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ABSTRACT

This paper provides a synthesis of the scholarly literature on education for democratic citizenship (EDC) in the school sector in England since 1995. Following the publication of the Crick Report (QCA, 1998), citizenship education was introduced to secondary schools in 2002 as a statutory subject. Primary schools are also required to show, through inspection, how they are preparing learners for citizenship. The implementation of citizenship as a national curriculum subject in England is taking place during a period of constitutional reform and was the most significant innovation of curriculum 2000. Recent parallel initiatives in EDC are taking place elsewhere in the UK, in Europe and internationally. In both established democracies and newly-established democratic states, such as those of Eastern and Central Europe and Latin America, there is a recognition that democracy is essentially fragile and that it depends on the active engagement of citizens, not just in voting, but in developing and participating in sustainable and cohesive communities. The paper examines the role of EDC in responding to these political challenges, setting national policy developments in both European and international contexts and exploring the growing international consensus on human rights as the underpinning principles of EDC. It identifies some key themes within the research, such as diversity and unity; global and cosmopolitan citizenship; children as citizens; democratic schooling; students’ understandings of citizenship and democracy; the complementary roles of schools and communities; European citizenship; and the practicalities of implementing EDC at school level. It identifies some gaps in the research literature and concludes by proposing an on-going agenda for research.
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1 INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the twenty-first century there is a renewed interest in education for democratic citizenship (EDC) at both national and international levels (European Commission, 1997; Niemi and Junn, 1998; Osler and Starkey, 1999, 2005a and 2005c; Torney-Purta et al., 1999a, 2001; Cogan and Derricott, 2000; Council of Europe, 2000 and 2002; Parker, 2003; Banks, 2004). This paper provides a synthesis of the scholarly literature on education for citizenship and democracy, focusing in particular on research published since 1995 on schooling in England. Our aims are to summarise recent developments in this field; critically inform the thinking of education researchers, practitioners and policy makers; stimulate use of the research; and identify possible future research agendas.

Following the publication of the Crick Report (QCA, 1998), citizenship education was introduced to secondary schools in England in 2002 as a statutory subject. Primary schools are also required to show, through inspection, how they are preparing learners for citizenship. This development in the national curriculum for England is taking place, significantly, during a period of constitutional reform, including the implementation of the Human Rights Act 1998 which incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights into UK law; the establishment of a Scottish Parliament and a Welsh Assembly; and a new settlement between Britain and Northern Ireland, also involving devolved government. The indications of further devolution to regional level can be seen in the creation of an assembly and elected mayor for London and in the election of mayors for other major towns and cities. These political and constitutional developments are encouraging debate about the meanings of nationality, national identity and citizenship and the extent
to which individuals and groups from both majority and minority communities feel a sense of belonging to the nation and State (Figueroa, 1999 and 2004; Hall, 2000; Osler, 2000b and 2005b; Runnymede Trust, 2000; Osler and Starkey, 2001a; Smith, 2003; Gifford, 2004; Olssen, 2004). Such debates are likely to intensify, following the July 2005 London terrorist bombings by suspects identified as British citizens.

The introduction of citizenship education into the national curriculum for England is matched by parallel initiatives in EDC elsewhere in the UK (Smyth et al., 1999; Andrews, 2001; Arlow and Watling, 2002; Kerr et al, 2002b; Smith, 2003; Maitles and Gilchrist, 2004; Turnbull, 2004; Wylie, 2004), in Europe (Marcaro and Adelman, 1995; Starkey, 1995; Osler et al., 1996; Davies, I., 1998; Mahony, 1998; Audigier, 1999; Osler and Starkey, 1999, 2001, 2002; Davies, L. and Kirkpatrick, 2000; Starkey, 2000; Davies, I. et al., 2001; Foster and Crawford, 2001; Osler and Vincent, 2002; Naval et al., 2002; Roland-Lévy and Ross, 2002; Birzea, 2003 and 2004) and internationally (Harber, 1997; Hahn, 1999a and 1999b; Page, 1997; Parker et al., 1999; Cogan and Morris, 2001; Morris and Cogan, 2001; Davies, L., 2002; Sardoc and Kerr, 2002; IIHR, 2003, 2004; Banks, 2004; Osler, 2005a; Osler and Starkey, 2005a and c). In established democracies, such as those of Western Europe and North America, in newly-established democratic states, such as those of Eastern and Central Europe and Latin America and, indeed, in countries taking steps towards democracy, there is a recognition that democracy is essentially fragile and that it depends on the active engagement of citizens, not just in voting, but in developing and participating in sustainable and cohesive communities. This, in turn, implies education for democratic citizenship.
Citizenship is a contested subject and it is therefore not surprising that education for citizenship in schools often tends to provoke heated debate and controversy, with various proponents adopting differing approaches and certain critics even questioning whether schools should be engaged in this area of learning. The national and international literature on citizenship education is considerable and setting the limits of this research review has proved a challenge. We discuss this and other methodological issues in the third section of this paper, before going on to identify and examine some key themes within the research literature. Before considering these methodological issues we discuss reasons why international interest in EDC is so considerable at the beginning of the twenty-first century, reviewing policy developments at both national and transnational levels.

2 NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONTEXTS

Our review of official policy documents from Britain and other nation-states and from transnational organisations concerned with education, together with commentaries of policy analysts, has led us to identify six key contextual factors that help explain the considerable growth in interest in citizenship education over the past decade.

Global injustice and inequality

First, there is, internationally, a broad recognition of a need to address through education the challenges presented by continuing injustice and inequalities in the world expressed, for example, in the initiative to set up the UN Decade for Human Rights Education (UN, 1994). Nation-states have acknowledged this challenge through the near universal ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989 (CRC), which includes among the agreed aims of education: ‘the
development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations’; respect for the child’s identity, culture and values, national values and those of ‘civilizations different from his or her own’ and ‘the preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples’.\(^3\) This perspective and the need for education designed to challenge inequality and injustice has been strengthened since 11 September 2001 because of a growing perception of links between poverty, injustice and inequality in the world and terrorist movements (Kinnock, 2002; Osler and Vincent, 2002).

UNESCO has identified an international consensus on the need for citizenship education which will equip young people with skills and attitudes for personal autonomy; employment; living together; respecting social and cultural diversity in their communities and globally; and peace-building and peaceful conflict resolution. It confirmed a need for education which ensures that:

all young people acquire the competencies required for personal autonomy and for citizenship, to enter the world of work and social life, with a view to respecting their identity, openness to the world and social and cultural diversity.

Moreover there was consensus among member states that ‘through education for active and responsible citizenship’ young people might acquire:

the willingness and the capacity to live together and to build peace in a world characterized by inter-state and internal armed conflicts and by the emergence of all forms of violence and war (UNESCO, 2004).

