in the four NGOs**

In this section, I have gathered the statements from each organisation and their staff which are able to be interpreted as the aims of citizenship education in the organisations. The relevant parts of the four organisations’ aims are shown below:

**Table 5 The aims of NGOs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Aims/Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YMCA</strong></td>
<td>YMCA aims to provide a welcome to members for themselves, in a meeting place that is theirs to share, where friendships can be made and counsel sought. Secondly, the YMCA aims to develop activities, which stimulate and challenge its members in an environment that enable them to take responsibility and find a sense of achievement. The third aim is to involve all members in care and work for others. The last aim is to create opportunities for exchanging views, so that its members can improve their understanding of the world, of themselves and of one another.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **YKA**     | 1. Let us constantly strive to improve ourselves by seeking the truth, acting on the truth, practicing loyalty and courage.  
2. Let us love each other, be faithful to each other, and help each other.  
3. Let us unite and work for the organization, and devoting ourselves to the organization.  
4. Let us be honest in everything and fulfil our responsibilities.  
5. Let us dedicate ourselves to the country and people with the spirit of service. |
| **UNICEF**  | UNICEF UK works to change UK Government policy on issues which affect both children in the UK and children around the world. When the UK ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1991, it included some reservations. These reservations mean that children seeking asylum in the UK and young offenders in particular are not entitled to some of the rights outlined in the Convention |
| **CSV**     | 1. We continually strive to create quality opportunities for people to volunteer and to access training and lifelong learning.  
2. CSV works with schools, colleges, universities and communities throughout the UK enabling young people to be active citizens through addressing real community needs. |
The ethos of citizenship education in the YMCA is similar to the national curriculum guideline in Korea, such as caring for others, co-operative working and international awareness. (The citizenship education in schools was explored in the literature review chapter.) The Korean YMCA also showed that their implementation of citizenship was more promoting social and moral responsibility and community involvement rather than political literacy, even though their aims precisely claim some form of political literacy (The last aim is to create opportunities for exchanging views, so that its members can improve their understanding of the world, of themselves and of one another). However, YKA's aim of citizenship education has a very strong message which asks for children’s loyalty and courage for their country which can be regarded as a very specific form of political literacy. If the YMCA is more individual and personal, YKA’s aims are more or less national and political. The political knowledge based activities were revealed through their programmes which I have already analysed earlier in this chapter. I believe that YKA’s aims were very much in evidence in the programmes.

In England, UNICEF showed that they are concerned with world issues and changing government policy regarding children’s rights which seems very political, but CSV has more local concerns such as community involvement and volunteering. However, these kinds of concerns were not strongly evidenced from these observations. Birmingham CSV’s activities could be regarded as PSHE rather than citizenship education programmes. In this sense, I argue that CSV might have focused on more direct citizenship education than PSHE with their long-term know-how in order to avoid this criticism. It was very helpful of CSV that they linked me to the Birmingham branch because I was based in Birmingham, but I think that it may well have been possible to see more direct citizenship education, if I were based in other city. The other three NGOs were providing a programme more directly related to citizenship education. I agree
that these kinds of citizenship activities (healthy eating and environmental education) can be
done through other existing subjects, but can PSHE specifically help to deliver the citizenship
curriculum? Huddleston and Kerr argue that:

Integrating citizenship education into PSHE can be a natural and effective way of delivering
important aspects of the citizenship curriculum...

The most effective way of integrating citizenship education into PSHE is through a modular
approach – with stand-alone citizenship modules sitting alongside PSHE ones. This makes the
citizenship element easier to identify and simplifies arrangement for monitoring and assessment. It is
important to ensure that there is parity between citizenship and PSHE modules. Citizenship
education is not a sub-theme of PSHE, or vice versa. It is also important to ensure that sufficient time
is given to written work – often less prominent in PSHE classes (Huddleston and Kerr 2006:46).

I believe that integrating citizenship education into PSHE is not a bad idea; however, there are
certain topics which are distinct from citizenship education. Also integrating of citizenship
education and other subjects depends on where focuses are and depends on which (citizenship
or other subject) has priority.

Through this research I came to the conclusion that NGOs have their own characteristics and
aims, and also that all NGOs do not have to be ‘citizenship providers’; they can just carry on
their missions and movements as they are. Furthermore, I believe that various NGOs can
provide variety in education for young people. In particular, it seems that everything can be
stretched as ‘citizenship education’ at the moment due to the short history of citizenship
education in the formal curriculum both in England and South Korea. Therefore I would argue
that NGOs which want to provide citizenship education need to deliver it as more specific and
independent from other subjects. I found that the four NGOs in this research aimed at a
particular dimension of citizenship education, in line with their organisational aims. However,
practising their aims seems not easy, especially for CSV; there was more evidence from YKA and UNICEF that they were better able to make the match.

The findings from the organisational aims for citizenship education can be categorised into two. Firstly, YMCA and CSV focus on how young people are to become active citizens who have responsibilities and rights in their local community and society. YKA and UNICEF on the other hand have more political and national aims of citizenship education for young people, although the former largely stresses an uncritical approach and the latter a critical challenge.

**Comparison of Crick’s three strands in NGOs**

My research finds that it was very hard for NGOs to provide a citizenship education programme which satisfies every aspect of Crick’s three strands unless they aim in advance to have all of the three strands in their programmes. I think that all of the NGOs have different strengths and weaknesses and they do not need to be a citizenship education provider in order to please others, or to get popularity. Furthermore, all citizenship education NGOs do not need to focus only on Crick’s three strands, even though as discussed, Crick’s three strands do look inclusive in terms of citizenship education. The negative aspect of citizenship education is that these days the term ‘citizenship education’ seems to be very ‘trendy’ both in England and South Korea. Therefore, many NGOs claim that they are citizenship education providers, although I believe that various NGOs can contribute different types of education for children, not only citizenship education.

