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FRITZ OSER & WIEL VEUGELERS

INTRODUCTION

Dialogue Processes in identity development

Getting involved’ in society means becoming a human person by doing something for others and thus being connected to mankind and society. Youngsters who get involved, develop a feeling of agency. But ‘getting involved’ is not easy: society’s growing cultural diversity makes connections between people more differentiated. The paradox is that in a modern, multicultural society ‘getting involved’ is even more important than in a traditional, more monocultural society. A society can only transcend if people are in a certain way connected. To live together in a true human sense, implies to participate actively in social life and in a peaceful, just and democratic way. From the perspective of the individual, there must be opportunities to get involved, to develop a sense of efficacy and to experience connectedness.

In today’s societies ‘getting involved’ is a dynamic process that challenges people to enhance special social and civic competences, in particular attitudes. ‘Getting involved’ is not a natural development – learning processes are necessary to develop the capacity and the will to get involved. Youngsters should have possibilities in educational settings to experience sharedness, to get involved in a dialogue, to have common reflection and to act for and with others. Education, both in formal and in informal settings, can support children and adolescents in this development of identity.

‘Getting involved’ relates to various scientific orientations. Political, sociological, psychological and pedagogical questions are at issue, and all of these will be consulted in this volume. The main perspective however remains the issue of identity development relating to ‘getting involved’, and it will therefore be psychological. As most of the authors will show, this psychological development is always embedded within concrete social, cultural and political contexts and will therefore also be analyzed from political, sociological and cultural points of view. Developmental questions are about the capacities and justification strategies that children, adolescents and young adults are able to generate and the kind of differences in these capacities and the justifications that emerge. A main question is how educators can support this identity development. Which goals do educators find important and what kind of identity are they stimulating?

Recent thinking on ‘getting involved’ is related to the concept of citizenship. The concept of citizenship in contemporary social sciences and in discourses in society is not limited to the formal political level of engagement, but extends to the
social and the interpersonal level. Modern conceptions of citizenship see ‘getting involved’ as a catalyst for a person to become a free, autonomous and participatory citizen. Citizenship education is therefore not limited to learning about politics, but to live a social and political life. Extending the notion of citizenship to the personal level means, in a democratic society, that youngsters must be given ample space for dialogical and social processes, and to empower and educate to what Dewey called a democratic way of life. Becoming a citizen is not a personal career but a collective effort of connected individuals.

Civil society, democracy and ‘getting involved’

With the linking of the political and the personal, ‘getting involved’ has made ‘civil society’ a crucial arena of civic identity development. Since about 1980 ‘civil society’ takes a central place in the debate about what politicians should support and stimulate and what political sciences can and should treat as central aspects of what we now call ‘getting involved’. Civil societies encompass initiatives and spontaneous groupings of citizens, not only in problematic dictatorial societies like the former eastern communist countries, but also as energetic forces in democratic countries, which are in danger of losing their dynamism. Every society has its civil society; it depends on the relation between the political level and the broader society how civil society functions.

‘Getting involved’ and democracy need to be invented and built up continuously, and youngsters have to learn to be part of these processes. The modern state, with its structural fine-tuned intra-community supply of services, can only function if there is a counterweight of civil societal activities that are structurally free from absolute obligations, but are constituted in possibilities of political self-regulation of the society. The problem is that today the engagement of people to be active in traditional political, cultural, social or religious organizations is declining. And at the same time many people prefer to be active in small and manageable communities like community institutions for the poor, community churches, community hospitals, etc. Youngsters are very active in more modern communities like the internet, in music and style-related subcultures, and sometimes in local community actions.

In most introductions to political sciences, the authors distinguish between three forces that keep liberal market oriented societies going, namely the state, the market and the civil society. Whereas the market is responsible for the supply of all kinds of goods and the state regulates the conditions of any exchange of these goods, civil society regulates social, political, cultural and ecological problems through voluntary and solitary actions of citizens. These informal, but important groupings can influence either the market or the state in a quite intensive way. Civil society also effectively helps to intercede between state and other formal forces like law or financial capacities, takes the right to protect nature, gives security to children or supports art movements. This engagement is always voluntary, it is usually welfare oriented and it is self-organized.
Organizations in civil society engage people, but in a liberal market policy they are often representing only a certain group of people and a certain concern. Civil society is, in cases like this, market-oriented as well. In countries with a strong welfare state and in countries with a firm educational policy, the civil society can connect ideologically in another way to the political. In particular in countries with a strong democracy, the political level and civil society is interrelated. The political level in that case supports civil society, social justice for all, and diversity. Civil society in a strong democracy creates and supports a deliberative democracy with a concern for diversity and social justice. However each type of society, either a liberal market or a social justice oriented democracy, needs its citizens to 'get involved'.

Psychological foundations of 'getting involved'

In psychology and especially in social psychology, 'getting involved' is often treated as 'pro-social behavior' – that means behavior that is oriented towards helping or giving. Sometimes it is called 'supererogatory' acting, which means acting that goes beyond of what is necessary and societal demanded. To save someone who fell in a cold river is such behavior, but also to give a beggar a coin. We may think that this form of 'getting involved' is somehow too individualistic and is therefore not related to a common civil society; but we have to understand that it is a special element of it. And even if many psychologists speak about pro-social behavior as a moral act, the relationship between this helping behavior or empathy for others and morality is not at all clear. Indeed as Staub already states in his famous volume on ‘Development and maintenance of pro-social behavior’, although different approaches are somehow concerned with morality, ‘the theoretical linkage received little attention’ (Staub, 1984; p. XXVI). Staub argues that helpfulness, kindness, generosity and cooperation are behaviors or value-emotions that lead to ‘the positive aspects of human morality, the thou shalt’s’ (Staub, 1984; p. XXIII). However, neither the respective status of morality nor the analytical weight is reflected in these studies. Another source for ‘getting involved’ could be studies on altruism. The famous findings by Latané and Darley on the bystander syndrome, or the study of Lerner on the desire for justice and reactions to victims are examples of it. But these results are also quite general and not specifically embedded in morality. We do not know in fact how we can, in these examples, conceive the moral obligation and any moral sensitivity. Recently Seligman (2002), in his Authentic Happiness book, showed that engagement and involvement lead to more life satisfaction than ‘wellness’ and similar self-directed activities. But still the question is: what leads to ‘getting involved’ in the concern for others?

‘Getting involved’: Morality and social conditions

In this volume, when speaking about ‘getting involved’, we refer especially to three aspects of action frames, namely:
a) How young people get societal engaged,
b) The relationship between social engagement and moral thinking/feeling/sensitivity,
c) How societal conditions stimulate and inhibit the involvement of youngsters in voluntary social acts and movements.

a) Personal conditions for young people’s involvement
Besides being in education and professional work, adolescents and young adults often participate a lot in leisure groups like drinking together, going shopping, hanging around, etc. Sociologists speak about the leisure generation, or even about leisure societies. The assumption is that these youngsters are not living consciously and do not reflect about their life and the world around them. This is not a new idea. Almost every older generation argues that the younger generation is not being serious enough and does not have the moral, reflective and dialogical competences and attitudes to live a meaningful life. Every older generation is partly blind for new forms of sense making and being in the world. However, every older generation does recognize the pedagogical task to educate youngsters and to continue society and mankind.

The question behind the leisure theory is not so much how youngsters could change such way of living, but how they learn to take responsibility for what happens around them, with others and with the ones who cannot participate in such endeavors. It seems that for the leisure generation the fragility of meaning making is high and shows up when life events like sickness, poverty, or loss of lives are at stake. Educationalists argue for more support for these youngsters to get involved. To ‘get involved’ is, according to us, also a way for embedding people into a more meaningful social system. Challenging youngsters to think about their life, enlarging their process of meaning making, and getting into a dialogue can result in ‘getting involved’. From the point of view of society, the relational social gain is substantial and helps to understand how sense can be made. Youngsters who get involved have a different self-concept and a higher self-esteem than the ones that do not. They develop a social capital that helps sharing common understanding (Seligman 2002). Even if in a methodological sense we know how young people get involved, we still do not know what makes them ‘getting involved’. In other words: what really are the sources of ‘getting involved’?

b) Involvement and morality
What makes people ‘getting involved’? As mentioned before it is not yet clear in which way helping behavior and other positive forms of social involvement are related to moral motivation. Morality in itself often refers to what not to do. Helping and getting engaged with others has a different source, namely to make the world a better place and give others a chance at an easier life. What are the moral elements for this social behavior? Is there a correlation between moral sensitivity and this pro-social enterprise? In the tradition of the Kohlberg paradigm, the judgment-
action bias does mostly mean moral judgment and the respective moral necessary act – for instance to prevent theft. Involvement with others is less compulsory and not directly related to such acts. Involvement needs a stronger sense of legitimation by the person involved. Nucci (2001) has made the important domain distinction of differentiating between domains that have a higher degree of freedom to act (social domain) and the ones with a lower degree (like morality).

Acting morally in the social domain is often justified by more universal categories like human rights, humanity, and cosmopolitism (Nussbaum, 1997; Hansen, 2008). These categories refer in a positive sense to human beings and the responsibility for humanity and the globe. It is an appealing discourse based on the idea of what connects us and what responsibilities we have, from a sustainability point of view in the cosmos.

A more political argument is given in discourses on democracy. Democracy is the peaceful living together of people with respect for minorities. In particular, more deliberate types of democracy (Gutmann, 1987) or strong democracy (Barber, 1984) needs citizens with the human capacities to reflect, to enter in a dialogue and to change praxis. Different kinds of society and different concepts of democracy ask for different kinds of citizenship. Veugelers (2007) makes a distinction between an adapted non-reflective type of citizenship, an individualistic type of citizenship and a critical-democratic type that combines autonomy and social concern. These types of citizenship refer to different values.

But what are the moral foundations of a more social oriented type of citizenship? Or in the tradition of Kohlberg: what motivates people to use the value of justice? Is it their human consciousness, their feeling that they should not do injustice? Is it a more social-psychological way of thinking of having an easy life without interpersonal and social tensions? Or is it a political living together driven by ‘making the best of it’ together? The crucial argument is when are people not thinking and acting from their own perspective, but do include the perspective of others. When are people getting socially involved?

c). Societal conditions for involvement
It needs to be analyzed under which conditions young people want to get involved. Research has not yet shown what it means to ‘get involved’ in a well organized world. In countries with a strong welfare state, it is difficult to help a beggar because such help is structurally regulated; in other countries however the openness towards poor people has exactly this spontaneous form that help others to overcome the next hours of hunger and misery. For many young members of western societies the necessity to help is not so obvious, and even to participate in social, cultural, political and religious groups is not always necessary.

Learning to participate in society, to ‘get involved’, is crucial. Education, and in particular schools, try to influence the identity development of youngsters. Schools socialize through a hidden curriculum and through explicit social goals. Schools may have their fundamental pedagogical goals like pro-social engagement, sub-
substantial helping and giving to others and they may have programs in which substantial getting involved for others is demanded. These programs can be directed at the society outside the schools, but help and cooperation can also be learned in the schools. Schools however are organized around selection and allocation, but more cooperative and democratic ways of learning are also possible. In schools we see many new forms of mentoring, in-service learning, community-based programs, etc.