Intergovernmental organisations, non-governmental organisations and individual nation-states have responded by reviewing how citizenship education and human rights education might be developed and renewed to increase awareness of global interdependence, producing both policy documents and classroom materials.\(^4\) A number of countries make strong links between citizenship education and human
rights education and there is a growing consensus internationally that human rights
principles underpin education for citizenship in multicultural democracies (Osler and
Starkey, 1996; Hahn, 1998; IIHR, 2003; Banks et al., 2005). Within the world
programme on human rights education, established by the UN Commission on Human
Rights in 2004, teacher education is now recognised as being of particular importance
(UN General Assembly, 2005).

Globalization and migration
Secondly, the processes of globalization and consequent migration are having a direct
impact on communities and schools, and are increasing diversity in local
communities. Within multicultural democracies there are perceived tensions between
the need to promote national unity or cohesion and the need to accommodate, and
indeed support, a diverse range of cultural communities within the nation-state
(Taylor, 1994). These tensions demand an educational response. Citizenship
education in schools is recognised as a means of addressing both unity and diversity.
An international consensus panel of scholars on Education for Global Citizenship in
Contexts of Diversity which was convened at the University of Washington, Seattle
from 2003-04, considered the research evidence. The panel concluded that there is a
need to re-think the aims and processes of citizenship education in schools:

 Increased diversity and increased recognition of diversity require a vigorous re-
examination of the ends and means of citizenship education. Multicultural societies
are faced with the problem of creating nation-states that recognize and incorporate
the diversity of their citizens and embrace an overarching set of shared values,
ideals, and goals to which all citizens are committed. Only when a nation-state is
unified around a set of democratic values such as human rights, justice, and
equality can it secure the liberties of cultural, ethnic, language, and religious
groups and enable them to experience freedom, justice, and peace. Citizens who
understand this unity-diversity tension and act accordingly do not materialize from
thin air; they are educated for it.

(Banks et al., 2005)
A meeting of education ministers from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) member states, on the subject of ‘Raising the Quality of Education for All’, noted the need not only for skills directly relevant to the workplace, but also skills that would support democracy and social cohesion. They addressed the tensions between diversity and unity (nation-building), and the importance of citizenship education which addresses both these dimensions:

[T]he issue for education is how to develop not only successful individuals with good workplace skills, but also ‘democratic citizenship’ — an outcome both linked to, and supportive of, social cohesion. Defining the qualities we might wish to see in citizens of democratic societies remains a political and context-dependent task. It might include qualities such as fairness, tolerance and a co-operative approach, recognition of the value of social norms, and a civic spirit. While education and informal learning, in isolation, cannot create model citizens, they can, alongside other factors, make a constructive contribution. Devising a policy response will require clear objectives, keeping a balance between the ‘nation-building’ role of civic education and its role in valuing and recognising social diversity.

(OECD, 2004 )

Concerns about civic and political engagement

Thirdly, there is a concern in a number of democratic nation-states about levels of civic and political engagement, particularly among the young. This is cited as a reason for strengthening citizenship education (Carnegie Corporation, 2003). Bénéï (2005) observes that lack of engagement in civic and political life is most likely to be characterised as ‘apathy’ in established democracies but as ‘ignorance’ or ‘backwardness’ in newer democracies. We have also noted a tendency (Starkey, 2000), even among writers who adopt an inclusive approach to minority groups, to assume that migrants to Europe are likely to be ignorant of democratic practices and procedures (see, for example, Costa-Lascoux, 1999). Indeed, the government-commissioned Crick report implies that minorities are in greater need of citizenship education than the majority population (Osler, 2000b).
The Crick report also expressed concerns about ‘worrying levels of apathy, ignorance and cynicism about public life’ (QCA, 1998: 8) which unless addressed, threaten the security of British democracy. One of the proposed solutions, in addition to providing space in the formal school curriculum for citizenship education, was:

to extend radically to young people the best in existing traditions of community involvement and public service, and to make them individually confident in finding new forms of involvement and action among themselves (QCA, 1998: 7-8).

Youth deficit

Fourthly, the emphasis on citizenship education is closely linked to a tendency, in many countries, to blame youth for the problems and challenges facing society as a whole (Griffin, 1993; Osler and Vincent, 2003). Citizenship education is often seen as a means of addressing a perceived deficit among the young (Osler, 2000b), whether this relates to low levels of voting (usually interpreted as political apathy), violence or anti-social behaviour. In France, for example, the government placed a renewed emphasis on citizenship education in response to public concerns about anti-social behaviour and violence in schools (Debarbieux, 1999a and 1999b; Osler and Starkey, 2001 and 2005b).

The end of the cold war

Fifthly, the end of the cold war was an enormous boost for democracy and, consequently, education for democracy in Eastern and Central Europe, Latin America and Africa. Similarly, states emerging from war and conflict have placed considerable emphasis on education for democracy and human rights. This has led to specific
projects focusing on citizenship and human rights for example in the Balkans (Davies, L., 2004) and in Northern Ireland (Reilly et al., 2005).

**Anti-democratic and racist movements**

Finally, and importantly, there are concerns in a number of countries, notably in Europe, about the growth of anti-democratic movements with racist agendas. Citizenship education is seen as a means of strengthening democracy by challenging such anti-democratic movements and attitudes and promoting antiracism. This perspective is particularly strong in Europe, where there is a historical consciousness of the legacy of fascism (Osler and Starkey, 2002). Since racism serves to undermine the participation rights of individuals and groups within society, it can be identified as an anti-democratic force. Antiracism is thus a critical element of democracy (Osler, 2002) and it is recognised as such by the Council of Europe and the European Commission. This point was strongly made by the member states of the Council of Europe, in a formal declaration at the European conference *All Different All Equal: from principle to practice* held in Strasbourg in October 2000:

*Europe is a community of shared values, multicultural in its past, present and future;*
*…Full and effective implementation of all human rights without any discrimination or distinction, as enshrined in European and other international human rights instruments, must be secured;*
*Racism and racial discrimination are serious violations of human rights in the contemporary world and must be combated by all lawful means;*
*Racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance threaten democratic societies and their fundamental values;*
*Stability and peace in Europe and throughout the world can only be built on tolerance and respect for diversity;*
*…All initiatives aiming at greater political, social and cultural participation, especially of persons belonging to vulnerable groups, should be encouraged.*

(Council of Europe, 2000)
Amongst specific measures recommended, education is seen as having a leading role.

Governments committed themselves:

> to give particular attention to education and awareness-raising in all sectors of society to promote a climate of tolerance, respect for human rights and cultural diversity, including introducing and strengthening such measures among young people.