Actually, apart from UNICEF, there was no direct mention of ‘citizenship education’ from either NGO staff and or school teachers in YMCA, YKA, or CSV. I think that children might not know what they were being given for the lesson unless they heard directly. In particular, among the
four NGOs, CSV’s sessions were the most debatable in terms of whether they belonged to PSHE or citizenship education. The important thing is that the four NGOs regarded themselves as major citizenship education providers even though there was no direct mention of citizenship during the programmes and even though there was a possible criticism concerning the contents of citizenship education. However, in this section I would like to compare the four NGOs in terms of what kind of citizenship education aspects they emphasised according to Crick’s three strands. Before moving on to the discussion, the table below summarises which strands were found in the four NGOs’ observed sessions.

### Table 6 Crick’s three strand in the NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social and moral responsibility</th>
<th>Community involvement</th>
<th>Political literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>•-students’ behaviour, the modelling respect, co-operation</td>
<td>•-volunteering</td>
<td>•-discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YKA</td>
<td>•- moral values(patriotism), strong belongingness to the organisation, respect for teachers and NGOs, co-operation</td>
<td>○ -volunteering</td>
<td>•-nationalism, debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>•- guidance on behaviour, modelling of relationships</td>
<td>○ -global community</td>
<td>• – human rights, debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV</td>
<td>•- students’ behaviour, modelling respect, concern for the common good</td>
<td>○- volunteering</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* : practising  
○ : no practice but theory

**Social and moral responsibility**

Among the three strands, the aspect of ‘social and moral responsibility’ was seemed more obvious than other two strands in the four NGOs in that pupil behaviour was always an issue. However, there were not many very strong examples of enhancing ‘social and moral responsibility’ in this research. Having been through the four case studies, I found that ‘social
and moral responsibility’ was not easy to teach separately. It could be taught by knowledge-based teaching, but students would have had to practise their learning. There was no direct explanation of ‘social and moral responsibility’ (although, to be fair, this was not in their aims); however, I was able to see a ‘stretched’ meaning of ‘social and moral responsibility’ such as the aspects of students’ behaviour, modelling of respect, concern for common good and co-operation which were found in all NGOs. NGOs or those who intend to provide citizenship education purposely might need to include more clear elucidation and practising of ‘social and moral responsibility’.

Regarding existing social and moral responsibility, there were points of comparison in the four case studies. There were always both attentive and inattentive students in each session. Texting messages were one of the distracting behaviours in YMCA and YKA, in contrast, there was no such incident in UNICEF and CSV. This is a very interesting point to compare. Both young people have similar mobile ownership rate, but no misuse was found in English NGOs. (England: 70% among 15-17, 2000 / South Korea: 74.70% 16-18, 2003). One possible reason can be the age of the student: CSV children were mainly primary school age, UNICEF children were both primary and secondary school age. The second possible and more likely reason is that Korean NGOs’ programmes happened through extra curricular activities, in contrast, English programme took place within the formal education setting. Korean students might think the session was not as important or strict as other formal subjects so that they could use their mobile phone. I was not able to compare their behaviour as between the NGO’s programmes and the formal subjects. The third possible reason of course is that Korean programmes were simply too boring to get any attention from young people. But I wonder how any education gets attention from every student. I have to say that those behaviour issues could be found in other ordinary
lessons, so it is important to know how NGOs could encourage young people’s good behaviour in terms of citizenship education. In this research I was not able to find how or with what NGOs helping students’ good behaviour, it might be possible to say that all lessons in schools and less formal sectors gives young people an opportunities to learn how to behave and practise the good behaviour.

Students used typical teenage slang as well as the internet language between themselves (for example, in English, possible expressions are: lights are on: parents are in the room, that’s chewy: cool or interesting), however apart from YMCA students in observation 3 (preparation for youth festival), all of students in the four NGOs used a good level of respectful language to their teachers and NGOs staff.

I saw all NGOs staff were very devoted to their work as well as to students, which means the staff and teachers could have been modelling respect.

Community involvement

Apart from YMCA programmes there was no volunteering related activity in the organisations. According to the YKA annual plan document, volunteering was a part of their programme of the year, but I did not see any related activities during my observation. UNICEF’s main concern was promoting human rights education, and their activities were mainly knowledge based classroom activities rather than practical activities in the community. CSV’s main aim was community involvement even though it did not appear in their practice in the Birmingham branch. Officially CSV holds the view that community involvement should be directed at community development, rather than at saving and developing the nation, as YKA believes.
Political literacy

As already compared in the previous section, there were different focuses in their educational programmes. The YMCA sessions observed did not show any activities in relation to gaining political knowledge even though their philosophy aimed at political skills negotiation, and only discussion was practised. I found that UNICEF aims were focused on more national and global concerns for human rights education for children, which can be linked to political literacy among the three strands. The programmes I watched were founded in global issues, where it is sometimes hard to think about direct involvement, although elsewhere in UK, UNICEF is promoting children’s rights within UK schools, as in the ‘Rights Respecting Schools’ programme. Yet neither in UNICEF nor other NGOs was there direct mention of democracy and ‘good citizens’ which is an important part of political literacy I can guess from UNICEF’s organisational aims that good citizens care about the rights of others however, it could be argued that children should be able to understand or at least debate concepts of ‘good citizens’ through their citizenship education. I also believe that children should experience all dimensions of citizenship education rather than only the human rights aspect. One can only hope that other curricular inputs helped to provide a balance.

YKA also showed that their activities were based on political skills. YKA’s main youth activity was debating current or historical issues. They were more concerned about national development and patriotism than any other organisation, possibly because the organisation was initiated during the Japanese occupation in order to support the Independence movement. In contrast there was little political knowledge-based activity in CSV. CSV children participated in group work, but there was not much negotiation or discussion on the topic.
Through the observations I found that political knowledge such as democracy, elections, and participation in governance were not emphasised by any organisation, at least not in these sessions, but then the question is where children can learn such political knowledge. Social studies teaches this kind of political literacy in Korea; however, I believe that political knowledge has to be taught alongside political skills. Otherwise it implies that citizenship can simply be implemented through other subjects in terms of political knowledge.