Civil society as well offers many possibilities for caring. An orchestra of youngsters gives a concert in a home for drug addicts; students of a secondary school class organize a Christmas celebration in a prison; young members of a political party start a campaign against hunger in the world; members of the scout movement clean up a forest hoping to save it as a nature reserve, etc. All these activities show how much personal engagement of leaders, teachers and responsible educators must be realized in order to develop this vision in the next generation, namely to make caring the main goal of a societal life. These educational and civic programs can have different pedagogical goals, ranging from adapting to political action, and to achieve social justice (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Common in these programs is a concern for the other.

However, participating in programs like this doesn't guarantee a sustainable social orientation in youngsters. The focus should be on processes of personal identity development of youngsters in cultural practices. A psychological concern should be linked with a sociological analysis and driven by ethics and pedagogical goals. In this book we try to bring these perspectives together.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CHAPTERS

The main focus of this book is on how youngsters are ‘getting involved’ in society, the role of morality in this development and practices, experiences of educators working in families, schools and civil society, and effect studies of pedagogical interventions.

The volume is divided into six parts. The first part, ‘Educating the good citizen: Civic engagement’, deals with the relationship of civic education and moral education. The central question of the chapters in this part is about the interference of morality and politics. The second part, ‘Moral development and social engagement’, treats morality with respect to social and pro-social engagement. Elements like autonomy, context and discourse, are important. The third part, ‘Teachers engagement for democratic schools’, relates the ‘getting involved’ concept to schools, school-lives and school-structures. The issue of teacher’s leadership is prevalent. Part four, ‘Methods and strategies for fostering engagement in conflicting fields’, includes many forms of pedagogically stimulating ‘getting involved’; the main question is about how to influence what is going to engage young people. The psychological pre-conditions for such acting are analyzed. Part 5 focus on ‘Research on religious involvement’. Religiousness can be an issue for engaging with others and for chang-
ing the world. ‘Getting involved’ was always a demand in religious denominations; we analyze if religiousness is still a motor for ‘getting involved’. The sixth part, ‘Conflicts between ethical involvement and economic engagement’, finally is about the question of the relationship between economics and ‘getting involved’. To speak about morality in business education means to introduce a different system of rules with respect to shareholder politics and profit and loss reporting.

We start the book with ‘Educating the good citizen: Civic engagement’. In this first part contributions have been brought together that focus on the concept of citizenship and in particular the more affective engagement element of citizenship. All the chapters make clear that there are differences in the way citizenship and citizenship education is conceptualized theoretically and realized in practices.

Westheimer shows in his chapter ‘On the relationship between political and moral engagement’ that moral engagement can be interpreted differently. Westheimer presents research that shows that stimulating moral engagement is embedded in different kinds of pedagogical goals, educational practices and social and political relations. Westheimer and his colleague Kahne make a distinction between the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen and the social-justice oriented citizen. Most programs focus on the first type of citizen, the personal responsible citizen. Some programs focus on the participatory citizen. A democratic society needs, according to Westheimer, a social-justice oriented citizenship; educational programs that work on this kind of citizenship are however difficult to find.

Deakin-Crick presents in ‘Pedagogy for Citizenship’ a review of research on citizenship education and learning and achievement. She concentrates in her analysis on cognitive learning outcomes: meaning making, understanding and reasoning, higher order thinking skills, academic achievement, and communication skills. The learning processes that were identified as making a significant contribution to the five categories of cognitive learning outcomes were: engagement, promoting discussion, learner-centered teaching, meaningful curricula and developing personally. Deakin-Crick argues for a kind of citizenship education characterized by learners’ own enquiry, rich interaction and effective two-way communication, attention to personal and social development, self-assessment and encouragement of reflective self-awareness in learners and their learning teachers.

Leenders, Veugelers and De Kat present in their chapter ‘Moral education and Citizenship education in pre-university schools’ an empirical research among teachers and students in schools about pedagogical goals, practices, experiences and outcomes in moral and citizenship education. They distinguish three types of citizenship and citizenship education: adapting, individualistic and critical-democratic. A school with a more adapting orientation has a dominant community concept of citizenship but with little concern for autonomy; their students however argue for more autonomy. A school with a more individualistic orientation lacks a link with an explicit social component. Also in this school, students ask for a better balance between autonomy and social commitment. A school with a critical-democratic
orientation has a better balance between autonomy and social component, but the emphasis in the social domain is on social performance and not so much on participation in society. Students of all schools argue more then teachers for social issues and politics in the curriculum and for dialogue as method. Teachers are reluctant in teaching about politics.

Markoulis and Dikaiou focus in ‘Being involved: theoretical and research approaches’ on citizen’s participation in actions and interventions to combat social problems in deprived communities. They show how social psychological phenomena can add to the understanding of participation in community context. Group history and inter-group relations are crucial elements in understanding the dynamic processes of participation especially when it refers to citizens from migrant minority groups.

Power and Power explore in ‘Civic Engagement, global citizenship and moral psychology’ some of the moral constructs involved in fostering global citizenship. In particular they focus on psychological prerequisites of citizenship like the moral self. Their empirical study among university students suggests that preparing students for global citizenship requires attention to the development of students’ identity and moral judgment. If students are to become politically engaged, they must see themselves as related not only to other individuals but to their society and to the global community. The study of Power and Power points to the importance of moral judgment for responsible political engagement. Being a good citizen means committing oneself to the pursuit of justice and the common good.

The second part of the book is called ‘Moral development and social engagement’. Chapters in this section focus on the moral component of citizenship. Morality is embedded in each type of citizenship, therefore citizenship development should be linked with moral development. The chapters in this part concentrate on more psychological concepts as moral self, emotional autonomy, sympathy, etc. These contributions show that affective components in the person’s moral self and in the social interaction with others are influencing moral development. These components can support both a theoretical understanding and practical application for a psychological foundation of moral development and citizenship.

The first chapter in this part is by Higgins - D’Alessandro. She analyses in ‘The judgment-action gap: A modest proposal’ what research says about context and personal characteristics that can understand moral behavior. In particular she focuses on personal characteristics like moral self-processes that stimulate the moral self and moral identity. Higgins - D’Alessandro concludes that the notion of moral self-processes may be helpful as a developmental concept, allowing us to think about how moral ideas and values become incorporated into daily functioning and over time into one’s sense of self. The wide variation in individuals’ sense of the parameters of the moral domain may be accounted for by the idea that individuals develop different networks of moral self-processes based on individual life experiences.

Latzko presents in her chapter ‘No morality without autonomy’ an empirical
study on the relation of autonomy and moral development. She makes a distinction in emotional autonomy between cognitive and affective autonomy. Her research shows that affective autonomy, for example the relationship with authorities like parents, influence moral development. There can however be a discrepancy between affective autonomy and cognitive autonomy. Latzko found a sub-group of adolescents who were rated as emotionally autonomous on a cognitive level of appraisal, not however with reference to the affective component. These adolescents found themselves in a transitional phase in the middle of the detachment process, whereby affective and cognitive components were not yet congruent.

Malti, Kriesi and Buchmann extend the focus on moral emotions. They analyze in ‘Adolescent’s pro-social behavior, sympathy, and moral reasoning’ the role of sympathy and moral reasoning as motivational pre-requisites for pro-social action. Moral judgment seems to be a necessary but insufficient condition for moral education. Malti, Kriesi and Buchmann put forward sympathy as an important motive for pro-social behavior, in particular in the domain of friendship. Sympathy is defined as an understanding of another’s situation and involves feelings of concern and involvement for the other. In their study they used a large sample of adolescents. They find that sympathy is an important stimulus for pro-social reasoning. The relationship between these components is however intermediated with the altruistic motive and its relevance to a person’s values and self-concept.

Thoma, Bebeau and Bolland present in their chapter ‘The role of moral judgment in context-specific professional decision making’ research on developmental processes in moral judgment of university students. In particular they looked at intermediate concepts that represent moral concerns that are described in terms of guiding ethical standards of the professional. They found a relation between moral judgment and these professional oriented intermediates. This relationship seems however more complex. Surprising was their finding of a decline in moral judgment development. In particular individuals that express strong personal interest reasoning show this decline. Thoma, Bebeau and Bolland conclude that professional ethics curricula should work more on reducing personal interest reasoning and enhance attention for professional situations.

Gibbs, Basinger, Grime and Snarey present in ‘Globalization and cross-cultural studies of moral judgment development’ a review of studies in which the Social-moral Reflection Measure instrument was used. The studies were done in different countries and cultures around the world. Gibbs and colleagues conclude that in line with the Kohlberg’s view the social interaction, social participation, and, in particular social perspective-taking opportunities facilitate moral judgment development. Regarding cultural differences it is argued that in Snarey’s pluralist-inclusionist stage model the higher stages must be broadened beyond Western philosophical traditions.

We end this part on moral development and social engagement with a contribution by Berkowitz, Althof, Turner and Bloch. In ‘Discourse, development, and education’ they show the importance of transactive discussion. Transactive discussion
was defined as peer discussion where one discussant manifests discursive reasoning about another discussant’s reasoning. They identified 18 different behaviors, ranging from just re-presentation to transformation of the other’s reasoning. Based on a review of the research they conclude that more transactive discussion in adolescent peer moral discours resulted in greater moral reasoning development. These findings are, according to Berkowitz and colleagues, encouraging for educators who wish to reap the developmental benefits of discussion based pedagogies such as cooperative learning, class meetings, and moral dilemma discussions.

The third part is called ‘Teachers engagement for democratic school’. Teachers play a very central role in moral and citizenship education. This chapter presents empirical work on teachers and moral leadership.

Vozzola and Long report in ‘Teaching the political psychology of genocide’ on their research on an educational program with university students. In their work they use the three types of citizens of Westheimer and Kahne. The research among their students shows that students were more involved in criticism than in action. They also find that the topic ‘genocide’ left students with a sense of despair rather than possibility. Vozzola and Long conclude that these kind of projects need to be complemented with stories of human engagement.

Lee presents in her chapter ‘Students and teacher perception of moral atmosphere in Taiwan schools’ a large empirical study. She uses the ‘school as a caring community profile’ scale of Lickona and Davidson. Taiwan students and teachers display a positive attitude toward their school, they score above the median. Students and teachers differ on some elements like ‘perception of student respect for each other’; students were more positive. Students and teachers of elementary schools judge the atmosphere as being better than do students in high schools. The same is true for small schools. Interesting is the finding that in metropolitan schools students and teachers judge the atmosphere as being better than in the rural schools. Lee concludes that schools should encourage a stronger sense of identity and participation of students and teachers.

Schrader states in ‘Teaching moral leadership: becoming moral leaders and being moral leadership’ that all citizens should become consciously aware of what they are teaching and that they are teaching moral leadership. People in formal and informal positions of power exercise moral responsibility in both the means and the ends of interaction and participation. Moral leadership implies for Schrader that leaders have a special obligation for the growth and development of others, and the self, in social interaction. Developing self-reflective awareness and leading by moral example should be part of professional education programs.

In part 4 we bring together ‘Methods and strategies for fostering engagement in conflicting fields’.