(Council of Europe, 2000)

3 METHODOLOGY

In undertaking this review on behalf of the British Educational Research Association (BERA) we agreed to cover the following areas:

- brief UK historical and political context
- context of EDC in Britain: constitutional reform, political framework
- synthesis of research and developments in EDC in England at school level: strengths, challenges
- analysis of developments in EDC internationally in the context of globalization and recent political developments.

This paper focuses largely on England (see sections 4 and 5 below), but seeks (particularly in its introduction and in section 2 above) to set the debates taking place in England within a broader UK and international context.

We have drawn on research-based books, peer-reviewed articles, chapters in edited volumes and published research reports from 1995-2004. Although we have not previously undertaken a systematic analysis of research and developments in EDC in England at school level, we are able to draw on literature reviews we have previously undertaken to support our own writing, including a research report for UNESCO’s International Bureau of Education on civic education in industrialized countries (Osler and Starkey, 2005c).
In order to identify peer-reviewed journal articles we used the British Education Index (BEI), searching items catalogued since 1995. A search on the key words ‘citizenship education’ yielded 455 records for the period. By adding the related terms: ‘civic?’, ‘political education’, ‘human rights education’, ‘child? rights’, ‘democratic values’, ‘development education’ and ‘global citizenship’ we had a total of 839 items. Among the items highlighted by the BEI search, we have restricted ourselves to those in peer reviewed journals available on the library shelves in the Institute of Education or the University of Leeds or in electronic editions of journals. We have excluded unpublished papers, conference papers and proceedings and certain other items that we could not locate after a further search. Additionally, we have included a small number of research-based articles in professional journals, where they relate to aspects of EDC under-represented in the literature.

Both the authored and edited books were identified by searching the libraries of the University of Leeds and the University of London, Institute of Education. Since we wished to confine our search to books in the field of education (and to avoid political science and other disciplines) we restricted the key words in our book search to ‘citizenship education’, ‘citizenship’ ‘human rights education’ and ‘child rights’. We then hand-searched these books to identify those we judge to be both research-based and dealing primarily with schooling in England. In making this selection we did not restrict ourselves to any particular type of research, but did exclude those books on how to teach citizenship, aimed at new or experienced teachers, which do not make explicit links to research evidence. We also included some additional recently published books known to us and did a further check using Scholar Google.
The key words we chose reflect our conviction that human rights principles need to underpin EDC within multicultural nation-states (see Osler and Starkey, 1996 and 2005a). While there is, as we have discussed above, a growing international consensus on this issue, we have not restricted our review to publications which conform to this position. We nevertheless judge it important to be explicit about our own positioning. We note that previous research reviews (for example, Deakin Crick et al., 2004) have privileged the terms ‘values education’ and ‘moral education’. The relatively modest scope of this study led us to exclude these terms, which would have generated a mass of material not related to citizenship education and which would have required an additional extensive hand-search.

We are aware that much useful research on EDC has been and continues to be published as chapters in edited collections in which citizenship education is not a primary theme. There is no established electronic route for identifying these contributions, as they appear neither in library catalogues nor in BEI. We were concerned to include as many relevant book chapters as possible in our review and we identified these through a hand-search.

We examined the bibliography generated by the EPPI citizenship research review (Deakin Crick et al., 2004) which reported in depth on an eclectic selection of 14 studies. We also examined two literature reviews generated by the DfES-funded longitudinal survey (Kerr and Cleaver, 2004; Whiteley, 2005) and we took account of the BERA professional user survey on citizenship education (Gearon, 2003a).
We regard teacher education as critical to the successful implementation of EDC in schools, though it does not fall within the scope of this review. However, our searches suggest that there are very few studies that focus on this area. One notable exception is the work of Wilkins (1999, 2001, 2003, 2005; Wilkins and Walkington, 2000). A number of teacher educators have written useful materials for teacher educators and their students available on a Teacher Training Agency-funded website. These do not, however, fall within the scope of our review.

We retained for review studies that seek to define or analyse EDC in schools, privileging the UK context, but retaining some major comparative studies. Our searches gave us a database of around 360 publications on which we based this review and analysis: this consists of 182 journal articles, 66 authored books, 48 edited books, 9 additional chapters from other edited collections and 52 research reports, reviews and syntheses.

4 PRINCIPLES OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

The introduction of citizenship education into the national curriculum in 2002 brings England into line with other European countries (Birzea, 2003) and is recognised as the most significant development within the revised national curriculum 2000. The Crick Report identifies three dimensions to citizenship education: political literacy; social and moral responsibility; and community involvement (QCA, 1998). The new contribution which citizenship education brings to the national curriculum and the element to which Bernard Crick himself gives particular emphasis in his subsequent writings (Crick, 2000) is political literacy.
The Crick Report sought to differentiate citizenship education from personal and social education, an area of learning that was already well-established in schools. It is therefore not surprising that cultural and personal elements of citizenship were neglected within this initial framework. This presents a real difficulty, since in addressing citizenship education we need to recognize that citizenship itself is not simply something from the realm of ideas which can be discussed in abstraction by political philosophers. Citizenship, from its beginnings, has been experienced as exclusive and has involved female, racial and class subordination. The struggle for political equality and justice continues to the present day. Citizenship is more than legal status. It is more than political activity or advocacy. It is also a sense of belonging, which means that any education programme has also to engage with learners’ cultural and personal identities or feelings (Osler and Starkey, 2005a).

The Crick Report presents citizenship within a historical vacuum, implying that the project of citizenship is complete, rather than ongoing. Thus, the differential ways in which citizenship is experienced, according to gender, class or ethnicity are ignored in the report, as are the on-going struggles to claim equal citizenship rights (Osler, 2000b).

The Crick Report’s model of citizenship education contrasts with Audigier’s (2000) model, which has been very influential in the work of the Council of Europe. Audigier draws on the work of Veldhuis, proposing four dimensions of education for democratic citizenship: a political and legal dimension (rights and duties with respect to the political system and the law); a social dimension (relations between individuals and an understanding of the basis of these relations, for example, solidarity); an
economic dimension (production and consumption of goods and services; labour); and a cultural dimension (collective representations and imaginations, shared values). This last element is also given emphasis in our own model of citizenship education (Osler and Starkey, 1996 and 2005a) in which we suggest that citizenship learning needs to have both a political/structural dimension and a cultural/personal one if it is to effectively engage learners.