**Other comparisons**

The following aspects appear not directly related to Crick’s three strands; however, I believe that these are still important issues in the provision of citizenship education. Each organisation has different facets of provision, linked to the nature of the NGO, its relationship with schools, and the kind of programmes offered. The advantages and disadvantages are summarised for each organisation as follows, enabling one or two significant features to be extracted:

**Table 7 Advantages and disadvantages of UNICEF citizenship education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| INSET & One-off programme | -good opportunity to experience citizenship education because schools provided it as a special citizenship programme  
                         | -the NGO staff is expert at citizenship education  
                         | -contents and materials                           | -difficult to see the long term impact  
                         |                             | -lack of time                               |

A key feature here would be that UNICEF has citizenship experts who made citizenship education well grounded and effective. The other NGOs had well qualified staff. (YMCA and YKC staff had the youth work diploma) but not necessarily in citizenship as such.
Table 8 Advantages and disadvantages of YKA citizenship education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YKA Activity</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual school activity</td>
<td>- Intimate relationship building is possible between students and teacher, and students and NGO staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No need for extra travel hours or efforts for the whole membership programme</td>
<td>- Can be cancelled easily according to school schedule and pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Can have less support and less material/human resources (volunteers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole club activity</td>
<td>- More material/human resources</td>
<td>- Can be exclusive for non-active participating students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More places than individual school activity</td>
<td>- Extra travel hours and efforts needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Broader relationship with other school students possible</td>
<td>- Schools have less support due to extra hours which can distract students from study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Variety of activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One aspect here is that of the intimate relationship between staff and students (also found in YMCA as well as CSV). UNICEF was the only organisation which did not have such close relationship between the staff and students due to the one-stop programmes. Second is the variety of programmes, again common to all except UNICEF. This enabled choice, and in particular, YMCA and YKA students’ opinions were reflected in the decision making process of the programmes. There is a dilemma here, in that the variety of programmes could allow students different types of citizenship education, but it is also important to specialise or to focus in terms of citizenship education provision for the NGOs, because none of the NGOs were able to provide all Crick’s three strands in their programme, and there can be gaps.

Table 9 Advantages and disadvantages of YMCA citizenship education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YMCA Activity</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership activities</td>
<td>- Continuity</td>
<td>- Difficulty in having school membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Long term educational plans and impacts</td>
<td>- Length of time to see the outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Possibility of building good</td>
<td>- Less opportunity for non-members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relationships with staff and teachers
-predictable participant numbers for the programme
-regular support from YMCA (such as volunteers and training workshops)
-belongingness and togetherness

Open activity
-approachability of everyone (non-members)
-flexibility of topic (no yearly plan to follow)
-more funding available from outside

-effect from sudden cancellation from school’s schedule
-difficulty in understanding the spirit of the YMCA with one time activity.
-difficulty in having greater participation

The interesting aspect here is the strong ‘belongingness’ among the Korean NGOs. I think the membership programmes gave students a strong sense of loyalty and tied them as a group. This belongingness was not found in British NGOs, but then, students were not members of these.

The common advantages and disadvantages across the four NGOs will form part of the next chapter which details the strengths of NGO provision as well as some of the issues relating to less formal education. These will also impact on how far the three strands of citizenship which I have discussed in this chapter can be fully realised.

The role of NGOs as connectivity

Edward and Fowler (2002) explain the role of NGOs as connectors.

In many ways, connectivity is the theme that ties all these management challenges together….in sum, NGOs constitute a crucial part of the ‘connective tissue’ of a vigorous civil society, so making and sustaining the right connections lies at the heart of effective NGOs management. The strength of NGOs lies in their ability to act as bridges, facilitators, brokers and translators, linking together the
institutions, interventions, capacities and levels of actions that are required to lever broader structural changes from discrete or small-scale actions. The development of an NGO management framework that can sit confidently alongside management and organizational development theories from other sectors remains an important task for the future. (Edwards & Fowler 2002:8-9)

Since the Korean War in 1950, Korean governments have not gained much credibility from the public. The government used to teach extremes of anti-communist education, and advocated dictatorship through education. The adverse examples of conflicts rather than co-operation between the ruling parties and opposition parties, together with political corruption, also made the public sceptical of what the government did. In this context, I think the role of NGOs is very important because the public may not listen to government. Fortunately, the image of NGOs in Korea is very good and they are seen as more trustworthy than government (Democratic citizenship education Forum 2001). NGOs have the huge responsibility of connecting people and government to meet the needs of both sides especially for my own concerns in terms of citizenship education. Earlier on I discussed whether this responsibility was to support or to challenge the government, which clearly varies with the organisation and with the current government.

Another form of connectivity is supporting the school. During the research, it became clear that the short history of citizenship education within the UK national curriculum required help and support. Just as Harber (2002) argues that citizenship education in England was not well prepared to be implemented, I found that schools were already busy enough with their work, and therefore that in particular, citizenship education needed help from outside school. One of the teachers in Birmingham conveyed to me his feelings about citizenship education.
Citizenship education? It’s rubbish... it’s ridiculous. Why are you (researcher) doing it(citizenship education)? NGO? What is it? Oh, NGO. Well it’ll be nice(to have support from NGOs)

My interpretation from the above interview is that schools do not have enough support and help for citizenship education and some teachers are antagonistic to it. Thus I argue that the NGO role as supporters should be emphasised both in schools and in the local community. There are three particular issues in the connectivity role. The first concerns knowledge and visibility/credibility of NGOs, the second relates to curriculum links between non formal and formal education and the third concerns the question of sustainable partnerships.