Montada argues in his chapter ‘Moral education by conflict mediation’ that social conflicts are at its core normative conflicts, and that even if justice is consid-
ered as an universal motive, the views of what is just and what is unjust are highly diverging. Montada therefore works on programs that teach people procedures and strategies to settle conflicts. He favors conflict mediation in which people learn to negotiate a social contract. Montada presents practical experiences with different strategies.

Lies and Block present in ‘What does it takes to give?’ an empirical study on moral identity, moral reasoning and religiosity as predictors of civic engagement in service-learning programs for upper-middle class students. They compare a group of students that participate in such a program with a group of students randomly selected. Lies and Bloch found that moral identity and moral reasoning are reliable predictors of participation in service-learning; religiosity was not.

Lapsley and Narvaez argue in ‘Psychologized morality and ethical theory’ that Kohlberg embraced the formalist ethical tradition and essentially lowered the fence between ethical theory and moral development. This affirmed the autonomy of morality, but at the expense of the autonomy of psychology. Lapsley and Narvaez advocate a more naturalist psychology approach that attempts to ground ethical theory by what is known about human motivation, the nature of the self, the nature of human concepts, how our reason works, how we are socially constituted, and a host of other facts about who we are and how the minds operates. These ideas imply a great shift in focus in research and educational practices; moral education should then focus more on psychological development.

Gross shows in ‘Combating stereotypes and prejudice as a moral endeavor’ how she works with Israeli Jewish and Arab students in a program on conflict management. The program gives voice and visibility for groups that were traditionally silenced at the university. The program focuses on exclusion and belonging, at inconsistency in attitudes and behavior, on how stereotypes are perceived, on how the transition from the general to the subjective occurs and on the impact of direct contact.

In part 5 we bring together ‘Research on religious involvement’.

Walker and Primer argue in ‘Being good for goodness’ sake’ that moral psychology suffers from a blind spot: the potential relevance of religion, spirituality, and transcendent faith to moral functioning. In a study on moral exemplars they find confirmation of their propositions: that transcendence acts to motivate and amplify moral functioning and that although morality may lead some individuals to concerns about transcendence, it will not do for everybody. Walker and Primer state that the relationship between morality and transcendence is much more complex and is mediated by many other factors.

Tirri, Nokelainen and Holm present a study on ‘Ethical sensitivity of Finnish Lutheran 7th – 9th graders’. In this empirical study they use an ethical sensitivity scale questionnaire based on the work of Narvaez. Tirri, Nokelainen and Holm found that students who had more religious education at school and also were confirmed, assess themselves more as ethical sensitivity than their younger and non-confirmed
educated peers. Female students estimated their ethical skills higher than their male peers. And more academically gifted students estimated their ethical skills as being higher than the opinions of average ability students.

In ‘Phenomenography and the variation theory of learning as tools for understanding religion’ Hella shows how the theory of Marton can help in understanding how the diversity of religious and secular traditions and variation in their beliefs and values can be dealt with as an understanding of religion and religious issues in education. Hella concludes that education should help students to engage with variation in the accounts of reality in order to make judgments between worldviews in relation to their own lives and to live responsibly with others as global citizens amongst the plurality of beliefs and moral values.

Part 6 focuses on ‘Conflicts between ethical involvement and economic engagement’.

Beck studied ‘Moral judgment in economic situations’. He collected moral judgment data from insurance apprentices and clerks over a period of six years. The results show that in the economic domain there is a tension between competition and cooperation. Ethically speaking it is of course unacceptable to sign the principle of seeking profit into an universal law. On the other hand it would be completely unacceptable as well to stigmatize this principle as morally deficient by nature. Beck concludes that instead of universalism we are in the economic domain in need of elaboration of a subsystemic relativism.

Minnamaier continues the debate between business and ethics. In ‘Education for business ethics’ he makes a clear distinction between situations in which direct moral action works and situations in which it is likely to be exploited so that these situations require changing the conditions of action. Conditions might be altered either in the sense of providing more opportunities for moral learning or setting suitable limits to the actions of morally incompetent individuals.

All together this book gives a broad overview of current research in the field of moral development and citizenship. It shows the diversity of concepts, research methodologies, and educational practices. The book in its diversity also shows the influence of local social, cultural and political contexts. Moral development is always articulated by local structures and cultural processes of giving meaning to life. ‘Getting involved’ is necessary for living together, creating democracy and sustainability of a global world.

This book is the first in the series ‘Moral Development and Citizenship Education’. We hope this book will stimulate researchers in their work, in particular if they take positions, methodologies and theoretical traditions that are not or only marginally present in this book. You all are invited to contribute to our series.
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PART I
EDUCATING THE GOOD CITIZEN:
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT
ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICAL AND MORAL ENGAGEMENT

Ask people of any nation if they think children should learn how to be good, moral citizens and most will say “of course.” Ask them if teaching children to get involved – locally, nationally, and globally – is a good idea, and, again, most will assure you that it is. But beyond the clichés, when teachers and education reformers wrestle with the nitty-gritty details of what will actually be taught about civic values, peace and war, nationhood and citizenship, global communities and global economies, the easy consensus starts to fray. What I’d like to do in this chapter is share some reflections on the role of schools in teaching students how to be democratic, politically-engaged, and ethical citizens. I’m going to draw on research that I have conducted with colleagues over the past decade looking at programs that specifically aim to nurture “good citizenship” among youth and young adults. Specifically, in this chapter, I am interested in the relationship between political engagement and ideals of the “moral” citizen.

THE TROUBLE WITH MORALITY

I confess that my relationship with the field of moral education is fraught. As many within the field will be quick to note, the enormous range of goals, values, and ideological commitments represented in moral education curricula and the research programs that seek to assess and advance them often bewilders not only relative outsiders like myself but also longtime enthusiasts (Althof & Berkowitz, 2006). When educators with commitments as varied as those held by Lawrence Kohlberg, Ed Wynn, E.D. Hirsh, William Bennett, Nel Noddings, and John Dewey are all drawn on to support calls for moral education programs in schools, you know there is bound to be trouble. I have always been troubled by a particular strand of moral education that seems to stand in unwitting opposition to goals of independent thinking and critical engagement with ideas. Historically, the emphasis for some moral educators, has been on school practices that reinforce commonly accepted (but not necessarily just) social practices. In contemporary terms, moral educators aligned with particular notions of “character” education – those that emphasize obedience over independent thinking – are, in my mind, too susceptible to pernicious antidemocratic tendencies that I will explain further on.

Moral education strategies can be valuable (especially as an antidote to the myo-
pic focus on math and literacy skills testing currently dominant in schools), but I worry about over-emphasis on conformity and “good” behavior. In fields outside of education – most notably literary criticism – scholars have often tended toward the use of the term “ethical” rather than “moral” to describe normative discourses of “goodness.” The historically religious overtones of “morality” that suggest a kind of objective universality about life decisions and actions make a number of critics uncomfortable (think “moral majority”). For some, the term ethics signifies a more contextual analysis, a recognition that as circumstances and understandings change, so too must our definitions of “good” actions, “good” lives, and “good” societies. But with the exception of philosophers and some literary critics, in many works, the two terms “morality” and “ethics” are used loosely and often interchangeably. It is not my concern for this essay to enter into this important discussion; because the subject of this volume is global citizenship and moral values, I will use “moral” in the broadest sense and when the works I am addressing use “ethical,” I will respond using that term instead.

Despite my reservations about the term “moral” and its associated assumptions, there is no doubt in my mind that consideration of one’s conduct in the world is an important component of any proper education plan. As in other fields, education has a critical role to play in undertaking all of the big questions with which human beings have been preoccupied for thousands of years. In The Way We Argue Now (Anderson, 2006), literary theorist Amanda Anderson argues that her profession has most recently been marked by a “general turn to ethics” (p. 6) that makes central to literary criticism the question “How should I live?” I believe that education, too, must make such questions central. But, if the question “How should I live?” is increasingly central to theory, it has been less so in the last decade of practice in education reform. Moral educators, character educators, service-learning curriculum advocates, and those interested in humanistic and democratic approaches to teaching and learning have an obligation to direct the profession and the public to encourage exactly such inquiry.

For this chapter, I will examine a subset of this more general inquiry. I am concerned here with the role of schools in developing dispositions consistent with democratic habits of citizenship. Which norms of citizenship education typically practiced in schools are consistent with democratic participation? What are the ethical implications of emphasizing some strategies and affording less attention to others? Why are “politics” implicated in these questions and what is the relationship between the political and the moral? I am suggesting three related arguments that have implications for moral educators: (1) There are a variety of competing visions of citizenship; (2) These different visions have different political (and ethical) implications; (3) Programs that emphasize one of these kinds of goals do not necessarily fulfill – and may, in fact, work at cross purposes with – others.
ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICAL AND MORAL ENGAGEMENT

WHAT KIND OF CITIZEN?

So much of school reform lately has been characterized by the elimination of any part of the curriculum that spurs thinking about big ideas, tackling controversial social and political issues, and asking sustained, philosophical questions. As a result, programs that aim to teach children about participation in civic and moral affairs of the community seem sorely needed. And many such programs are adopted in a growing number of North American schools. However, even when educators are expressly committed to teaching “good citizenship,” there is cause for caution. When it comes to teaching democratic citizenship, there is generally quite a lot of head-nodding agreement about the importance of the goal. Yet the kinds of character traits and dispositions necessary are matters of great debate. Some parents, educators, and policy-makers perceive a diminishing sense of commitment, responsibility, and good “character” among students as threats to democratic life. They argue that students must be taught self-reliance, perseverance, and personal fortitude. Others are concerned with declining civic and political participation. Citing declining youth voter participation statistics, they hope schools might teach students the attitudes, skills, and knowledge necessary to participate as active and effective citizens in democratic life. When educators, policymakers, politicians, and community activists pursue democratic citizenship, they do so in many different ways and towards many different ends.

Students are no more in agreement on what good democratic citizenship means than are teachers, policy makers, or politicians. When asked what it means to be a good citizen, one student told us, “Someone who’s active and stands up for what they believe in. If they know that something's going on that is wrong, they go out and change it.” But another student from a different school told us that to be a good citizen, you need to “follow the rules, I guess, as hard as you can, even though you want to break them sometimes. Like cattle.”

My colleague Joseph Kahne and I spent the better part of a decade studying programs that aimed to develop good citizenship skills among youth and young adults. In study after study, we came to similar conclusions: the kinds of goals and practices commonly represented in curricula that hope to foster democratic citizenship usually have more to do with voluntarism, charity, and obedience than with democracy. In other words, “good citizenship” to many educators means listening to authority figures, dressing neatly, being nice to neighbors, and helping out at a soup kitchen – not grappling with the kinds of social policy decisions that every citizen in a democratic society needs to learn how to do.

In our studies of dozens of programs, we identified three visions of “good” citizens that help capture the lay of the land when it comes to citizenship education in the United States: the Personally Responsible Citizen; the Participatory Citizen; and the Social-Justice Oriented Citizen (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). It is worth summarizing the differences here so we might better be able to situate various educational programs that emphasize moral values among these kinds of goals. They
can serve as a helpful guide to uncovering the variety of assumptions that fall under the idea of citizenship education (see Table 1).