McLaughlin (1992, 2000) proposes an interpretation of citizenship along a continuum from minimal to maximal, identifying four aspects of citizenship, namely: identity, virtues, political involvement and social prerequisites. At a maximal level identity might include, for example, dynamic membership of a shared democratic culture, involving responsibilities and obligations as well as rights, a sense of the common good and solidarity, whereas at a minimal level it might simply be the basic rights commonly associated with citizenship, such as voting, holding a passport and having an unreflective approach to nationality. Virtues might minimally include being law-abiding and helping one’s neighbour, whereas at a maximal level they imply engagement in struggles for justice and the empowerment of one’s fellow citizens. Minimally, political participation includes exercising one’s right to vote. Social prerequisites for citizenship include, at a minimal level, basic legal guarantees and, at a maximal level, consideration of social disadvantages as barriers to full citizenship participation. McLaughlin notes how the official national curriculum documents relating to the earlier (1991) attempt to introduce citizenship education in schools tended to interpret citizenship in minimalist ways, whereas the Crick Report ‘does contain evidence of “maximal” or “active” elements’ (2000: 550).
Olssen (2004) has usefully compared the Crick Report with the Parekh report on *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain* (Runnymede Trust, 2000), exploring their complementarity. Osler (2005b) has undertaken a similar exercise, setting both reports alongside the report of an international consensus panel (Banks *et al.*, 2005), established by the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington in 2003-2004, which was charged with the task of examining principles and concepts appropriate to citizenship education in democratic nation-states and in a globalized world. The international consensus panel’s report *Democracy and Diversity* is based on research evidence and it identifies four key principles and ten inter-related concepts for citizenship education. The key principles are: that students should learn about the complex relationships between unity and diversity in their local communities, the nation and the world; that they should study the ways in which people in their community, nation and region are increasingly interdependent with others around the world; that the teaching of human rights should underpin citizenship education in multicultural nation-states, and that students should be taught knowledge about democracy and democratic institutions. Both the analysis of Olssen (2004) and that of Osler (2005b) shed light on the context in which citizenship education is developing in England, acknowledging that students are growing up in both a multicultural society and a globalized world, and providing us with further insights into principles which might inform the practice of citizenship education in schools.

5 KEY THEMES IN EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP

RESEARCH
Diversity and unity

As we have already noted (in section 2 above), it is increasingly the case that international organizations, such as OECD (2004), and a number of nation-states address within their education policies the perceived tension between the need to promote national unity (community cohesion) and the need to accommodate or support a diverse range of cultural communities within the nation-state. This is particularly notable in a number of nation-states which have experienced migration of visible minorities or which are seeking to re-establish or strengthen democracy in a post-conflict situation. In such contexts, citizenship education in schools is promoted as one means of addressing both unity and diversity (Hahn, 2005). So, for example, the British government responded to the report of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Macpherson, 1999), which highlighted institutional racism as a feature of British public life inhibiting the full participation of citizens from minority communities, by proposing the new citizenship curriculum as a vehicle for addressing issues of equality and diversity in schools (Home Office, 1999). Scholars have responded by critiquing degree to which the official Crick Report on citizenship education (QCA, 1998) addressed questions of diversity, inequality and differential experiences of citizenship according to gender, social class and ethnicity (Arnot and Dillabough, 2000; Osler 2000b and 2005b; Olssen, 2004).

Research and scholarship in England reflects the policy agenda relating to diversity and unity in a number of ways. The tensions between diversity and unity are discussed by a number of philosophers of education, including McLaughlin (1992, 2000) and Figueroa (2000). In debating citizenship and the educational demands of diversity McLaughlin earlier argued for a public debate to define shared values within a diverse society, suggesting that we need to reach agreement on public virtues and
the common good. The Parekh Report (Runnymede Trust, 2000) initiated the kind of
debate that McLaughlin was proposing, not only discussing how a culturally diverse
society might achieve cohesiveness and agreement on basic values, but also reflecting
in an informed way on key areas of public policy, including education, and proposing
an agenda for ensuring greater justice and full access to citizenship; or in
McLaughlin’s terms, how we might achieve a maximal level in social prerequisites
for citizenship.

Figueroa has a different starting point from certain other British philosophers and
historians of education (Archard, 2003; Davies I, 2003) in that he does not see
diversity as ‘disintegrative or a fault to be overcome’(2000: 54). Instead he draws our
attention to the fact that ‘all present-day societies (if not, indeed, all societies) are
plural’ to a degree (p. 52) and that difference is primary and a rich resource.Arguing
that the encounter with the different other is at the heart of human experience, he
presents cultural pluralism as an ideal, and one which sets equity as a central goal. For
Figueroa, citizenship involves:

- Commitment to the society in its diversity
- Openness to, solidarity with, and respect for the different other
- Acceptance of the basic worth of all people
- Rejection of any form of exploitation, inequitable treatment or racism.

(Figueroa, 2000: 57)

Rejecting the notion of a blind commitment to ‘the common good’ Figueroa suggests
that citizenship in a plural society implies security in one’s own culture and a critical
respect for all cultures, including one’s own. Challenging the taken-for-granted
perspectives of existing cultures and acknowledging the power relations between
groups is, for Figueroa, an essential task in addressing the tensions between unity and
diversity. We also attach importance to power relations in our own work. Drawing on
the theoretical framework of Essed (1991) who highlights ‘everyday racisms’, and on education policy frameworks from Sweden, we argue that since racism is a barrier to participation, antiracism needs to be seen as an essential feature of democracy (Osler and Starkey, 2002).

**Global and cosmopolitan citizenship**

In recent years there has been co-operation between the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), the Department for International Development (DfID) and the Development Education Association (DEA) (an umbrella organisation of non-governmental organisations concerned with development education) to promote global aspects of citizenship education (see, for example DfES, 2004, 2005). However, in official discourse, global aspects of citizenship education have been less prominent, and were not mainstreamed within the official Crick Report.

The history of development education and global education is the subject of a number of studies. Starkey (1994) examines the origins and growth of development education in the UK, focusing on the World Studies Project, the role of NGOs and intergovernmental organisations and the increasing prominence of a human rights discourse amongst development educators. Heater (1996, 1999, 2002, 2004) takes a broad historical and philosophical perspective on education for national and world citizenship. Holden (2000) and Hicks (2003) look to world studies as the precursor to global citizenship education and stress both the political challenge that this movement presented to conservative educationalists and the importance of political education. Davies, I., et al., (2005) argue that the historically separate traditions of global education and citizenship education should be brought together.
Between 1980 and 1997 there was extremely limited official funding in Britain for
development education or education for global citizenship, the major exception being
the Council of Education for World Citizenship, which received a limited amount of
core funding. Since 1997, DfID has funded a number of global citizenship projects
which focus on schools and teacher education. In a comparative study of four EU
countries and their approach to global education, Osler and Vincent (2002) note that
while DfID has supported schools in accessing the wide range of resources available
in this area, education for global citizenship remains marginalised, with little support
within teacher education. Ibrahim (2005) reviews the types of materials available to
teachers, noting that there has been a resurgence of interest in global citizenship since
citizenship education became a statutory subject in the school curriculum. She argues
that in producing teacher and student support material, the NGO sector needs to
complement its current emphasis on skills and values, giving more attention to an
explicit human rights framework and taking account of students’ identities and
political knowledge and skills.