Knowledge and visibility /credibility of NGOs

At first, I discovered that the term ‘NGO’ and the NGOs’ citizenship education programmes were very new to many school teachers. Among the schools researched, four had very little knowledge of the NGOs and their roles. Therefore, introducing NGOs to schools can be an issue in access for citizenship education. It can be difficult to talk to a school which has no idea of NGO work and of less formal education. I asked two South Korean teachers and two English teachers whether they had heard of the NGOs which were doing citizenship education for their children. Firstly I asked about the general term ‘non-governmental organisation’, secondly, I mentioned the specific names of NGOs. The answers were as follows:

Researcher: **Have you heard of NGOs?**
Ms. Evans: *pardon? …*
Researcher: **NGO means non government organisation.**
Ms. Evans: *oh, yeah... NO…*
Researcher: **Have you heard of this organisation before?**
Ms. Evans: *No. I even didn’t know this NGO existed. I found out they can help us by chance. You know, this is a useful thing.*
Researcher: have you heard of NGOs?
Ms. Shin: yeah... I heard of it, but I don't know about it very well.
Researcher: have you heard of this organisation?
Ms. Shin: I've never heard of it...... I didn't know they provided citizenship education for schools. Well, I am lucky to find this( organisation). I wish I could have them for the next term; but, it's not possible.

Researcher: have you heard of NGOs?
Ms. Roberts: no.
Researcher: have you known this organisation before?
Ms. Roberts: Sorry...I didn’t know.

When I heard the above comments, I was embarrassed because I never expected such lack of knowledge on NGOs among the teachers. My assumption that NGO was a common concept to the public was wrong. I do not argue that teachers should be sensitive to all social concerns and issues so that they should be aware of relevant NGOs. However, the reason why I expected NGOs and their work to be publicly known is that in South Korea NGOs are very visible. They are very near to people, physically as well as programmatically. For example, major NGOs like YMCA, YWCA, and YKA have at least one branch in a city. Even though the local community may not recognise their existence, the NGOs are just there as a part of their daily life.

I think the reason why South Korean NGOs are more visible than in England is that the NGO movement played a very important role in social development in terms of the social welfare system as well as public and lifelong learning education for adults. Until the mid 1980s the Korean NGOs did not play a strong role in an ‘anticommunist regimented society’. However, after the democratic uprising in June 1987, the numbers of NGOs rapidly increased. It was quantity development. Its movement or advocacy in the mid 1980s was mainly about the
revolution of society and challenging regimentation. The quality development of NGOs actually happened after the Kim Young Sam government in 1993. This was the first government which was not from a military regime, bearing a main slogan as the revolution of South Korea.

It is possible that if the NGO movement became more visible in the UK, it would help to attract the public in terms of citizenship education. As I argued earlier, the social welfare system meets people’s needs less in South Korea compared to England, so that Korean NGOs need to help underprivileged people with many programmes and are therefore known by the public. The NGO movement and programmes are often introduced on the broadcasting and the daily newspapers in South Korea. The NGO movement in England seems much more localised in comparison to the nationalised and issue-centred Korean movement. Introducing themselves to the community becomes one of the important roles of NGOs, and achieving a good reputation to support their work. A UNESCO (2004) article argues that NGOs are so diverse and some so controversial that it is not possible to support, or be opposed to, all NGOs, and that the structures of NGOs vary.

Apart from the scant knowledge of NGOs, another issue which emerged was how we make known to the public that the NGOs are ‘doing good’ and why NGOs’ role is important. In an interview with a NGO staff member, I came to realise the importance of defining the term ‘NGO’.

Mr. Robinson, England: Are NGOs always good? Are businesses always bad? There are lots of Non Governmental Organisations in the world. How do we know which ones are good? As a researcher, you need to define which NGOs are good for citizenship education.
In this research study I chose the NGOs according to their reputations and activities. Among the four NGOs, two are international organisations and the others are national organisations, and are better known for the provision of citizenship education both in England and South Korea than other small NGOs. The NGOs I chose, fortunately, did not have big problems in introducing themselves to schools even though some schools were not familiar with NGO’s connectivity potential. The reason was that firstly, these four NGOs have a good reputation and secondly, the size of NGOs was also big enough to gain reliability. One school teacher told me that

Teacher, Ms. Hong, Korea: I contacted the NGO, because, I thought they looked as though they had a great reputation. ...Choosing an organisation for my children was not easy. ...I wanted to have a more reliable organisation. I believe national organisations will have more know-how than new organisations.

While the above teacher’s opinion is reasonable, I think that would be a very dangerous idea to judge NGOs just according to the size rather than their expertise in issues and programmes. I asked three NGO employees in England if the NGOs have a well-known reputation, and whether it is easy to get funding or not. Two of them answered ‘not really’, one of them telling me that

Mr. Smith: It depends on the issues and programmes. If it is of interest to the national Lottery, you will get funding. I don’t think my organisation’s reputation is very important (to get funding). I don’t think so.

However one of the three NGO staff told me that:

Mr. Williams: I think the bigger NGOs can give more credibility to someone to decide funding. They might say, how do we believe this smaller organisation spends money well?
To be effective in citizenship education, I argued earlier that one of the NGO roles is to make themselves known to the public so that NGOs can access schools more easily and schools have benefits from them. There can be many ways of introducing themselves. For example, through persistent active advocacy on social issues, and developing and implementing programmes which can approach the public more closely, NGOs will be able to gain public approval. Therefore, NGOs should have a trust-worthy reputation. One research study showed that the most untrustworthy group to the citizens was the politicians yet the most trustworthy group was the NGOs (Democratic Citizenship Education Forum 2001).

**Curriculum links between non formal and formal education**

Even though less formal education, in particular in citizenship education from NGOs, is important, there are also points of contention. When less formal education appears, some will identify with the methods, but others will respond to it as a distraction from the pursuit of examination subjects or their core curriculum. That is why one of the Korean NGO activities was cancelled without advanced notice, due to preparation for an examination. Also, ‘informal’ education should be distinguished from ‘extra-curricular activities’. Extra-curricular activities can still be part of formal education.