### Table 1. Kinds of Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Personally Responsible Citizen</th>
<th>Participatory Citizen</th>
<th>Social-Justice Oriented Citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts responsibly in their community</td>
<td>Active member of community organizations and/or improvement efforts</td>
<td>Critically assesses social, political, and economic structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works and pays taxes</td>
<td>Organizes community efforts to care for those in need, promote economic development, or clean up environment</td>
<td>Explores strategies for change that address root causes of problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picks up litter, recycles, and gives blood</td>
<td>Knows how government agencies work</td>
<td>Knows about social movements and how to effect systemic change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps those in need, lends a hand during times of crisis</td>
<td>Knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
<td>Seeks out and addresses areas of injustice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obey laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Action</th>
<th>Personally Responsible Citizen</th>
<th>Participatory Citizen</th>
<th>Social-Justice Oriented Citizen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributes food to a food drive</td>
<td>Helps to organize a food drive</td>
<td>Explores why people are hungry and acts to solve root causes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible, and law-abiding members of the community</td>
<td>To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must actively participate and take leadership positions within established systems and community structures</td>
<td>To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must question and change established systems and structures when they reproduce patterns of injustice over time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Personally Responsible Citizens** contribute to food or clothing drives when asked and volunteer to help those less fortunate whether in a soup kitchen or a senior-citizen center. They might contribute time, money, or both to charitable causes. Both those in the character education movement and those who advocate community service would emphasize this vision of good citizenship. They seek to build character and personal responsibility by emphasizing honesty, integrity, self-discipline, and hard work (Ryan, 1989; Lickona, 1991). The Character Counts! Coalition, for example, advocates teaching students to “treat others with respect … deal peacefully with anger … be considerate of the feelings of others … follow the Golden Rule … use good manners” and so on. They want students not to “threaten, hit, or hurt anyone [or use] bad language” (Character Counts! 1996). Other programs that seek to develop personally responsible citizens hope to nurture compassion by engaging students in volunteer activities.

Other educators emphasize the vision of the **Participatory Citizen**. Participatory citizens actively participate in the civic affairs and the social life of the community at local, state/provincial, and national levels. Educational programs designed to sup-
port the development of participatory citizens focus on teaching students about how
government and other institutions (e.g., community-based organizations, churches)
work and about the importance of planning and participating in organized efforts to
care for those in need, for example, or in efforts to guide school policies. While the
personally responsible citizen would contribute cans of food for the homeless, the
participatory citizen might organize the food drive.

A third image of a good citizen, and perhaps the perspective that is least com-
monly pursued, is of individuals who know how to critically assess multiple per-
spectives. They are able to examine social, political, and economic structures and
explore strategies for change that address root causes of problems. We called this
kind of citizen the Social-Justice Oriented Citizen because the programs fostering
such citizenship emphasize the need for citizens to be able to think about issues of
fairness, equality of opportunity, and democratic engagement. They share with the
vision of the Participatory Citizen an emphasis on collective work related to the
life and issues of the community. But the nature of these programs gives priority
to students thinking independently, looking for ways to improve society, and being
thoughtfully informed about a variety of complex social issues. These programs are
less likely to emphasize the need for charity and volunteerism as ends in themselves,
and more likely to teach about ways to effect systemic change. If Participatory Citi-
zens organize the food drive and Personally Responsible Citizens donate food, the
Social-Justice Oriented Citizens – some might also call them critical thinkers – ask
why people are hungry, then act on what they discover.

Currently, the vast majority of school programs that take the time to teach citi-
zenship are the kind that emphasize either good character (including the importance of
volunteering and helping those in need), or technical knowledge of legislatures and
how government works. Far less common are schools that teach students to think
about root causes of injustice or challenge existing social, economic, and political
norms as a means for strengthening democracy. If, like Lawrence Kohlberg, we agree
that “social education is moral education and moral education is preparation for citi-
zension” (Kohlberg, 1976, p. 213), then the kind of citizenship preparation going on in
schools is overwhelmingly oriented to individual service and rote “moral” inculcation
of rules, rather than to collective forms of social conscience and action.

Interestingly, many large-scale evaluations of school-based programs showcase
the same penchant for avoiding critical thinking and moral engagement with con-
troversial issues. Research and evaluation of educational programs also reflect this
individual-character based conception of personally responsible citizenship. Com-
mon survey items (the items use a five point Likert scale based on responses ranging
from “1–strongly disagree” to “5–strongly agree”) include:

-- Taking care of people who are having difficulty caring for themselves is (every-
one’s responsibility including mine/is not my responsibility)
-- Helping others without being paid is (not something people should have to do/
something every student should feel they have to do)
Recycling cans, bottles, and other things is (too much of a hassle for me to bother with/everyone’s job, including mine)

These questions (and many more like them) emphasize individual character and charitable acts. They ignore other possible levers for ethical and engaged action in a democracy – participation in social movements, for example, or efforts to shape government policy on behalf of those in need. These same surveys do not ask students questions that address issues such as whether there are enough jobs that pay decent wages for anyone who wants to work or how society should respond if there are not.

“MORAL” CITIZENSHIP DOES NOT ALWAYS MEAN DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP

Programs that privilege individual acts of compassion and kindness often neglect the importance of social action and the pursuit of social justice. I believe it is fair to say that personal responsibility as represented in some moral education programs is an inadequate response to the challenges of educating a democratic citizenry. First, the focus on individual character and behavior obscures the need for collective and often public sector initiatives. Second, this emphasis distracts attention from analysis of the causes of social problems. Finally, volunteerism and kindness are put forward as ways of avoiding politics and policy.

In other words, it is not at all clear that character education, for example, will solve deep-seated social problems unless accompanied by important lessons in critical analysis and ethical reasoning. As John Holt (1995) observes in How Children Fail, “schools tend to mistake good behavior for good character.” When we consider the implications for democracy, the consequences become even more stark. Government leaders in a totalitarian regime would be as delighted as those in a democracy if their young citizens learned the lessons put forward by many of the proponents of personally responsible citizenship: don’t do drugs; show up to work on time; give blood; help others during a flood; recycle; etc. These are all desirable traits for people living in a community. But they are not about democratic citizenship. Efforts to pursue some conceptions of personal responsibility might even undermine efforts to prepare participatory and justice oriented citizens. Obedience and loyalty (common goals of character education), for example, may work against the kind of independent thinking that effective democracy requires. The hidden curriculum of too many character education programs is how to please authority, not how to develop convictions and stand up for them.

POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AND MORAL ENGAGEMENT

Unfortunately, broader school reform has recently moved even further in this direction. In the past five years, hundreds of U.S. schools, districts, states, and even the federal government have enacted policies that seek to restrict the kind of critical
analysis and independent thinking that is consistent with learning how to be an ethically-engaged moral person. For example, in June 2006, Florida became the first state to ban historical interpretation in public schools, thereby effectively outlawing critical thinking. The 2006 Florida Education Omnibus Bill includes language specifying that:

The history of the United States shall be taught as genuine history.... American history shall be viewed as factual, not as constructed, shall be viewed as knowable, teachable, and testable.

Other provisions in the bill mandate “flag education, including proper flag display” and “flag salute” and require educators to stress the importance of free enterprise to the U.S. economy. But what some find most alarming is the stated goal of the bill’s designers: “to raise historical literacy” with a particular emphasis on the “teaching of facts.” For example, the bill requires that only facts be taught when it comes to discussing the “period of discovery” and the early colonies. Facts, that is, but not (ethical) interpretation.

Of course, historians almost universally regard history as exactly a matter of interpretation; indeed, the competing interpretations are what make history so interesting. Historians and educators alike have widely derided the mandated adherence to an “official story” embodied in the Florida legislation, but the impact of such mandates should not be underestimated – especially because Florida is not alone. In April 2008, the Arizona House of Representatives passed SB 1108 specifying that schools whose teachings “denigrate or encourage dissent” from American values would lose state funding. This drive to engage schools in reinforcing a unilateral understanding of history and policy shows no sign of abating. More and more, teachers and students are seeing their schools or entire districts and states limiting their ability to explore multiple perspectives to controversial issues. From a moral-reasoning perspective, Berkowitz (1988), Walker (1983), and others, have emphasized the importance of being exposed to multiple perspectives on the development of moral thinking. Moreover, role-taking exercises (limited under a growing set of legislative policies) have also been found to promote the development of moral reasoning (Day, 1991; Lind, 2000). As changes in the school curriculum reflect a growing intolerance for discussion, debate, and role-playing exercises, some educators are concerned with the devastating impact reforms like these could have on the health of democracy itself.

POLITICALLY-ENGAGED MORAL EDUCATION

There are many varied and powerful ways to teach children and young adults to engage the moral issues critical to the development of democratic societies. While a significant body of work has been written in this regard (for example, Greene, 2000; Kohn, 2004; Noddings, 2007; Veugelers & Oser, 2003; Shapiro, 2005; Veugelers, 2007), I want to focus here on a few examples of the possibilities for curriculum
aimed in particular at civic engagement with dilemmas of ethical importance. For example, longtime teacher Brian Schultz’s inspiring efforts with his 5th grade class in Chicago’s Cabrini-Green housing project area included having his students conduct research on improving conditions in their own neighborhood, especially with regard to broken promises to build a new school. His students studied historical approaches to change and, rejecting passivity, demonstrated a deep attachment to their community and neighbors. Each step of the way, they grappled with ethical concerns as they related to the political and economic reality of their surroundings (Schultz, 2008).

Bob Peterson, a one-time Wisconsin Elementary Teacher of the Year, worked with his students at La Escuela Fratney in Madison to examine the full spectrum of ideological positions that emerged following the events of September 11, 2001 and the policies that followed. Instead of avoiding the challenging questions his 5th grade students posed, Peterson encouraged them, placing a notebook prominently at the front of the classroom labeled “Questions That We Have.” As the students discussed their questions and the unfolding current events, Peterson repeatedly asked students to consider their responsibilities to one another, to their communities, and to the world. Through poetry (Langston Hughes’s “Let America Be America Again”); historical readings (the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, the 1918 Sedition Act); and current events (photographs of September 11 memorial gatherings, protests in the United States and abroad, newspaper editorials), Peterson allowed students to explore political events surrounding the September 11 attacks and their effect on American patriotism and democracy (Peterson, 2007; Westheimer, 2007).

El Puente Academy in the Williamsburg neighborhood of Brooklyn, New York, ties the entire school curriculum to students’ and teachers’ concerns about the community. Named a New York City School of Excellence, El Puente boasts a 90 percent graduation rate in an area where schools usually see only 50 percent of their students graduate in four years. El Puente principal Héctor Calderón attributes the school’s success to a curriculum that engages students in efforts to realize democratic ideals of justice and equality, reverse the cycle of poverty and violence, and work toward change in their own neighborhood. Students study environmental hazards in the area, not only because they care about the health of the natural environment, but also because these hazards directly affect the health of the community to which they are deeply committed. El Puente students learn that ethical action requires more than following a list of rules or principles, but rather constant engagement with realities of neighbors, causes of problems, and political solutions. In one unit, students surveyed the community to chart levels of asthma and identify families affected by the disease. Their report became the first by a community organization to be published in a medical journal. Students and teachers also successfully fought a 55-story incinerator that was proposed for their neighborhood (Gonzales, 1995; North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 2000; Westheimer, 2005).