In 2002-2004 DfID funded a study on the needs of teachers and learners in the context
of global citizenship (Davies, L., et al., 2005). The research team observed lessons
and worked with pupil researchers in 6 primary and 6 secondary schools in the West
Midlands. They also conducted interviews with teachers, with students and staff in
three initial teacher training institutions and officers in 13 local education authorities.
The study found pupils to have a sophisticated concept of global citizenship and a
keen interest in the wider world, particularly contemporary wars and conflicts. They
were aware of the dangers of stereotyping others according to their origin and
spontaneously raised issues of racism and discrimination. In spite of this, teachers often felt uncomfortable with handling controversial issues and felt ill-prepared to undertake such assignments with confidence.

Our own work (Osler and Vincent, 2002; Osler and Starkey 2003 and 2005a) challenges the somewhat narrow conceptions of global citizenship in the literature. We propose a re-conceptualisation of citizenship education that incorporates local, national and global perspectives. Recognising that the processes of globalization impact on local communities, that diversity is a feature of all societies and that this diversity is increasingly recognised, we propose education for *cosmopolitan* citizenship to acknowledge contemporary realities. We argue that students need skills for participation at all levels from the local to the global.

**Children as citizens**

The programme of study for citizenship in schools in England clearly situates children as *future* citizens: ‘Teaching should ensure that knowledge and understanding about *becoming* informed citizens are acquired and applied’ (DfEE and QCA, 1999) (our emphasis). However, just as citizenship has been achieved by women and by other categories to whom it was previously denied, so too have citizenship rights been extended to children. This is recognised under the terms of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which, since 1989, has recognised children’s participation right.

There is, accordingly, a strand in the literature that makes the case for children to be accepted as citizens in their own right, rather than as future citizens (Jeleff, 1996;

Seeing children through the lens of their citizenship gives a very different picture of their place in the social world. [Citizenship] can be defined as an entitlement to recognition, respect and participation…Defined in this way, citizenship applies as much to children as to adults and it suggests new ways for adults and children to relate to each other in their daily lives. (Willow and Neale, 2004)

The pedagogical implications of this perspective for teachers have been addressed by a number of researchers (Osler and Starkey, 1996 and 1998; Harwood, 1997, 2001; Holden and Clough, 1998; Richardson and Wood, 1999; Richardson and Miles, 2003).

**Democratic schooling**

In spite of A.S.Neill’s radical experiment with democratic schooling at Summerhill (Neill, 1968), there is little evidence of a British tradition of applying democratic principles in *mainstream* schools. Roland Meighan, for one, has long been an advocate of democratic schooling and democratic teacher education, but his work (see for example, Meighan 2004) questions whether it is indeed possible to democratise education, given the prevailing model of mass schooling. However, it is increasingly argued and accepted that EDC requires the democratisation of schools and that an authoritarian model is incompatible with effective citizenship education (Harber, 2004). Several authors, using case-studies, identify what they perceive as anti-democratic forces, particularly the system of school inspection (Hatcher, 1999; Fielding, 2001; Flecknoe, 2002).
Writers examining the interactions between school ethos and EDC draw on a few major theorists of democratic education. Harwood (2001) notes the influence of John Dewey ([1916] 2002) and Paolo Freire (1972) in the curriculum development projects of the 1970s. European influences include the French educator, Celestin Freinet, who from the 1920s to the 1950s created a movement of co-operative classes and schools based on democratic principles (Beattie, 2002). Other writers have been impressed by Scandinavian traditions and have been able to draw on case studies to illustrate democratic principles in action (MacBeath and Moos, 2004).

Apple and Beane’s (1999) frequently cited work acknowledges Dewey’s position that democracy is not just an abstract concept, but a dynamic process. They present case studies from four contrasting US schools and from these derive a set of ‘conditions on which democracy depends’ which they claim are the foundations of ‘the democratic way of life’. In summary the seven conditions are:

- Critical reflection and analysis for the evaluation of ideas, problems and policies
- Open flow of ideas
- Faith in the capacity of people to resolve problems
- Concern for the common good
- Concern for the dignity and rights of individuals and minorities
- Democracy of an idealised set of values for guiding life as a people
- Social institutions that promote the democratic way of life.

(Apple and Beane, 1999: 7)

US writers Pearl and Knight (1999), also influenced by Dewey, summarise democratic education theory as applied to schools in four requirements, namely:

- Knowledge should be universally provided to enable all students to solve generally recognised social and personal problems.
• Students should participate in decisions that affect their lives
• Clearly specified rights should be made universally available
• Equal encouragement should be given for success in all of society’s legal endeavours.

(Pearl and Knight, 1999: 2).

Aspects of democratic schooling have also been promoted by international organisations such as UNESCO (Meyer-Bisch, 1995) and the Council of Europe, which has sponsored a study of student participation in schools in a range of European contexts (Dürr, 2003). Having worked with both organisations, we have developed a set of pedagogical principles for democratic schooling that echo the conditions and requirements of the US authors but ground them in international human rights standards, starting from the provisions of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. These pedagogical principles address: dignity and security; participation; identity and inclusivity; freedom; access to information; and privacy (Osler and Starkey, 1996, 2005a). Carter and Osler (2000) provide a case-study that builds on these human rights principles, applying an action research approach within a school, to address the issue of violence. Alderson (1997, 1999, 2000), also explicitly situates her studies of school democracy within the framework of the 1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Her case study of a primary school (1997) highlights how the institution was transformed and student achievement enhanced by adopting democratic principles as the basis for its ethos. This is extended in a second case study (1999).

Whereas Alderson (2000) grounds her research on student voice and participation in a theory of democracy based on children’s rights, Flutter and Rudduck (2004), who also study student participation, provide an apolitical analysis of the benefits to schools, situating their work within the context of the school improvement movement. Their
justification of student participation is pragmatic and not based on children’s rights. Other studies confirm that greater student participation provides for a better climate for learning and may help reduce pupil exclusions (Osler, 1997, 2000c; Davies, L., 1998).

One strongly represented theme within the literature on democratic schooling is the role of formal structures for student participation in schools, specifically student councils (Trafford, 1997, 2003; Cunningham, 2000; Taylor and Johnson, 2002; Rowe, 2003). School councils appear to be particularly important in a context where, according to the IEA survey results for England, children have had relatively few opportunities, in and out of school, to debate political issues (Kerr et al., 2001, 2002a). Data on the number of schools in England with school councils is not systematically captured. The base-line DfES survey (Kerr et al., 2003) reported that one third of pupils had participated in elections for school councils and ten per cent had had experience of membership of a council. One year on, the survey noted that student participation in school council elections had risen to 50 per cent (Kerr et al., 2004). However, the following DfES survey report noted that schools in England perceive themselves to be only ‘moderately democratic’ which is taken to imply limits to participation and democracy in schools (Cleaver et al., 2005).