Burley (1990:64) argues that the relationship of less formal education and the school curriculum of the school must be clarified, and the contribution of less formal methods to the formal curriculum should also be considered. Furthermore, he insists that generally the national curriculum in the UK makes less time available for teaching staff to be involved in less formal education. However, I found that the South Korean national curriculum in theory preserves certain times for extra curricular activities, even though the extra curriculum time was often
ignored. I agree with Burley that in both England and South Korea, less formal education and extra curricular activities were not receiving enough attention and that is a problem for NGOs in doing citizenship education. I have already described the difficulties in implementing citizenship education in the previous chapter. I believe that to provide citizenship education in less formal ways more effectively, there should be a protective system in which less formal education is more widely recognised as important, but I wonder how both countries can be free from the pressure of examinations and access to higher education.

Burley (1990:74) argues however that less formal education exists in schools whether or not it is openly recognised by the staff.

*The benefits of informal education are felt to be more participation, choice, independence and a sense of fulfilment for students and staff alike: recognition of ownership of their learning and work.*

NGO education should also be recognised as important within formal educational activities. The World Education organisation defined the non-formal education links to formal education: neither less formal education nor formal education alone can achieve their educational goal ([http://www.worlded.org/projects_topic_6.html](http://www.worlded.org/projects_topic_6.html) - 31.07.2004). For example, World Education takes lessons learned from less formal and out-of-school education programmes and applies them to formal education activities in an effort to improve the quality and relevance of education. This could apply well to citizenship education. Therefore, I argue that NGO citizenship education is also able to serve as a bridge between formal education and less formal education within the formal system. Through my research I realised that even though NGOs may have more capability about citizenship education in terms of their expertise and knowledge of such education, their aims of citizenship education could not be accomplished without the school’s support and understanding. Obviously, if schools did not allow NGOs to come into
school settings, NGO citizenship education programmes would not be possible unless completely independent.

**Partnerships with schools and other organisations**

The third aspect of connectivity, in order to ensure NGO visibility and to act as a bridge for curriculum work is the forming of specific partnerships with a range of schools and with other organisations in the community. This enables cross-school activities. We saw that CSV has a community partnership with local schools, and it was obvious that community partnership was their main concern in their organisational aims. In YMCA too, there were activities which were open to the community for all age groups. Observation 2 in the YMCA was an open youth activity; any school that wanted to participate in the activities was welcomed.

Mr. Han, YMCA: We have club members’ activities in schools and also youth programmes for non members in the city. Once a year, we host a youth festival in the big park that invites schools from the area to participate. This is very popular among young people, I think. Well....Korean kids are unfortunate, aren’t they? They have to study and study. If they are not good at academic performance, they are regarded as failure, which is not right. However, in YMCA youth festival, we never discriminate young people according to their academic performance. Often we find that some of students who were not good at school were very good what they really like to do such as dancing or singing. I think all of students don’t need the college certificate they should have the right to choose according to their interests and abilities. But parents and society push all students to go to good University. I think young people want someone who stands for them. We’ve tried to listen to their needs and given them the freedom to choose what they want to do in their festival.

Volunteering is also a good way of being involved in the community as well as bringing different educational organisations together. The four sessions which I observed in YMCA employed volunteers as leaders in the programmes, and also, according to staff (Mr. Park), YMCA recruited university students as volunteers, providing regular training programmes. This
can be another partnership, with local Universities. Research findings from the open activity showed that YMCA was able to have more volunteers to help their programmes in schools because of the flexibility and lesser responsibility. YMCA university volunteers were able to choose and negotiate the volunteering schedule and did not have the same responsibility as the staff had. If anyone wants to be a long term volunteer, they will be placed in one or two schools for certain programmes, therefore it is less of a burden for a volunteer. One volunteer from observation 2 said why he joined the camp.

We are nine of us and University students, who joined this summer camp previously. We met here and still have old members’ meeting. We are very proud of ourselves that we belong to a very privileged group. We thought that it was natural to be volunteers for a while after we have been to this camp. Usually, the other seniors did the same. It's nice to do volunteering for my juniors. I think the kids here tonight; they will do the same in the end.

I believe the seniors’ role modelling in volunteering may have affected juniors’ volunteering, with younger students learning from their senior volunteers. This is also referred to in the social and moral responsibility strand in the previous chapter, under ‘modelling respect’. Yet partnerships may be difficult to sustain. YKA also has a partnership with local schools in the local community. However, Mr. Yoon said that the numbers of partnership schools were decreasing.

The number of partnership schools is now 8 in Kwangju city. (there were 58 high schools in the city). It used to be more than that. One of possible reasons, the students became busier than 10 years ago. And some schools and students wanted just to fill up the compulsory volunteering time with us, however, except for volunteering, YKA asked other organisational activities. But schools and students wanted only volunteering and they left us. I think YKA have to find teachers who understand and agree with the YKA spirit and then increase the partnership. Also YKA needs to have parents education, too in terms of partnership with parents.
Decreasing partnership was not only Kwangju YKA’s problem. Mr Jang in YKA in the Seoul office who was going to visit a school with me, but who suddenly found the observation cancelled told me a similar thing.

_Sorry, these days many schools easily ignore the club activities (not only YKA activities but also other organisations’ activities). Well, if they (schools) continuously cancel YKA activities, I can suspect, one day, the school just can call me up and say, no more YKA activities. Actually, it happens today. Who I can blame for? Schools? Or horrible education system? I don’t know._

While partnership with schools can be an important aspect of connectivity, this can be fragile and not to be taken for granted.