These approaches to political engagement all force students and teachers to grapple
with profoundly moral questions of justice, equality, and community. They share several characteristics with some but by no means all more traditional moral education programs. First, teachers encourage students to ask questions rather than absorb pat answers – to think about their attachments and commitments to their local, national, and global communities. Second, teachers provide students with the information (including competing narratives) they need to think about subject-matter in substantial ways. Third, they root instruction in local contexts, working within their own specific surroundings and circumstances because it is not possible to teach democratic forms of thinking without providing an environment to think about.

CHALLENGE FOR MORAL EDUCATORS

Many of the most popular moral education programs focus first and foremost on virtues – last month honesty, this month integrity, next month loyalty, and so on. As a recipe for unquestioning obedience, the rationale for this kind of educational approach might be compelling. But for those who want to develop ethical citizens, able to critically evaluate public policies and act on their beliefs, the challenge lies rather in creating a school environment in which the ethical life can flourish. This kind of school environment is under attack either directly or indirectly in many school reform policies. Indeed, many educators concerned with the ethical development of children and with societal improvement would find their goals well-represented by turn-of-the-20th-century progressives. John Dewey, for example, called for school activities to constitute a continuous engagement with social aim of the community. Under these conditions, he wrote in 1916, “the school becomes itself a form of social life, a miniature community, and one in close interaction with other modes of associated experience beyond school walls... All education which develops power to share effectively in [such a] social life is moral” (Dewey, 1916, p.360). The progressives, while concerned with the moral development of the individual, laid that concern squarely in the broader struggle towards a better society. Their hopes for change reflected the historical power of social movements and democratic participation in social and political movements. They sought “not to instill and reinforce specific virtues but to engage in the skills of democratic citizenship: deliberation, problem solving, and participation in governance of the group” (Berkowitz, 2004, p. 192). As Jeffrey McClellan (1999, cited in Berkowitz, 2004) observes, progressives,

consistently gave more attention to great social and political issues than to matters of private conduct. Reversing the emphasis of earlier moral educators, they expressed little interest in the drinking habits or sexual conduct of individuals as long as such personal behavior did not impede the ability to operate as intelligent and productive citizens. (p. 57).

Education is without a doubt both a moral and a political enterprise. We all want to live next to people who do not lie, who pick up their trash, who are hard-working,
cheerful, and who, for the most part, obey the law. But, as I have suggested and as many advocates of moral education observe, moral education too often through both omission and commission, advances a far darker side of individual character, one that works towards neither democratic, nor global, nor – many would argue – moral behavior. Although there are many who are careful to define their work in moral development in terms that embrace the goals of democracy, diversity, and social justice, when it comes to schools, they are often found locked in opposition, or worse in uneasy but oddly productive cahoots with those who equate morality with the status quo and with the most conservative neo-liberal forces this world has seen in more than a century. There is good reason to worry that the more we allow cultural, social, and political problems to be defined exclusively as individualistic and moral ones, the more we further the work of this latter group.

Often when I have spoken about these issues, I have inadvertently conveyed a sense that I am somehow against the idea of schools teaching personal responsibility (or what some readers might consider “character” or “virtues.” I have never intended to suggest that there is something wrong with developing a sense of personally responsible citizenship in young people (except to the extent it conflicts with critical thinking). I am only suggesting that personally responsible citizenship is only a partial response. We also need citizens to be able to talk about visions of the good society and think critically about policies that help or hinder their goals. And we need citizens who can take action on ideas they believe in to help improve society. But personal responsibility is still an important disposition to teach, as I will illustrate with a personal story.

I am from New York City. On the morning of the September 11 terrorist attacks, I stood with my wife and daughter on a street corner 18 city blocks away from the World Trade Center. We watched as the second plane hit the South tower. Soon after, we watched both buildings collapse into the impossibly dense financial district streets below. I can’t properly describe for you the haunting silence, shock, and grief in the minutes that followed. It spread across our fellow New Yorkers – who stood with us on that corner and on countless other corners, in cafés, and in living rooms throughout the city. It was not long after the second tower fell that the first office workers arrived at our corner covered in dust and debris and carrying first-hand accounts of what had happened. As rumors of gas explosions spread and as the enormity of the events slowly revealed themselves, we raced home to fetch bicycles and pedal uptown to Washington Heights, the northern Manhattan community where my mother lives – still close by but removed from the noxious air that ensued for months after the attacks. We spent the next few days, like most New Yorkers, communing with others on the streets, in local restaurants, and in parks, trying to make sense of the unthinkable. I tell this here because I want to draw your attention to the fact that I fully considered only weeks after September 11: While we were standing on that street corner, tens of thousands of schoolchildren in lower Manhattan were with their teachers. In fact, until we went to get my daughter, she too was in a pre-school.
In the book *Forever After: New York City Teachers and 9/11*, dozens of teachers tell stories of being put in impossible situations, many of them on their 3rd or 4th day of teaching. These teachers picked a vocation defined by responsibility for the young. But they never could have imagined what that responsibility would entail. The teachers responded in all different ways: had children sing songs; draw pictures; get in lines; escorted them outside; grabbed hands and ran as fast as they could. Some children saw people jump from the burning towers; some children and teachers were covered in debris. Some were frightened; others confused. Teachers didn’t really know what to do. Nobody did. But every one of those teachers – on their fourth day of the school year – knew that they were teachers and that they held enormous personal responsibility for those children. Patricia Lent, one of the teachers whose story is told in this book, was a third grade teacher who taught at PS 234, right under the collapsing towers – she ran with her children uptown to PS 41 and to safety. Eight months after that harrowing day, she asked her young students “what do you remember most about September 11?” And one of the little boys said, “what I remember most is that you held my hand and never let go.” Let’s hope that none of us are ever put into a similar situation. But in many ways – big and small – as educators, we all hold personal responsibility for the people we teach. And as citizens, we all hold personal responsibility for each other.

At the same time, moral educators interested in developing the ethical predispositions long associated with democratic citizenship have a responsibility to advance at least the three dimensions of citizenship I have described. Personal responsibility is not the same as participation in the civic and political life of the community. Similarly, personal responsibility and participation do not guarantee an orientation towards justice. For those interested in schooling’s civic purposes, it is not enough to argue that moral values as important as traditional academic priorities. We must also ask what kind of values. What political and ideological interests are embedded in varied conceptions of citizenship and moral behavior? How do these values encourage or discourage deep thinking about social problems? How do these different values encourage or discourage action? Through questions such as these, we can assess whether students will be ready to take action to make our world more humane and more just. That is a goal for moral education that I believe we should all be able to support.

NOTES

1 This chapter is adapted from a keynote address delivered at the annual conference of the Association For Moral Education (Freiburg, Switzerland). July 2006. The author would like to thank Fritz Oser and John Snarey for the invitation to present at the conference. The research for this chapter was supported by generous grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE), and the University Research Chair Program at the University of Ottawa. Wiel Veugelers gave thoughtful feedback on an earlier presentation of these ideas.

2 Most notably, research conducted with my longtime colleague Joe Kahne of Mills College in Oak-
land, California but also with Sharon Cook, Gina Bottamini, Alessandra Iozzo, Kristina Llewellyn, Alison Molina, and Karen Emily Suurtamm at the University of Ottawa.

Historically, school-based moral education programs relied on “codes of conduct” to convey a set of core values to children (McClellan, 1999) and many contemporary character education programs continue to follow in this tradition. The Children’s Morality Code, published in 1917 by William Hutchins, for example, suggested that children be taught ten laws of “right living.” These included: self-control, good health, kindness, sportsmanship, self-reliance, duty, reliability, truth, good workmanship, and team work. Similarly, contemporary programs that emphasize the popular “Six Pillars of Character” (from the Josephson Institute of Ethics): trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship.


See also Schudson, The Good Citizen, 1998 for his discussion of ‘colonial citizenship’ “built on social hierarchy…and the traditions of public service, personal integrity, [and] charitable giving…” (294).

See Kahne, Westheimer, & Rogers (2000).
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INTRODUCTION

Citizenship education became a statutory requirement for secondary schools in England from September 2002 and a recommended subject for primary schools with guidelines in the form of a framework for personal, social and health education and citizenship. The history of the development of this policy initiative spans the 1990s and has been informed by the requirements of the 1992 Education Act, which required OFSTED to report on the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of students in schools. Significant among the resulting policies were developments in personal, social and health education; and a range of initiatives, which addressed the personal and social aspects of student development, including the National Forum for Values in Education and the Community. All these initiatives have been informed by growing societal concerns about values and the personal development of young people. Resources for citizenship education are provided from within the voluntary sector and from government departments.

Alongside these policy developments, there has been a much greater emphasis on improving standards in education, focusing mostly on measurable learning outcomes but, more recently in the UK, a significant emphasis on the processes of learning, and the use of assessment for learning rather than simply of learning outcomes. These policy initiatives are generally seen as distinct and separate from the initiatives surrounding citizenship and values. However, evidence from a systematic review (Deakin Crick et al., 2004) suggests that when schools address citizenship education, defined in its broadest sense, then there are implications for the core tasks of schooling and in particular for the context and manner in which students learn. This paper reports on the findings of a second systematic review which focused on the relationship between citizenship education and learning and achievement (Deakin Crick et al., 2005).

DEFINITIONAL AND CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Within England, and to some extent the five nations of the UK, the Crick Report (1998) provides the current framework for citizenship education. Crick defined citizenship education as including three distinct strands: moral and social responsibility, community involvement and political literacy. The programmes of study for
the National Curriculum appear to focus more on political literacy, but many of the outcomes are in the domain of personal development. Citizenship is linked in these documents to whole school ethos and organisation, to values education and to the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of students. While much discretion is left to individual schools, it is clearly expected that citizenship education will appear in discrete curriculum time, across the whole curriculum and in extracurricular activities and be related to the school’s particular vision and values.

The report identified four distinct elements of Citizenship Education, which it suggested should be reached by the end of compulsory schooling. These are key concepts, values and dispositions, skills and aptitudes, and knowledge and understanding. The skills in particular relate to cognitive and social learning processes, while the values and dispositions relate to moral concerns some of which are reminiscent of Smith and Spurling’s (1999) moral components of lifelong learning.

The first systematic review addressed the question of the impact of citizenship education on the processes and structures of schooling (Deakin Crick et al., 2004). The findings of that review, based on 14 studies from around the world, indicated that citizenship education does have a significant impact on school processes and structures. The implications of this are important for school leaders as they address policies relating to teaching and learning; leadership and management; school ethos and context; external relations; and community and curriculum construction and development.

The combined findings relating to these themes are summarised here:

- The quality of dialogue and discourse is central to learning in citizenship education.
- Dialogue and discourse are connected with learning about shared values, human rights, and issues of justice and equity.
- A facilitative, conversational pedagogy may challenge existing power structures.
- Transformative, dialogical and participatory pedagogies complement and sustain achievement rather than divert attention from it.
- Such pedagogies require quality of teacher-student relationships that are inclusive and respectful.
- Students should be empowered to voice their views, and to name and make meaning from their life experiences.
- Contextual knowledge and problem-based thinking can lead to (citizenship) engagement and action.
- Engagement of students in citizenship education requires educational experiences that are challenging, attainable and relevant to students’ lives and narratives.
- Opportunities should be made for students to engage with values issues embedded in all curriculum subjects and experiences.
- A coherent whole-school strategy, including a community-owned values framework, is a key part of leadership for citizenship education.
- Participative and democratic processes in school leadership require particular
attitudes and skills on the part of teachers and students.