School violence, whether experienced in inter-personal or institutionalised forms, is an obstacle to democratic schooling as Harber (2004) and Davies (2004) clearly demonstrate from their observations of a wide range of different national contexts, including post-conflict societies. The issue of school violence (usually interpreted as
student violence towards teachers or fellow students) has been politicised in an attempt to combat democratic approaches to schooling (Osler and Starkey, 2005b).

A supportive school ethos has been identified as a key factor for successful citizenship education (Torney-Purta et al., 1999, 2001; Kerr et al., 2004). However, we might logically expect that EDC would engender democratic schooling. A number of studies conclude that a democratic school ethos is necessarily based on democratic principles such as antiracism, valuing diversity and promoting equity (Apple and Beane, 1999; Richardson and Wood, 1999; Osler and Starkey, 2002; Richardson and Miles, 2003; Banks et al. 2005; Starkey, 2005).

**Students’ understandings of citizenship and democracy**

The views and understandings of young people with respect to citizenship are addressed in the international IEA study (Torney-Purta et al., 1999, 2001) which provides a context for the English IEA study (Kerr et al., 2001, 2002) and the DfES-commissioned longitudinal study (Kerr et al. 2003, 2004; Cleaver et al., 2005). These surveys gather data through questionnaires and concentrate on elements of citizenship knowledge such as political and legal processes and institutions, voting, including voting intentions, and political representation and legal rights. For example they suggest a decline in levels of awareness of political processes and institutions, a low level of trust in the European Union and little intention of engaging in future political activity (Cleaver et al., 2005). An ESRC-funded questionnaire survey in one LEA likewise reports low levels of political knowledge, interest, trust and efficacy among young people, but the authors note that the findings do not confirm a lack of engagement with the wider social world (Halpern, et al., 2002; Morris et al., 2003). However, these findings are challenged by a Home Office survey (Farmer and Trikha,
Farmer and Trikha (2005) analyse the results from a sample of nearly 1700 young people and concluded that levels of trust in institutions such as the police broadly match that of the adult population. Although a substantial minority of young people (41 per cent) were dismissive of politicians, the vast majority (81 per cent) wanted involvement in decision-making. This study finds that young people play an active role in their communities, with half engaging in civic activity. Young people from minority ethnic groups are particularly likely to make contributions within their homes, families and communities, the highest rates of participation in civic activities being recorded by black Caribbean and mixed race respondents. This confirms evidence from the DfES survey, which found that students from visible minorities tended to have more positive views about volunteering (Cleaver, et al., 2005).

Abstract and decontextualised questions can only go so far in reaching evidence of the significant and often sophisticated understandings that young people do have of their roles in the world and their relationship to wider society, locally, nationally and globally. These have been captured through qualitative studies such as Roker et al., (1999); Lister et al. (2001, 2003); Osler and Starkey (2003) and Hudson (2005) which confirm young people’s willingness to engage in political issues at all levels from the local community through to the global.

**Complementary roles of schools and communities**

2005), which found wide variations in levels of political engagement among young people.
Education for citizenship in schools does not take place in a vacuum. Learners bring with them their experiences of daily life and are often strongly influenced by their families and experiences in communities. Two studies conducted in the multicultural city of Leicester explore some of the ideas, values and attitudes that young people bring to their learning from their communities. Lister et al. (2001 and 2003) explored young people’s perceptions of citizenship and community and their own status as citizens. Osler and Starkey (2003 and 2005a) examined young people’s perceptions of citizenship and identity, setting out to influence policy and challenge a deficit model of teaching citizenship. This study aimed to identify the community-based sites of learning for citizenship. Both studies found that young people identified with their local communities and were prepared to act in solidarity with others both nationally (for example, a campaign for the rights of refugees) and internationally (such as fund raising for earthquake victims in India).

One way in which communities is formally engage with schools is through parent governors. In a unique study, Gittens (2000) interviewed 14 black school governors, who saw their own participation as an expression of citizenship and as a mechanism for dialogue around whole school issues. This dialogue is further exemplified by Carolan (2000) who conducted a survey with over 100 parents of children at an ethnically diverse inner city primary school, followed up with individual interviews. He found parents to be supportive of a democratic school ethos. They proposed greater dialogue between parents and teachers on issues of citizenship education and racial justice.
Parents can provide valuable support to teachers of citizenship education. However, Chamberlin (2003), in a qualitative study of parents conducted in three secondary schools before citizenship education became compulsory, found low levels of community participation and a lack of interest in what the school was offering as citizenship education. By contrast, Holden (2004) found that although parents whose children attended a secondary school and two feeder primaries in a small town were largely ignorant of citizenship programmes, they were nonetheless keen to understand what schools were offering. She expresses concern that teachers may hold deficit models of parents and cites evidence that some teachers stereotype minority ethnic parents as having values likely to be in conflict with those of the school (Holden, et al., 1996). This deficit model of parents is sometimes expressed in terms of social capital, with working class and minority ethnic parents assumed to lack social capital. Print and Coleman (2003) argue that citizenship education has the potential to develop social capital, but that its impact, to date, has been disappointing.

The Crick Report advocated community involvement as an essential element in citizenship education and this is comprehensively exemplified in Potter (2002) and Linsley and Rayment (2004). Annette (2003) explores the communitarian theories underlying what is often termed active citizenship or service learning. He challenges the notion that education for active citizenship in the form of volunteering in an immediate neighbourhood will necessarily develop political literacy. He argues for engagement in the political processes of inner city regeneration and neighbourhood renewal as a means to ensure that the political dimension of learning in the community is not overlooked. Arthur et al. (2000) propose the notion of social literacy to embrace a range of activities in the school, including volunteering.
European citizenship

In the 1990s many significant developments in conceptualising and implementing citizenship education in Britain came from the participation of academics in the work of European organisations including the Council of Europe, the European Commission, the Association for Teacher Education in Europe (ATEE) and the European Educational Research Association (EERA) (Fogelman, 1996). The Council of Europe, has been engaged with citizenship and human rights education since the 1980s. In 1987 the European Commission (EC) initiated transnational education projects through its Erasmus programme. Although some of these projects have had a research element, more substantial funding for transnational educational research is available through successive EC Framework programmes. One rationale for all the European education programmes is the promotion of a sense of European identity and citizenship.

From the mid 1990s, a number of studies explore the implications of European citizenship and its meanings for UK schools. Following the Maastricht Treaty (1992) there was an intensification of interest in this area as research funds were made available. Bell (1995) reports on a series of projects addressing the apparent tensions between citizenship education for a national identity and a sense of European citizenship. This challenges the prevailing nationalist paradigms of citizenship education and highlights the benefits of comparative study.