**Summary of the research**

There appear to be many important research findings. Among them, the most important finding is that NGOs can play significant roles in the provision of citizenship education through less formal education. The second important finding is that NGOs have a connectivity role in between young people and schools, between young people and society. NGOs are also complementing schools’ provision of citizenship education. Therefore, in this section, I will summarise the aims of the NGOs, the implementation of citizenship education from the NGOs, and the roles of NGOs in citizenship education that I have found through this research.

**The aims of NGOs in the provision of citizenship education**

The four NGOs were found to have different aims of doing citizenship education. First of all, YMCA aims at caring for others, co-operative working and international awareness for young
people. They tried to provide a welcoming environment to members; this was observed through case study, however direct community involvement was not found even though they were aiming at such involvement. There were university volunteers and also the young people were going to be involved in volunteering in the future, but there was no practice of students’ volunteering in my observations.

YKA’s citizenship education has very strong messages, which ask young people for loyalty and courage for their country; it also aims at raising national leaders. Crick (2002) argues political literacy means someone should have the knowledge and skills and values to be effective in public life, however it was not clear how they practise the political knowledge in their public life afterwards. These long term outcomes about citizenship education should be studied as a longitudinal study in the future; however there is not yet this type of research in South Korea.

UNICEF’s aims on the other hand relate to their concern with world issues and children’s rights which have not been shown in other NGOs. Their organisational aims about these global issues were apparent from the observations.

Lastly, CSV cares more about environmental and health issues. In terms of citizenship education CSV’s educational activities were interpreted as being underpinned by a pretty stretched meaning of citizenship education. As I pointed out in Chapter 4, those CSV activities which I observed were closer to PSHE than citizenship education. However, overall CSV’s concerns and aims in UK were strongly about community involvement which promotes volunteering, an important aspect in Crick’s view.

The above aims can be categorised into two, even though there are shared aims among the four
NGOs. Firstly YMCA focuses more on how young people are to become active citizens with responsibilities and rights through volunteering activities. This accords with one of Carr and Hartnett’s (1996) concepts of democracy. They argued that the function of classical democracy was to develop knowledgeable, informed and active citizens. We have seen that YMCA’s citizenship education aims at challenging young people’s volunteering in order to become active citizens in their society. YMCA’s involvement in the society as active citizens also matched up to a point with Dewey (1916) and with UNESCO’s definition of democracy. Dewey’s (1916) key phrase was democracy as a mode of associated living and participation in society. He believed that this kind of democracy gradually breaks down of barriers of class, race, and national territory. Similarly UNESCO (1992) describes democracy as a way of life as I explored in the literature review. I suppose that being an active citizen with responsibility and exercising their rights is part of democratic life.

In contrast, the other organisations (YKA, UNICEF) aim at a more national and political level of citizenship education for young people. Historically, YKA was involved in the national independence movement during the Japanese occupation. Also, UNICEF has worked to change UK government policy on issues such as the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. YKA and UNICEF’s emphasis on national and political citizenship education has resonances with Tarrant’s argument on democracy. He argues that democracy is to provide critical citizens to sustain a healthy nation. It did seem that that citizenship education tried to promote young people to be more politically informed in YKA and UNICEF.

However, I was not able to confirm how young people directly understood the ethos of democracy in the four NGOs. Even though NGOs’ citizenship education aimed to promote
democracy, none of them directly taught the philosophy of democracy to young people. I
presume that there might be students who would not analyse what they had learned or never
recognised the ethos of democracy. Also, interestingly, NGOs rarely directly taught young
people their aims in citizenship education nor their organisational aims. The aims of NGOs in
citizenship education were highly valuable, yet if NGOs did not reveal them young people
would not necessarily understand what the NGOs’ activities were for.

According to Kerr’s IEA international citizenship education study (2002), students in England
had a basic knowledge of democracy and they believed democracy was weakened when
politicians gave jobs in government to family members, when wealthy people have undue
influence on government and when media opinions are uniform. Although Kerr’s research
implies that students in England were aware of the concept of democracy, my research findings
indicate that the philosophy of democracy could usefully be taught more directly so that
students in general would have a more accurate and deeper knowledge of it.

Much is of course indirect, for example with regard to Heater’s analysis of civil society
discussed in chapter 2. Heater argues that civil society has good citizens such as persons who
possess knowledge and capacity. The NGOs did not directly or explicitly intend to build a good
civil society, yet their aims were certainly to produce ‘good citizens’. Edwards’ (2004) concept
of civil society is also related to the aims of NGOs in citizenship education. He argues that civil
society motivates people in search for social goals, peace, social justice, freedom and human
progress, which again appeared in the various aims of NGOs. As with democracy, these
concepts were not always openly discussed in classes however I think that key concepts of
citizenship education from the theoretical exploration in the literature review chapter were to be
found in basic and general philosophy for the four NGOs. However, key concepts such as ‘ways of life’, ‘equality’, and ‘co-operation’ (from for example, UNESCO) were reflected more clearly than other concepts such as challenging governments or challenging excessive nationalism. I was assured by research observations that the four NGOs were trying indirectly to promote aspects of democracy as a way of life, and had some examples of democratic processes, but this was not an overt exploration of democracy or indeed of any other political systems. Looking back at the findings, there was little or no evidence of political literacy. Therefore, I would say that there is only a partial aspect of preparation for democracy which is very important part of civic republicanism. As I explored under the concept of civic republicanism in the literature review chapter, civic republicanism put an emphasis a lot on political literacy. It means the concept of civic republicanism has not appeared in the four NGOs’ aims and their implementation. According to the concept of civic republicanism, active and good citizens are politically literate and involved in social and political issues. In this sense, the four NGOs were not fully educating young people as active citizens. However, I argue that someone cannot be judged as an active citizen by only political aspects; rather someone should be judged as an active citizen in various aspects beyond Crick’s three strands, such as global aspects, and the multicultural aspect as Starkey argues (2005). Therefore, the aims of NGOs’ in the provision of citizenship education should be wide and inclusive.