- Listening to the voice of the student leads to positive relationships, an atmosphere of trust and increased participation. It may require many teachers to ‘let go of control’.
- Teachers require support to develop appropriate professional skills to engage in discourse and dialogue, and to facilitate citizenship education.
- Strategies for consensual change have to be identified by, and developed in, educational leaders.
- Schools often restrict participation by students in shaping institutional practices but expect them to adhere to policies and this can be counterproductive to the core messages of citizenship education.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND ACHIEVEMENT

On the basis of these findings, the Review Group undertook a second systematic review to focus on the relationship between citizenship education and learning and achievement. For the purposes of this review Citizenship education was understood as all of those planned experiences that school-based educators construct for their students in order to fulfil the different aims and purposes of citizenship education. These may be formal or informal, explicit or implicit, extra-curricular, cross-curricular or within particular curriculum strands. Citizenship education also includes the provision for pastoral and personal development of students and relates to both pedagogy and school ethos and culture.

The conceptual framework provided a starting point for the review was drawn from Crick (1998). This framework was selected because it was itself the outcome of considerable research, development and consultation, drawing on a wide range of processes that together were referred to at the time, as forming ‘preparation for adult life’ initiatives. It is also a framework that defines the scope of citizenship education in England and although its terminology is contested, it is ‘maximal’ in its scope and provided a broad framework around which to focus the study. However, internationally there are other terms which refer to aspects of citizenship education, and in order to capture the widest possible range of curriculum activities the terms described in Table 1 were used in searching and in keywording.
Table 1. Search terms for ‘citizenship education’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship Education</th>
<th>Educational programmes which are designed to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral and social responsibility</td>
<td>Develop in learners’ moral and social attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Engage learners in learning and service in the wider community or the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political literacy</td>
<td>Equip learners with the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and know how to engage in public life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual moral social and cultural development</td>
<td>Develop in learners any aspect of personal development which is not measured as a cognitive learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for diversity</td>
<td>Nurture in learners an understanding of difference between groups and cultures and a capacity to engage positively with groups and cultures ‘different in some way from me’. Includes race, disability, gender, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character education</td>
<td>Contribute to the formation of a person’s – values, virtues, character and behaviour – which is beneficial to self, others and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and social literacy</td>
<td>Develop the capacity to understand one’s own emotions, others’ emotions and to use that knowledge effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values education</td>
<td>Nurture learners in an understanding of and a personal engagement with values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>Engage learners in learning which is constructed as service in the wider community or the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Enable learners to understand and resolve personal and communal conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer mediation</td>
<td>Enable learners to support peers in resolving conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights education</td>
<td>Lead to an understanding of human rights and an engagement with the values of human rights legislation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT**

The terms learning and achievement were used to capture both the processes and the outcomes of learning that may, theoretically, be associated with citizenship education. Learning processes include those cognitive, affective and volitional processes, attitudes and dispositions that operate in order for students to learn. ‘Learning outcomes’ refers to achievement, when that is determined by a summative assessment either by teachers, or by tests or examinations. The domains of achievement are not limited to cognitive outcomes, although these are the most readily understood, as, for example, in the knowledge, skills or understanding required for particular levels in a subject of the curriculum. Specific curricular outcomes, such as these, are often referred to as ‘attainment’. For the purpose of this review, ‘achievement’ was understood as a learning outcome, which may be assessed by teachers or students.
and which may pertain to cognitive, personal, social, emotional, or moral/political domains of human experience.

Achievement in citizenship education, for example, could be determined by a portfolio or narrative account of particular service activities or experiences a student has recorded and evaluated. Less common, achievement measures could be a ‘citizenship award’ for particular service to the community, or the ‘learner of the week’ award in a classroom where the processes of learning are valued as much as the outcomes. It could also be a teacher or self-assessment of a student’s social skills, such as empathy or conflict resolution.

THE REVIEW METHODOLOGY

Funding for this review was provided by CitizEd – a professional resource network in the UK funded by the Teacher Development Agency (TDA) and by the EPPI-Centre, which was established in 1999 with UK Government funding to support groups in undertaking systematic reviews of research in education to inform policy and practice. Its aim is to provide, in the education sector, a resource that gives policy makers and practitioners access to constantly updated results from synthesised research evidence. As a condition of funding, reviews are undertaken by groups, using systematic protocols and procedures briefly described later, which provide precise parameters for the review specification.

The literature was restricted to studies conducted with students aged 4-18, and excluded further and higher education. The search for studies was completed in 2004 and any studies published after this date were not included. A further limitation was that the review included studies published in English, and although theoretically studies from all around the world could be included, it meant that studies published only in other languages were excluded.

Within this framework, the review included all types of studies, from a range of research genres. The term ‘intervention’ was used to describe any intentional pedagogical activity which met the criteria for citizenship education. The review attempted to appraise the weight of evidence of each study and this was based on a composite judgement of its methodological soundness, the relevance of the study type to the review and the extent to which the study addressed the review question. This overall judgement is review specific and does not represent a view of the quality of a study in its own right.

REVIEW QUESTION

The overall question addressed in the review was as follows:

What is the impact of citizenship education on student learning and achievement?

In order to achieve all the aims of the review, it was necessary to address the fol-
What are the implications of the findings of the review for teacher education?

The term ‘impact’ was used in this review question with care. It could imply a linear, cause-effect relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable. However, the Review Group was concerned that such a narrow definition might not do justice to the complexity of the two variables, and the iterative relationship between them.

LITERATURE SEARCH

Addressing these questions involved seeking out a range of studies of different types. Both intervention studies and non-intervention studies were relevant. Intervention studies were those in which a specific citizenship intervention programme was introduced in order to study the effect of citizenship education on student learning and achievement. These studies could be either researcher manipulated (e.g. the researcher had introduced the intervention), or naturally occurring (e.g. the citizenship programme was already occurring prior to any evaluation). These interventions took the form of quasi-experimental studies and some involved the comparison of results between groups who received the intervention and those groups who did not. Non-intervention studies did not involve intervention programmes but included surveys of existing conditions relating to citizenship education in order to describe and identify associations between citizenship programmes and learning processes and outcomes.

The review question served as a framework in the search for studies. All the relevant electronic databases, journals held in accessible libraries and those online were searched, citations in earlier reviews and obtained papers were followed up and personal contacts used to obtain further references. The number of studies relevant to the review question found in this way was 578.

APPLYING INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA AND KEYWORDS

Before obtaining the full text of the studies, inclusion and exclusion criteria were systematically applied to titles and abstracts of the articles. Studies were included if they were empirical studies, written in English, undertaken in a school context, involved citizenship education and learning or achievement. The full text of the 48 studies meeting those criteria were then obtained and read. A further 13 were excluded at this stage because of a mismatch between abstract and text, or because the reporting was of insufficient quality. The next step was to describe the remaining 35 studies in terms of a set of keywords relating to study type, source, age range and a set of review specific keywords describing which aspect of citizenship education and which aspects of learning and/or achievement the study addressed. The review specific key words are presented in table 2 below. A definition of each
of the key words is provided in appendix one. The keywording and the application of inclusion and exclusion criteria were both undertaken by two reviewers working independently, and then moderated.

Table 2. Review specific keywords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship Education</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral and social responsibility</td>
<td>Creative thinking</td>
<td>Cognitive outcomes (e.g. logical, linguistic, mathematical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Personal outcomes (e.g. inter and intra-personal development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political literacy</td>
<td>Meta-cognition</td>
<td>Social outcomes (e.g. relationships with groups, societies, communities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights education</td>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>organisations and the world)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for diversity</td>
<td>Meaning-making</td>
<td>Moral and political outcomes (e.g. political literacy, political knowledge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual moral social and cultural development</td>
<td>Inter- and intra-personal awareness, including</td>
<td>ethical decision-making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal development</td>
<td>empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character education</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and social literacy</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values education</td>
<td>Problemsolving/decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>Values awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for adult life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive outcomes (e.g. logical, linguistic, mathematical)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal outcomes (e.g. inter and intra-personal development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social outcomes (e.g. relationships with groups, societies, communities, organisations and the world)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and political outcomes (e.g. political literacy, political knowledge, ethical decision-making)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINAL SELECTION OF STUDIES

At this point a detailed ‘map’ of the included studies was discussed by the review group. The resource implications and complexity of the map led to a decision to focus only on those studies which addressed cognitive learning outcomes, leaving the remaining studies for a future review process. Of particular interest to the group was the relationship between citizenship education and the development of knowledge, skills and understanding. The in-depth review question was therefore:

What is the impact of citizenship education on students’ cognitive learning outcomes?
Data extraction was carried out using the guidelines for coding and quality assessing educational research (EPPI-Centre 2003b) applying the EPPI Reviewer – the EPPI-Centre’s software. This rigorous and quality assured process led to a set of research evidence which was then available for synthesis. In order to bring the studies together to form conclusions, the studies were reported initially in terms of evidence of cognitive outcomes, such as higher order, critical and abstract thinking, conceptual and creative thinking with the application of concepts and principles to situations, meta-cognition, meaning-making and making connections between concepts and experiences, communication skills, problem-solving/decision-making, the award of grades and academic achievement. Other significant outcomes, such as social and personal outcomes were reported on secondarily where relevant, because, while not being cognitive, these outcomes were recognised as making a fundamental contribution to the cognitive learning and achievement of the whole person.