An EC-funded Erasmus research and curriculum development project involving 30 universities explored the cultural basis for European citizenship. It investigated the extent to which proclaimed European principles were or could be operationalised in
the context of teacher education. Osler et al. (1996) and Holden and Clough (1998) report the results of this project, presenting a series of case studies which focus on the values of democracy, social justice, global responsibility and respect for human rights. Another EC-funded study by Sayer (1995) focused on co-operation between schools, universities and local authorities in England and their counterparts in Poland and the Czech Republic to develop a democratic school ethos. A key strategy was the provision of continuing professional development for teachers.

Davies and Sobisch (1997) examine the historical and political dimensions of European citizenship illustrated through case studies of school projects. A special edition of the *European Journal of Education* on education for democratic citizenship in Europe has a number of articles that provide a broader context for developments in schools in England (Kerr et al., 2002; Naval et al., 2002; Osler and Starkey, 2002; Torney-Purta, 2002).

A study for the European Commission, which set out to establish the degree to which transnational projects promoted and enacted citizenship education, found that social inclusion, antiracism and the promotion of human rights were common project goals, but that project coordinators were rarely able to evaluate project outcomes (Osler and Starkey, 1999). The research report proposes a set of guidelines for evaluating transnational projects for their contribution to citizenship education.

The work of the EC-funded Children’s Identity and Citizenship in Europe thematic network (Ross, 1999) has generated a number of publications published by Trentham as a series entitled *European Issues in Children’s Identity and Citizenship* (Näsman
and Ross, 2002; Roland-Lévy and Ross, 2002; Krzywosz-Rynkiewicz and Ross, 2004; Papoulia-Tzelepi et al., 2005). Whilst only a small minority of the case-studies and research reports in this series focus on England, the involvement of British researchers and the publication of these studies in the UK permit insights from this range of European contexts to be disseminated.

There is a continuing programme of research, curriculum development and dissemination from the Council of Europe’s project Education for Democratic Citizenship. The main findings are summarised by Birzea (2003, 2004). 2005 has been designated European Year of Citizenship through Education (EYCE).\(^{13}\)

**Implementing EDC at school level**

The implementation of EDC at school level has generated a substantial literature. We identified over 80 books, chapters, articles and reports that focus on implementation. The main themes are:

- Curriculum policy
- Baseline data
- Cross-curricular learning
- Classroom practices
- Leadership
- Teacher perspectives.

**Curriculum policy**

A few studies (Crick, 1999, 2000, 2003; Kerr, 1999, 2000; Kerr et al., 2002b) trace the development of curriculum policy for citizenship in the national curriculum in
England. These are first hand, often descriptive accounts, by members of the Secretary of State’s Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools. Research into policy implementation of at school level, funded from sources other than the DfES is somewhat limited but includes the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) (Osler, 2000c; Halpern et al. 2002); UNICEF (McKenzie et al., 2000; McKenzie 2004); BERA (Gearon, 2003b); the Nuffield Foundation (Wales & Clarke, 2005) and DfID (Davies, et al., 2005).

Baseline data

A number of studies, both large surveys and smaller qualitative studies report on school practices and student understanding prior to the introduction of citizenship to the national curriculum in 2002. Hahn (1998, 1999b) offers a perceptive account of classroom practices in a number of state and independent schools in England, in a comparative research study with four other countries. Halpern et al. (2002) provide evidence based on a questionnaire survey of 63 state schools in Hertfordshire in 2000. The results suggest that prior to the requirement that all schools educate young people for citizenship, less than 20 per cent of schools were teaching it as a discrete subject though almost all claimed to be providing some form of citizenship education.

McKenzie’s (2004) survey for UK UNICEF, the last in a series dating from 1999, engaged with over 600 schools. The report focuses on the extent to which schools across the UK are teaching about and implementing the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). It nonetheless also provides useful indications of how citizenship education is being implemented. Just over 40 per cent of respondents reported that their school taught citizenship as a discrete subject. However, it is clear that the
complex ways in which schools provide citizenship education (assemblies, school councils, cross-curricular, active learning) cannot easily be analysed by means of a survey. Nonetheless the overwhelming majority of respondents (school leaders and curriculum coordinators) considered that the introduction of citizenship had enriched the curriculum. 75 per cent considered that the school had become more democratic as a result. These results are in line with the findings of the DfES survey (Cleaver, et al. 2005). A different view is recorded by Leighton (2004) in a qualitative study of citizenship coordinators in four Kent schools. Focusing on a grammar school, he concluded that citizenship education there was little more than ‘a mantra being repeated’.

The first cross-sectional survey of the DfES funded study of the development of citizenship education in England (Kerr et al., 2003) was carried out immediately prior to the formal introduction of citizenship education into schools in September 2002. Responses were analysed from nearly 300 secondary schools, each of which submitted questionnaires completed by a senior manager, a teacher and a sample group of students. The findings are intended to provide a baseline survey of students’, teachers’ and school and college leaders’ attitudes to citizenship and citizenship education. The study also reports on the extent to which schools were prepared to teach it. They found evidence to support Holden’s (1998) assertion that citizenship was most frequently taught through Personal Social and Health Education or through a cross-curricular approach drawing on religious education, English, history, geography and extra-curricular activities. The main challenges identified were: a lack of teacher training; a lack of curriculum time; engaging and maintaining student interest; and assessment.
Cross-curricular learning


Studies of history and citizenship education in primary schools are reported by Holden (1996), Claire (2002, 2004, 2005) and Dean (2002). Science teaching is also proposed as a potential site of citizenship education (Barbosa et al., 2004) as is business studies (Olson and Lang, 2004; Davies I., et al., 2001 and 2004; Deuchar, 2004). Language teaching as a site of citizenship learning is explored by Starkey (1996, 2002), Byram (2002) and Starkey and Osler (2003). Other researchers focus on ways in which schools provide activities for citizenship education through a special themed day (Gray et al. 1998), community work (Lawson, 2001) and theatre (Day, 2002).
Classroom practices

Citizenship education requires opportunities for debating and discussing contested issues and politically divisive topics. McLaughlin (2003) provides a philosophical perspective on what he calls controversial issues. A few studies provide evidence of how teachers approach these challenges. Summers et al. (2003) analyse teacher strategies when handling politically controversial topics in primary science. Oulton et al. (2004) were funded by the Countryside Foundation for Education to explore teacher attitudes to teaching about racism and factory farming. The results suggest that teachers are not confident in handling such issues and that they are not consistent in the strategies they adopt. Rowe (2000) and Huddleston and Rowe (2003) draw on research about classroom discourses (Mercer, 1995) to propose a ‘public discourse model’ for classroom debate.