I found however some issues and barriers in the provision of citizenship education in NGOs which could interrupt such aims, and discussed how they might be minimised in the previous chapter.

The implementation of citizenship education
The most significant difference in the implementation of citizenship education was that South Korean NGOs showed a strong ‘membership’ emphasis in programmes and activities; in contrast, English NGOs had no such membership ethos. There were, however, commonalities in the implementation of citizenship education across each organisation. First of all citizenship education from the NGOs reflects its own context. The strong membership emphasis reveals that Korean NGOs are reflecting the perceived needs of Korean society such as unity and holistic ‘belongingness’, which I was not able to find in British NGOs. The South Korean government has asked people for such strong unity and ‘loyalty’ in order to confront the North Korean regime, because there has been fear of war and communism. Furthermore, I believe that emphasising the strong unity and belonging for people facilitated South Korea to become an industrialised country very fast after the Korean War. This social unity was the political agenda for both the authoritarian groups as well as anti-authoritarian groups such as NGOs in Korea. Strong unity and holistic belongingness became a good excuse for authoritarian regimes in the name of rebuilding a poor nation. However, as I have argued in the findings and analysis chapter, British NGOs had no such urgent and strong mission for reviving a nation as Korea had.

Secondly there is the view that citizenship education should meet young people’s needs. In particular, there was a concern about lack of critical thinking among young people. Other needs included young people needing to have less exam-oriented stress as well as young people needing to be equipped for the rapidly changing society. I argued that young people’s problems are not only theirs but also society’s. Therefore, in the future, young people’s needs in relation to citizenship education can be an interesting research agenda, as has been demonstrated by the work of Davies, Harber and Yamashita with regard to the needs of teachers and learners in global citizenship education (2005).
Some issues surrounding the actual implementation of citizenship education were also identified, and I have argued that these issues can be interpreted as obstacles for NGOs. They reveal the current situation of citizenship education and I believe that these current issues have important implications for the future. While the management and organisation of programmes appeared relatively democratic, the five barriers concerning NGOs’ citizenship education were: financial constraints, low priority (time limitation, lack of interest and participation, teachers’ lack of confidence), lack of human resources, low social security among NGO staff, and the lack of development of critical thinking. These current issues may impede the impact of citizenship education and should be addressed, although I acknowledge that they reflect systemic realities not easily changed. There is not a perfect organisation for citizenship education. Before the beginning of this research I presumed that NGOs were the best solution for citizenship education but clearly they are not without constraints.

**The role of NGOs**

In the literature review chapter, I explored the advantages and disadvantages of the role of NGOs. As in Williams (1991:195), the biggest advantage in NGO implementation in my research was ‘the ability to experiment freely with innovative approaches’. My research found that the four NGOs have the ability to experiment with their programmes creatively. The responses of the students were very positive with regard to NGO citizenship education. Therefore, I would argue that NGO’s ability to experiment should be protected from government intervention in order to deliver citizenship education in an innovative way. However, as identified above, the lack of finance was found as a disadvantage in the provision of citizenship education from NGOs, as Williams also argues. Solving the finance problem will
be a long-term agenda.

Even though NGOs are not universally recognised as an important educational institution, they can play a prominent role in the implementation of citizenship education. This research shows that both England and South Korea have been putting in much effort into delivering citizenship education for young people, and there is seen to be an urgent need for it in both societies. The most important NGO role is that such organisations have ‘less formal’ educational functions (the mixture of informal learning and non-formal education). Both terms, informal learning and non-formal education, were applied to NGOs’ programmes and activities; however, it was found there were many overlaps in defining the real contexts. Therefore, I used the term ‘less formal’ education to describe the NGO’s citizenship education.

This research finds that the NGOs’ role as a ‘less formal educator’ has a number of strengths in providing citizenship education. The first strength was that less formal citizenship education reaches young people better and appears more enjoyable. The second strength was that NGOs’ experimental learning with less formal approaches may lead more to lifelong learning. The third strength of less formal education in NGOs was that NGOs encourage young people to take responsibility for their own learning. And finally, less formal education generated useful incidental learning.

I found these NGOs’ roles as less formal educational institutions support the ‘connectivity’ between schools and society, as well as between young people and the schools providing citizenship education. In the literature review chapter, I explored how civil society should be composed of good citizens. Krut (et al.) (1997) argues that NGOs play a key moderating role in
the democratic decision-making process in that they protect human rights and provide essential services to the most needy. NGOs were keen to take a crucial role in nourishing civil society and believe in the potential of the educated citizens’ power. For example, the main organisational purpose of UNICEF encouraged children’s rights all over the world through citizenship education. In addition, YMCA and YKA’s citizenship education inspired some active decision-making processes among students. My belief is that those students who participated in the NGOs’ citizenship education programme could anticipate what their rights and responsibilities would be as members of society and learn how to make a contribution to society.

Practical outcomes from the comparative study

Before the research began, my assumption was that there had been something about citizenship education in England which South Korea could adapt. However, throughout the research I found that there was no ‘correct’ model for citizenship education. Citizenship education is designed to meet what are seen as needs of citizens in learning about the political, economic and social structure of that society, and cannot be generalised for every context. In terms of Crick’s three strands which I used as a tool for analysis of the case studies, none of the NGOs emphasised the three strands equally. While Crick would see them as indivisible in the sense that citizenship education needs all three, in practice, the NGOs could specialise in one or two strands to complement any gaps in school provision. This demands that schools have a clear overview of what these gaps are, and which NGOs would be best able to fill them.

There are several things that Korea can learn from citizenship education in England. First of all, citizenship education provided by a national curriculum secures certain time for NGOs and schools, even though there are ongoing arguments as to whether the implementation of
citizenship education is well prepared or not in terms of teacher training and resources. It is very significant that the government, to equip young people for their adult life, has raised the importance of citizenship education. That is in contrast to citizenship education South Korea. Moral education and social studies in Korea was historically used as a supporting tool for the authoritarian regime. There was no citizenship education like the British model (although there are ongoing debates), even though the Korean moral and social studies education programmes had been used as an alternative to citizenship education.