The details of the findings of each study are reported in the full review text while a summary of the studies is reported in table 3. At this stage the findings were then peer reviewed, both in a consultation meeting and in writing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Citizenship education</th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Overall weight of evidence</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyer and Presseisen</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Evaluation: Researcher-manipulated</td>
<td>Moral and social responsibility, Spiritual moral, social and cultural development, Values education, Human rights education</td>
<td>Critical thinking, Meaning-making, Inter-personal awareness, Values awareness</td>
<td>Cognitive outcomes, Social outcomes, Moral and political outcomes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and Goldowsky</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Evaluation: Naturally occurring</td>
<td>Moral and social responsibility, Spiritual moral, social and cultural development, Values education</td>
<td>Creative thinking, Critical thinking, Meaning-making, Values awareness</td>
<td>Cognitive outcomes, Personal outcomes, Social outcomes, Moral and political outcomes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare et al. (1996)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Exploration of relationships</td>
<td>Moral and social responsibility, Spiritual moral, social and cultural development, Character education</td>
<td>Critical thinking, Meaning-making, Intra-personal awareness</td>
<td>Cognitive outcomes, Moral and political outcomes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Citizenship education</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Overall weight of evidence</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia-Obregon et al. (2000)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Evaluation: Naturally occurring</td>
<td>Moral and social responsibility, Community involvement, Spiritual moral social and cultural development, Service learning</td>
<td>Experiential learning, Meaning-making, Inter-personal awareness</td>
<td>Cognitive outcomes, Personal outcomes, Social outcomes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laconte et al. (1993)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Evaluation: Researcher-manipulated</td>
<td>Moral and social responsibility, Character education</td>
<td>Intra-personal awareness, Communication skills, Problem-solving/ decision-making</td>
<td>Cognitive outcomes, Personal outcomes, Social outcomes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Evaluation Type</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Cognitive Outcomes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchior (1999)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Naturally occurring</td>
<td>Community involvement, Service learning</td>
<td>Personal outcomes</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential learning, Meaning-making, Inter-personal awareness, Intra-personal awareness</td>
<td>Social outcomes, Moral and political outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite and Adams (1997)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Exploration of relationships</td>
<td>Moral and social responsibility, Emotional and social literacy, Values education</td>
<td>Personal outcomes, Social outcomes, Moral and political outcomes</td>
<td>Medium, Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell (2002)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Naturally occurring</td>
<td>Moral and social responsibility, Spiritual moral social and cultural development, Emotional and social literacy, Values education</td>
<td>Personal outcomes, Social outcomes, Moral and political outcomes</td>
<td>Medium, Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbitts (2001)</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Researcher-manipulated</td>
<td>Political Literacy, Values education</td>
<td>Personal outcomes, Social outcomes, Moral and political outcomes</td>
<td>Medium, Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade (1994)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Naturally occurring</td>
<td>Human rights education</td>
<td>Personal outcomes, Social outcomes</td>
<td>High, Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY THEMES EMERGING FROM THE FINDINGS

The findings from the 13 studies were synthesised into five categories of cognitive learning outcomes and five learning processes. Although this review focused on the 13 studies that reported on evidence of impact on cognitive learning outcomes, these studies all reported evidence relating to other types of outcomes and a range of learning processes. The evidence suggests that it is the interrelatedness of affective, cognitive, and volitional learning processes, interacting together in a cohesive and well planned citizenship education programme (Melchior, 1999; Deakin Crick 2002), which has an impact on the achievement of the learner as a whole person, who then displays greater self-confidence and is a more potent learner (Faubert et al. (1996).

An overarching finding is that the effects of these variables are difficult to study independently of each other because they function together more in the manner of a complex ‘ecology’ rather than as a set of discrete entities. Thus the evidence suggests that learning and achievement in citizenship education is a complex domain, which cannot be reduced to a single variable. Student learning and achievement is associated with the nature and quality of the pedagogy of the subject. The following discussion will deal with these factors together to reflect this complexity.

COGNITIVE LEARNING OUTCOMES

The five categories of cognitive learning outcomes (table 4) drawn from across the 13 studies

– meaning-making
– understanding and reasoning
– higher order thinking skills
– academic achievement
– communication skills
Table 4. Emergent cognitive learning outcomes findings from in-depth review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive learning outcomes</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LEARNING PROCESSES**

The following learning processes (table 5) were identified from the findings as making a significant contribution to the five categories of cognitive learning outcomes.

- engagement
- promoting discussion
- learner-centred teaching
- meaningful curricula
- developing personally
Table 5. Learning processes findings of in-depth review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning processes</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Developing personally | Improved attitudes, behaviour, better attendance, positive experiences, positive self-image and self-confidence, care and respect for others, ability to respond, conflict-resolution skills, increased interest in learning, beneficial impacts non-white, educationally disadvantaged, and students with learning difficulties. | Clare et al. (1996), Faubert et al. (1996), Garcia-Obregon et al. (2000), Melchior (1999), Polite and Adams (1997), Russell (2002)

**DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS: COGNITIVE LEARNING OUTCOMES**

*Meaning-making*

There is strong support from the study findings that citizenship education can engage children to seek (cognitive) understanding for the meaning of their personal stories and experiences when acquiring conceptual knowledge and knowledge of others’ situations (Beyer and Presseisen, 1995; Black and Goldowsky, 1999; Day, 2002; Polite and Adams, 1997). There is evidence that students' motivation to participate increased when topics were pertinent and relevant to their own experiences and they could make connections between the content and experiences in their personal lives (Wade, 1994; Polite and Adams, 1997). Students were able to apply knowledge of others’ situations to make sense of:

- their own personal and social worlds making learning more meaningful (Black and Goldowsky, 1999; Deakin Crick, 2002)
- the implications of their own actions (Beyer and Presseisen, 1995)
- how they regarded people who may be in similar challenging situations (Day, 2002)

Meaning-making was linked to innovative learner-centred media, such as the use of theatre, role-play, simulations, conversational instructional discourse, discussion, journal-keeping and reflection exercises (Black and Goldowsky, 1999; Clare et al., 1996; Deakin Crick, 2002; Faubert et al., 1996; Melchior, 1999; Wade, 1994). The findings suggest that quality dialogue, thinking and talking and well-designed programmes make a difference and are likely to have an impact on student outcomes (Deakin Crick 2002; Melchior, 1999). Where students were given the opportunity to discuss events in relation to their personal experiences, this aided them in connecting their world with a curriculum content that they would otherwise have seen as disparate and unrelated to their life (Faubert et al., 1996).

*The implication is citizenship education can enhance students’ ability to make meaning of and connections between their personal stories and society.*
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Students’ understanding and inductive and deductive reasoning, were enhanced and developed (Deakin Crick, 2002; Polite and Adams, 1997; Russell, 2002) in citizenship education through the use of meaningful curricula and learner-centred processes such as:

- dialogue and debate – class conferences, conversational discussions, seminars (Clare et al., 1996; Polite and Adams, 1997; Wade, 1994)
- increased participation – group and individual, presentation, research, discussion (Clare et al., 1996; Deakin Crick, 2002; Faubert et al., 1996; Polite and Adams, 1997; Russell, 2002)
- opportunities for reflection – watching theatre, journal-keeping, weekly written exercises (Day, 2002; Faubert et al., 1996; Melchior, 1999).

Students’ understanding of the process of conceptual change can influence their understanding of lesson content and their cognitive engagement (Wade, 1994) leading to a better understanding of community (Melchior, 1999). It is evident from the studies that student reasoning skills about human relationships (Beyer and Presseisen, 1995) were helped and enhanced with students better able to reason about social, moral and ethical issues of different subjects, such as science, that may impact their lives (Black and Goldowsky, 1999). The evidence suggests that students were better able to comprehend problems (Clare et al., 1996), their thinking skills went beyond levels normal for their classroom (Deakin Crick, 2002; Russell, 2002) and that students developed a greater reliance on problem-solving (Faubert et al., 1996).

The implication is that citizenship education can improve students’ understanding and reasoning skills.

Higher order thinking skills

There is support in the study findings by Polite and Adams (1997) that citizenship education can engage and encourage students in meta-cognitive processes and this is achieved through the processes of learner-centred pedagogy and meaningful curricula. Where teachers assisted students with developmentally appropriate questions, students’ critical thinking skills in moral or social reasoning were increased (Clare et al., 1996). Students’ conceptual thinking; ability to analyse, consider and grasp multiple ideas and abstract concepts (Deakin Crick, 2002; Tibbits, 2001); their ability to make sense of the abstract notions of the lesson content and to reconsider their ideas in the light of new information (Wade, 1994) were all outcomes of these studies. Conceptual abstract thinking and thought provoking curricula increased students ability to link complex and moral issues (Black and Goldowsky, 1999), facilitating students to move beyond basic points and superficial understanding to explore the moral and emotional qualities of issues (Clare et al.,
The provision of citizenship education can result in statistically significant positive changes in formal operational thought through movement from concrete literal thinking to abstract and scientific thinking (Faubert et al., 1996) resulting in higher levels of reflection.

*The implication is that the provision of citizenship education can engage and enhance students’ higher order thinking skills.*

**Academic achievement**

Evidence from across the studies show that citizenship education improved students’ grades and academic achievement. There was a positive impact on grades, with increased achievement, cognitive engagement and cognitive functioning (Deakin Crick, 2002; Melchior, 1999; Polite and Adams, 1997); the development of further knowledge (Wade, 1994); and gains in cognitive abilities (Faubert et al., 1996; Garcia-Obregon et al., 2000). There was some evidence that service learning had a stronger impact on academic achievement among non-whites, along with improved school performance (Melchior, 1999).

*The implication is that the provision of citizenship education can enhance students’ academic achievement.*

**Communication skills**

There is evidence of increased communication skills (Black and Goldowsky, 1999; Day, 2002), which is closely related to participation and dialogue. Where students received increased opportunities to participate in dialogue and structured class discussions, they could express themselves freely and justify and explain their views (Wade, 1994). Citizenship education was found to enhance students’ abilities to develop, debate and express complex moral and social themes (Clare et al., 1996) and encouraged students to respond to each other with a deepening ability to actively listen and reciprocate to others (Clare et al., 1996; Faubert et al., 1996; Russell, 2002)

*The implication is that the provision of citizenship improved students’ communication skills. Learning processes emerged as contributing to the achievement of cognitive learning outcomes.*

**Engagement**

There is evidence from the studies that contextual knowledge, problem-based thinking and matching learning content with pedagogy seemed to result in increased student engagement, participation and action for individuals and groups (Clare et al.,
The implication is that the provision of citizenship education through students’ engagement and active participation can contribute to students’ cognitive learning outcomes.

Promoting discussion

A common feature throughout the studies is the practice of increased opportunities for students to make a contribution such as in a group discussion, dialogue, conversational discourse or debate (Clare et al., 1996). These practices are highly characteristic of the processes of citizenship education and had an impact on student learning and achievement. Schools’ involvement in transformative interactive dialogical pedagogies and democratic processes was not at the expense of, but complementary to, and enhancing of, academic learning and achievement. There was evidence from Russell (2002) and Clare et al. (1996) that a highly interactive and challenging dialogue process helped children refine their ideas and created an opportunity for comprehension and moral growth.

Dialogical pedagogies require quality of relationships, which are inclusive and respectful. When the learner was regarded as a whole person, with affective and volitional and cognitive needs, then teachers related differently to students (Deakin Crick, 2002). The findings show learning and teaching strategies that facilitated a conversational pedagogy, in which dialogue and discussion were the norm, because questioning and dialogue encouraged students in the processes of reflective searching for deeper meaning to issues and events (Clare et al., 1996; Day, 2002; Deakin Crick, 2002; Russell, 2002). Such strategies included weekly class conferences (Wade, 1994), student participation in formal and informal group discussions (Deakin Crick, 2002; Melchior, 1999) and Socratic dialogue (Polite and Adams, 1997).

The implication is that the provision of citizenship education promoted discussion and dialogue, which can contribute to students’ cognitive learning outcomes.
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Learner-centred teaching

Some of the studies provide evidence that teachers may need to change their pedagogies and will need support in order to develop a more facilitative role and enhance their competencies of questioning, listening and summarising (Clare et al., 1996; Wade, 1994). In cooperative learning environments, where the teacher lets go of control in order to listen to the voice of students, an atmosphere of trust and safety was created that enhanced teacher/student relationships and increased participation (Clare et al., 1996; Deakin Crick, 2002; Polite and Adams, 1997; Russell, 2002). When teachers possess the technical ability skilfully to question, listen, summarise and clarify what the student has said, the students are empowered because they feel listened to and what they have said mattered and was taken seriously (Clare et al., 1996; Polite and Adams, 1997; Russell, 2002). It is an acknowledgement of the student as a person with opinions, and those opinions and contributions are of value. This can in turn lead to a boost in student self-confidence because they think and feel that they have something to meaningful to offer and their stories are of value for others to hear and learn from. This is empowering for students, both cognitively and affectively (Faubert et al., 1996).