Teacher perspectives

A large-scale survey of teachers’ understandings of citizenship was carried out by Davies I. et al. (1999) prior to the introduction of citizenship education in English schools. This focused on understandings of ‘good citizenship’ and analyses responses under the headings of: social concern; knowledge; and ‘conservative characteristics’. Teachers defined citizenship in terms of concern for the welfare of others, moral and ethical behaviour and tolerance of diversity. The researchers report that teachers understood good citizenship to imply knowledge of government and current affairs; global awareness and the ability to question received ideas. They noted a tendency among teachers to associate good citizenship among the young with acceptance of and obedience to authority and uncritical patriotism. Teachers recognised their important
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role in influencing understandings of good citizenship, seeing their influence as less significant than families and friends but greater than television.


Leadership
Tuna (2004) provides a framework for school leadership and citizenship, whilst Hudson (2005) in a detailed case-study of a London school, shows how leadership and staff training are vital to the success of implementing citizenship across the curriculum and creating an appropriate ethos. This view is confirmed by Ó Cuanacháin (2005) with a case-study of a school in Ireland.

6 FUTURE RESEARCH AGENDAS
In reviewing the research literature on education for democratic citizenship in England 1995-2005 we have sought to situate recent developments within a broader European and international context. Our observation is that research and analysis of citizenship education has often been conducted with little reference to parallel developments taking place elsewhere. So, for example, while US researchers place considerable emphasis on the need to balance unity and diversity (patriotism and cosmopolitanism), this debate has, in the UK, has not always been recognised as a
mainstream issue and has not been examined by those reporting on the implementation of EDC at school level, remaining the preserve of educational philosophers and a few others.

European institutions, especially the Council of Europe and the European Commission, have been active in supporting research and curriculum development in schools and teacher education. It would appear that many British researchers are unaware of the extensive work of the Council of Europe in EDC. Schools engaged in EC-funded transnational projects appear to have benefited from these partnerships, but it is not clear whether the research community is building upon or analysing these experiences to a significant degree.

The DfES is funding a longitudinal study of citizenship education, but most university-based research in this area appears to have been conducted without external funding. There has been no significant independent funding for research in this area and consequently no substantial and coherent programme of university-based research into what is widely recognised as one of the most important recent developments in the national curriculum. Most of the work is relatively small scale and those projects which explore the relationship between school learning and community learning are modest in scale. A number of studies appear to have been conducted in a vacuum, with researchers failing to draw upon the available research literature. Recognising that established democracies as well as newer democracies need to be sustained if they are to flourish, we propose that EDC among young people needs to be supported by independent research which will further inform policy and practice.
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This paper was commissioned by the British Educational Research Association (BERA) in response to an open competition, in which the authors’ proposal on Education for Democratic Citizenship was selected to form the 2005 BERA Annual Review. It has been subject to the normal refereeing processes of this journal. The aim of a BERA academic review is to summarise historical and recent developments in research, so as to be useful to students and academics without specialist knowledge of the field.

Critics such as Harber (2004) and Davies, L. (2004) have questioned whether schools, which are often authoritarian institutions, are appropriate places for learning democracy. Both writers conclude that schools, although imperfect institutions, are the only places currently available to undertake this task comprehensively. By contrast, traditionalists, coming from the right of the political spectrum, challenge the place of citizenship education in the curriculum. They argue it is a distraction, removing time and resources away from what they present as the established canon of learning. For example, Melanie Phillips (2002) criticises the active learning approaches of citizenship education and suggests that children will be subject to ‘propaganda’: ‘citizenship will inculcate the politically correct mumbo-jumbo of globalization and cultural diversity. Children won’t be taught about their own culture, only that other cultures are beyond criticism’. Former chief inspector of schools, Chris Woodhead, also links citizenship learning with ‘political correctness’ and ‘indoctrination’. According to him, citizenship education ‘is designed to encourage young people to think critically about current affairs, but it assumes they are far more capable of doing that than they are’, arguing that children will be better off learning geography, history and science (Woodhead, quoted in MacLeod, 2002).

Commitments to education designed to promote equality, justice and greater international co-operation through education have not always been supported by adequate resources as UNESCO (2001) notes:

Progress has been achieved in fostering a greater awareness of, on the one hand, the importance of such education for the harmonious development of countries and, on the other, the need to integrate all the aspects of such education in an overall strategy for citizens’ education and training at all levels. However, there is not always an observable match between the commitments made and the means allocated for their implementation (in particular in the field of training and the production of textbooks and educational materials). Efforts should be made to allocate greater resources to developing this type of education.


There are plentiful examples of classroom materials produced by civil society organisations to support the education of citizens in this way. These are often available to teachers on websites. Resources are reviewed on the Global Dimension website: http://www.globaldimension.org.uk/ and by the Nuffield Curriculum Centre: http://www.nuffieldcurriculumcentre.org

Other NGOs that provide materials include:
Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT) http://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/
BBC http://news.bbc.co.uk/cbbcnews/hi/teachers
Citizenship Foundation http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk
Oxfam http://www.oxfam.org.uk/coolplanet/
Save the Children http://www.savethechildren.org.uk
Unicef http://www.unicef.org.uk/tz/

Identifying a book as research-based or otherwise is difficult in the case of some edited collections. Some ‘how to teach citizenship’ books (for example, Gearon 2003) contain one or more chapters which are explicitly research-based but which have been previously published in a peer-reviewed journal. Where edited chapters are researched-based but not reported elsewhere we have considered them in this review, particularly if they address aspects of EDC which are under-represented in the literature.

12 of the 14 items were published in peer reviewed journals (six from the Journal of Moral Education) and two were monographs by members of the research team.

Kerr and Cleaver’s (2004) review does not restrict itself to peer-reviewed research and includes a number of unpublished reports and articles in professional journals. Whiteley (2005) is not strictly a literature review and focuses largely on political science texts.

The Citized project. http://www.citized.info/

An earlier attempt in 1991 to introduce citizenship education, as one of five cross-curricular themes (Fogelman, 1991) was unsuccessful, largely because it took place when schools responding to the demands of a new excessively content-heavy national curriculum (Whitty et al., 1994; Davies, I 1999).
The term ‘political literacy’ (Crick and Porter, 1978; QCA, 1998) was originally used in the context of political education. Political education and its relationship to citizenship education is explored in a number of studies (Heater, 1996, 1999, 2001; Davies, I. and Sobisch, 1997; Davies, I., 1999; Crick, 2000; Leicester et al., 2000; Maitles, 2000; Lockyer et al., 2003).

Banks et al., (2005) also includes a useful checklist for schools.

We discuss the relationship of EDC and human rights (Osler and Starkey, 1996, 2000a and 2000b, 2005a; Osler, 2005c) as do two studies commissioned by the British Council (Chauhan, 2000; Davies, L., 2000).

The EYCE has its own website that provides access to reports and materials http://www.coe.int/T/E/Cultural_Co-operation/education/E.D.C/.