Secondly, the NGO workers’ social security as well as NGO’s financing was better in England than in South Korea. Social welfare in England appears more advanced, and British NGOs were better off in terms of finance. For example, while the full time youth workers’ salary averages 19000–25000 pounds in England (http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/VacancySearchServlet 20/08/2005), the Korean full time Youth workers’ salary reaches only half or less of England. Interestingly the Global/Worldwide cost of living survey 2005 reveals that London was ranked the world’s third most expensive city and Seoul was ranked the fifth most expensive city in the world (http://www.finfacts.com/costofliving__20/08/05). This salary gap demonstrates the financial difficulties in Korean NGOs.

There was also something British NGOs can learn from Korea. First of all, the NGOs are very visible in Korea. Their visibility allows the public to be aware of their work, and makes their work more favourable in the public’s eyes. In Korea, there is even a specialised broadcasting company which mainly broadcasts NGOs’ work and civil issues. I believe that this NGO visibility has potential power to approach young people and schools better and enable young people to be aware of civil society organisations now and for the future.
The second feature British NGOs could adapt is having ‘volunteer systems’ at their place of work. Korean NGOs had more volunteers in their system so that the programmes could run more smoothly and enable long term planning. Some may raise the criticism that this volunteer system leads to high turnover, however I believe this system was based on the strong membership and loyalty from the NGOs, because most volunteers from YMCA and YKA were ex-members of the club. In addition, the systematic and accepted use of volunteers could be possibly due to the longer history of such citizenship education, compared to England. Therefore, I believe that ‘volunteer systems’ are crucial for the NGOs’ work, especially in terms of lack of staff members. As Crick (2002) argues, all citizenship must involve at some stage volunteering but volunteering becomes citizenship when the volunteers have responsibilities and organise their action. Students seeing volunteers may have good role models.

On a more philosophical level, what I have also learnt from this comparative study is that citizenship education should be understood in the larger context, such as a global context as well as in the narrower national context. The background of citizenship education in England and South Korea was very different, as their modern history differs. However, the attention to global issues and global citizenship education was more or less similar to each other. One of the topics from YKA’s citizenship education programme was the Iraqi War and world peace. UNICEF’s main aim was to promote children’s rights all over the world. Therefore, the topics and the contents of the citizenship education need to be understood in a global perspective.

Conclusion

Up until now, I have attempted to identify different approaches to citizenship education
provision as between South Korea and England. Finally I would like to draw up my vision of a new direction for citizenship education policy.

Firstly, overall citizenship education provided to students should not be directed to a particular ideology, value or assumption according to specific organisations. The fundamental aims should be that young people voluntarily are involved in decision-making and participation in the citizenship education provided. Separate roles between government and NGOs are necessary, but with financial and systemic support from government and with planning and implementing by NGOs.

Secondly, just as Germany has a body that has whole responsibility for citizenship education (Zentrale fuer politische Bildung: Centre for Civic Education), I believe that constructing an expert citizenship education body is essential to encourage citizenship education. The expert education body would include professional staff, enough financial support from government and united assistance from NGOs, which share a common and popular ideology of citizenship education. An expert citizenship education body can also investigate citizenship education both theoretically and practically.

Third, the NGOs’ development of programmes and investment in human resources are prerequisites for promoting citizenship education. Generally staff training and re-education has often been ignored due to work pressure. Lack of staff training is not only a problem in Korean NGOs but also in the UK. Unstable citizenship policy has frightened institutions into not having citizenship education subject courses, and some barriers, such as perceived lack of relevant qualifications, can prevent teachers taking on a citizenship education role. However the
citizenship educator, whoever they are, should be qualified in terms of knowledge as well as practice and have suitable materials and resources. It is extremely important to encourage citizenship education for pupils as well as teachers and staff at the same time. Discouraged workers cannot perform well. As commented in the Introduction, from my informal talk with teachers in Birmingham schools, I have noticed that British teachers are already tired of preparing for the new subject; how could the subject be effective with tired teachers? It would seem that government should invest in new teachers in large numbers until there are enough qualified citizenship teachers; yet it can be more flexible than other subjects and can be taught by teachers in the class or by NGO workers in the community. There can be a gap between teachers and NGO workers, however; I was convinced by the NGO workers who I met in the research, that NGO workers are able to deliver citizenship education and are currently more expert than some teachers in the particular field. They could be involved in professional development of teachers as well as delivering their own programmes.

Fourthly, government policy has crucial importance. Over the past decades educational policies in Korea have been changeable, according to the regime or government, and the education system and policy easily changed without a long term agenda. Through my studies in the UK for the last few years, I also have found that educational policies are easily affected by shifts in power. In the UK for that reason the policy on citizenship education could be changed according to the change of government, but the fundamental values and components should not be changed unless social values change.

Finally, citizenship education should meet social needs. My research found that the four NGOs met only partially the full implications of Crick’s three strands and that in particular the political
literacy strand was weaker than other two strands, although Crick had in fact put more emphasis on political literacy in citizenship education. The explanations might be that political education or literacy is difficult to implement in citizenship education, or that NGOs do not agree that political literacy is as at least as important as other aspects. It also depends on what is interpreted as ‘political literacy’ – some might seem to be more indirect, such as teaching about children’s rights. I think that each one of Crick’s three strands has equivalent importance in the provision of citizenship education, but there can be other strands such as the personal and cultural dimensions as Osler and Starkey argue (2006:14). Therefore I argue that citizenship education should be developed beyond Crick’s three strands, and I agree that in these multicultural societies citizenship education needs to help citizens to show concern for cultural diversity, to respect others and to understand the economic system. NGOs should be able to provide citizenship education in order to meet social needs by offering their particular strengths.
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