The implication is that the provision of learner-centred teaching through citizenship education can contribute to students’ cognitive learning outcomes.

Meaningful curricula

The studies provided evidence where the content of the curriculum is relevant and pertinent to students’ lives that there is increased motivation to participate (Russell, 2002; Tibbitts, 2001; Wade, 1994). The use of real-life contexts, which were highly relevant to students’ personal life experiences, and the use of different media (such as plays and theatre forum), led to students being better able to apply and make connections between events and issues and their own experiences, leading to improved learning, an improved ability to reason about their own and the experiences of others, and an improved ability to reason about the impact of developments on their lives (Beyer and Presseisen, 1995; Black and Goldowsky, 1999; Day, 2002). The development of meaningful curricula requires a change from traditional teaching methods (Clare et al., 1996; Tibbitts, 2001; Wade, 1994). Greater interactivity, through audience participation (Black and Goldowsky, 1999) and volunteer service in the community, affects students’ ability to make meaning of the lesson content and provides a positive experience of participation (Melchior, 1999). When students are given opportunities to make contributions in a discussion or role-play scenario, they are more likely to initiate discussions (Clare et al., 1996) with students expressing a preference for seminar scenarios to the classroom environment (Polite and Adams, 1997), because they learned more than in a regular classroom environment (Wade, 1994). A facilitative pedagogy and meaningful curricula en-
able students to make deeper connections with lesson content and hence learn on
deeper cognitive and affective levels than they might otherwise (Clare et al., 1996;
Deakin Crick, 2002). The evidence suggests that more attention should be given
to the use of different strategies to encourage greater student participation (Black
and Goldowsky, 1999) and that highly interactive and challenging discussion ap-
proaches can be a useful tool for educators attempting to enhance comprehension
(Clare et al., 1996; Deakin Crick, 2002; Wade, 1994).

The implication is that the provision of citizenship education can enhance
students' cognitive learning outcomes through relevant learning experiences
and the use of different media.

Developing personally

There is evidence from across the studies that the provision of citizenship education
has an impact on personal and social affective outcomes, as well as on cognitive
learning outcomes in areas such as the development of self-concept (Faubert et
al., 1996), increased self-confidence (Russell, 2002) and more positive behaviour
(Melchior, 1999). These were positive impacts on behaviour, with students display-
ing less risk behaviours and more positive attitudes to society (Melchior, 1999).
Students displayed greater empathic and impartial reasoning (Faubert et al., 1996;
Russell, 2002) and there were increases in student motivation levels to participate
and get involved, in particular when the lesson content was relevant to the students’
own experiences. Emotional salience played a significant role in conceptual change
(Wade, 1994). Greater gains in self-concept development were evident with stu-
dents taking greater responsibility for their own choices (Russell, 2002), developing
a greater sense of autonomy, working diligently, increasing a firmer sense of self
and presenting with poise and confidence (Faubert et al., 1996; Russell, 2002). De-
creases in absence levels were reported with a lower number of referrals; more stu-
dents were reported to be feeling better about themselves; and the programme in-
terventions helped students get along with, and care about, others (Garcia-Obregon
et al., 2000). Different learning-centred approaches allowed students to develop and
apply conflict resolution skills; seminars gave students the opportunity to witness
to other students’ contributions (Polite and Adams, 1997) and engage in active lis-
tening (Russell, 2002), developing increased feelings of respect for others opinions
and noticing differences in peer behaviour, with more polite behaviour commented
upon (Polite and Adams, 1997).

The implication is that the provision of citizenship can impact on students’
cognitive learning outcomes through helping them to develop personally.
CONCLUSIONS

The review into the impact of Citizenship Education on student learning and achievement offers us a different way of looking at teaching and learning – one that has the potential to improve performance, whilst recognising that the drive for improved performance in itself neither engages nor motivates learners, neither shapes nor energises learning. Four themes emerge from the implications of the review, which can certainly shape, energise, motivate and engage, but which profoundly challenge much familiar practice and policy in our schools. They are the themes of flexibility, relationships, process-orientation and holistic thinking.

Firstly, the review’s findings imply the need for a pedagogy reflective of learners’ needs, interests, current knowledge, life experience, circumstances, responses and capabilities. This echoes Miliband’s definition of ‘personalised learning’ as ‘something very simple… a system tailored to the needs, interests and aptitudes of every single pupil’. This Review suggests that such an aim requires flexibility in two important areas: flexible groupings of students, flexible sequencing of curriculum content, thereby allowing teaching and learning to respond to – and so enhance – students’ emerging capacity for responsibility and decision-making.

Secondly, the review’s findings underline the crucial part played by the quality of relationships in learning. Relationships need to be positive and open, so learning can grow through communication and interaction. They need to be supportive, so the environment is safe for risk-taking. They need to be strong, so misconceptions can be challenged without breakdown. They need to be trusted, for conceptual conflict to be embraced and illuminated without rancour and strongly-held convictions aired and re-considered in the light of new information. Relationships of this quality are incompatible with an authoritarian culture; they are fostered by teachers relinquishing control with confidence and clarity about the structures and ground rules of shared responsibility and mutual respect.

Thirdly, the review significantly challenges a ‘didactic’ view of curriculum and assessment design. The studies show what a difference it makes when learners have a conceptual ‘map’ of how their learning works - and why? - and an understanding of the processes of conceptual change. Instead of basing the curriculum on content and simply assessing related knowledge, skills and understanding, it argues for the new approach embodied by such projects as the RSA’s ‘Opening Minds’ curriculum. This makes much more explicit to learners both processes of learning and criteria for assessment, by developing and self-assessing learning ‘competencies’ whilst using them to solve problems and access required knowledge through enquiries designed and driven by the learner. These approaches to curriculum design appear to have yielded dramatic improvements in motivation, achievement, continuity and progression between key stages. They do appear, however, to be incompatible with the current format of the National Curriculum and sit uneasily within its assessment framework.

Lastly, there is the repeated insistence on the need for holistic thinking. This
comes up in several guises in the studies scrutinised for this Review. One of them speaks of the role of ‘emotional salience in fostering motivation to learn and cognitive engagement’. At the heart of the Review’s findings is the understanding that intellectual progress is inextricably bound up with feelings; insights come from personal identification with new learning; cognitive development goes hand in hand with emotional development. The ‘personal’ and ‘academic’ aspects of a student’s progress, just like the ‘intellectual’ and emotional’ components of ‘meaning’, are as inseparable and co-creative as shape and colour in a watercolour landscape.

The review’s holistic theme develops this view of the learner as a ‘whole person’ by recognising the interplay of thought, feeling and action in all learning and emphasising the vital importance of linking learning with personal experience and story. One of the studies focussed on the positive impact of service learning on mathematics grades, for instance; another on how theatre made science more meaningful by dramatising the moral and ethical reasoning it provoked.

The message is as clear for researchers and policy-makers as it is for students and teachers: that improved academic performance is not best accomplished by being made the single, main or ultimate goal of learning. It would seem, though, that it is the virtually inevitable by-product of meaningful, integrated programmes characterised by learners’ own enquiry, rich interaction and effective two-way communication; attention to personal and social development, self-assessment and encouragement of reflective self-awareness in learners and their learning teachers. In short, education for citizenship, done properly, enhances learning and achievement for everyone.

NOTES

1 http://www.nc.uk.net/nc/contents/values.htm
2 For a detailed explanation of the methodology see http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/
3 http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPiWeb/home.aspx?page=/reel/reviews.htm
4 David Miliband, then Minister for Schools, in speech to National College for School Leadership Annual Network Conference, October 2004.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Those studies included in both the map and the synthesis are marked with an asterisk.

PEDAGOGY FOR CITIZENSHIP


OTHER REFERENCES


EPPI-Centre (2003a). *Core keywording strategy: Data collection for a register of educational research. Version 0.9.7*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit.


Ruth Deakin-Crick
University of Bristol, United Kingdom
### APPENDIX – DEFINITIONS OF KEYWORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning processes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative thinking</td>
<td>This involves relating together principles, ideas, information and entities in new and original ways to generate new entities or ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>This involves the evaluation of arguments or propositions in relation to evidence, reasoning, drawing conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-cognition</td>
<td>Meta-cognition refers to higher order thinking that involves active control over the cognitive processes engaged in learning. Activities such as planning how to approach a given learning task, monitoring comprehension, and evaluating progress toward the completion of a task are meta-cognitive in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>This is learning that comes from reflection on direct experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning-making</td>
<td>This is a person’s capacity to make personal meaning from information by integrating different kinds of knowledge. It is the ability to link information gained from different learning arenas and throughout a person’s personal history which provides an integration of different kinds of knowing – at personal, group, societal and global levels and across life contexts (home, school and community).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-personal awareness</td>
<td>This is concerned with the capacity to understand the intentions, motivations and desires of other people. It allows people to work effectively with others. Educators, salespeople, religious and political leaders, and counsellors all need a well-developed interpersonal intelligence, including empathy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-personal awareness</td>
<td>This entails the capacity to understand oneself, to appreciate one’s feelings, fears and motivations. In Gardner’s (1993) view, it involves having an effective working model of ourselves, and being able to use such information to regulate our lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>This category includes the range of communication skills: for example, listening, speaking, writing, persuading and influencing etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>This is the capacity to work with other people in a cooperative way, drawing and building on their ideas and willingly contributing their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving/decision-making</td>
<td>This involves the whole process of arriving at a decision from generating a range of ideas, screening the ideas to select the most profitable one(s) and employing a mechanism for choosing a limited number for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values awareness</td>
<td>This concerns increasing awareness of the values that are held and the implications those values have for life and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definitions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment evidence of achievement in higher order creative and critical thinking skills, problem-solving, analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment evidence of achievement in personal development, including values, attitudes, dispositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment evidence of achievement in social development, including empathy, engagement in community, service learning, collaboration and team work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and political outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment evidence of achievement in moral and political development, including ability to hold a particular point of view and to act on it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Citizenship Education</strong></th>
<th><strong>Educational programmes which are designed to:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral and social responsibility</td>
<td>Develop in learners’ moral and social attitudes, values, beliefs and behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Engage learners in learning and service in the wider community or the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political literacy</td>
<td>Equip learners with the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and know how to engage in public life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual moral social and cultural development</td>
<td>Develop in learners any aspect of personal development which is not measured as a cognitive learning outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for diversity</td>
<td>Nurture in learners an understanding of difference between groups and cultures and a capacity to engage positively with groups and cultures ‘different in some way from me’. Includes race, disability, gender, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character education</td>
<td>Contribute to the formation of a person’s – values, virtues, character and behaviour – which is beneficial to self, others and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and social literacy</td>
<td>Develop the capacity to understand one’s own emotions, others’ emotions and to use that knowledge effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values education</td>
<td>Nurture learners in an understanding of and a personal engagement with values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>Engage learners in learning which is constructed as service in the wider community or the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Enable learners to understand and resolve personal and communal conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer mediation</td>
<td>Enable learners to support peers in resolving conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights education</td>
<td>Lead to an understanding of human rights and an engagement with the values of human rights legislation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>