This paper is taken from

Developing Identities in Europe: Citizenship education and higher education Proceedings of the second Conference of the Children's Identity and Citizenship in Europe Thematic Network

London: CiCe 2000

Edited by Alistair Ross, published in London by CiCe, ISBN 1 85377 3239

If this paper is quoted or referred to it must always be acknowledged as

Ross, A (2000) Curricula for citizens and for their teachers: processes, objectives or content, *in Ross, A. (ed)* Developing Identities in Europe: Citizenship education and higher education. *London: CiCe, pp 89 - 100*

CiCe
Institute for Policy Studies in Education
London Metropolitan University
166 – 220 Holloway Road
London N7 8DB
UK

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained herein.

Acknowledgements:

This is taken from the book that is a collection of papers given at the annual CiCe Conference indicated. The CiCe Steering Group and the editor would like to thank

- All those who contributed to the Conference
- The CiCe Central Coordination Unit for both the organisation of the conference and this collection, and in particular Martin Sundram and Cass Mitchell-Riddle for seeing this book through revisions, layout and to press
- The University of North London, for financial and other support for the programme, conference and publication
- The SOCRATES programme and the personnel of DGXXII for their support and encouragement

Curricula for citizens and for their teachers: processes, objectives or content?

Alistair Ross
University of North London (UK)

Who needs citizenship education?

Interest in citizenship education has increased in many states across Europe in the past decade. Initiatives are taking place in countries from Portugal to Estonia, from Norway to Greece. They include revitalised approaches to traditional civics education, the introduction of new teaching approaches, the addition of new curricular content, and the reformulation of some traditional subjects such as History. There have also been initiatives at the European level. For example, the former EU Commissioner for Education and Youth, Edith Cresson, called for 'the achievement of citizenship through the sharing of common values, and the development of a sense of belonging to a common social and cultural area ... a broader-base understanding of citizenship founded on mutual understanding of the cultural diversities that constitute Europe's originality and richness' (in *Towards a Europe of Knowledge* (COM (97) 563)).

> The European dimension in Education should … strengthen in young people a sense of European identity and make clear to them the value of European civilisation. *Council and the Ministers of Education*, 24 May 1988

> Education systems should educate for citizenship; and here Europe is not a dimension which replaces others, but one that enhances them. … Education for citizenship should include experiencing the European dimension … and socialisation in a European context … because this enables each citizen to play a part on the European stage. … Teachers should develop a European perspective alongside national and regional allegiances; to make use of the shared cultural heritage; to overcome cultural and lingustic obstacles. *Green Paper on the European Dimension in Education*, 29 September 1993

The European programmes make much of the ideas of nested identities, and seek to promote citizenship at European level as part of a self-identity that includes national and regional elements. In the various national programmes there are significant differences, that this paper in part addresses. In Estonia, for example, the problem of national identity is such that educational programmes need to address citizenship for a school population that has a significant minority of pupils who do not speak the national language (and some of whom do not wish to learn it) (Valdmaa, 1999). The French Civic Education has its roots in maintaining an identity (Fumat, 1999), while the English (qv) Citizenship education proposals are perhaps understandably hazy. Here it is never clear of what one will be educated to be a citizen. England? The United Kingdom? No: pupils must learn 'to participate in society as active citizens of our democracy'. Citizenship education 'promotes their political and economic literacy through learning about our economy and our democratic institutions, with respect for its varying national, religious and ethnic identities' (p 28). These various identities seemingly refer to 'our economy and our democratic institutions'. Perhaps this is the entity of which we in England are now citizens? Swedish teachers try to make students internalise democratic values and

ideology, but do so with a strong focus on 'subject knowledge' of the political life of Sweden (Vernersson, 2000).

Moves to educate for citizenship in the UK and in Europe thus both seem to have been initiated by some confusion, at the political institution level, about identity. What are the states, or super-states, or unions, with which people identify? States themselves are not natural, but are recent social constructions, that were forged at the beginning of the modern period. And as a phenomenon of modernism, it is perhaps unsurprising that as the post-modernist age begins, the legitimacy of states comes into question - both the legitimacy of individual states, and the legitimacy of states per se, which may be no more than *Imagined Communities* (Anderson, 1983). And these initiatives are being made when there is a very real decline in understanding, sympathy and trust in politicians and political institutions.

The European Parliamentary elections in June 1999 saw remarkably low participation rates - a quarter in the UK, and less than a half in most countries in which voting in not compulsory. Why the decline? The traditional answer of the politicians, perhaps the obvious answer for them, is that we have not had enough political education. Schools have let down the various nations (once again): make the schools tell the kids about the virtues of democracy, and all will be well. Politicians are rightly afraid that without popular endorsement at the polls, they lack authority: getting people to believe in the systems that they stand for might restore their legitimacy. But politicians have a much greater personal identity with the state (or the union) than do most other people. Their role depends on the political entity: ours does not. Questioning the existence of the nation state, the boundaries, the rules of membership challenges the identity and legitimacy of the politicians and the public service, but does not challenge most of us in the same way. This is a powerful motivating force for the current political emphasis on programmes for citizenship. (Some non-politicians also feel themselves particularly threatened by the erosion of the idea of the nation-state. Those who need the authority of a state, who choose to identify strongly with conceptions of 'their race', their genetic stock, are undermined by questions that challenge the legitimacy of this institution: hence the resurgence of extreme right-wing parties across Europe. The political answer to such individuals is that they need more political education: the current rhetoric for citizenship education, as noted earlier, is interlaced with references for education to promote inclusivity, about challenging xenophobia and racism).

There is a second set of problems around citizenship education. Citizenship 'for democracy' is particularly problematic. As Borhaug (1999) has pointed out, it rather depends on what kind of democracy. Traditional representative democracy puts its energies into ensuring the intermittent participation of the population in elections, through political parties that stand for broad principles. The key actor is the informed voter. The classic 1960s study of *The Civic Culture* suggested that the ideal citizen was a careful mix of the active citizen and the passive subject (and suggested that the leading exponent of this tradition was Britain (Almond and Verba, 1965)). But there are other kinds of democratic action, and many people over the past two decades have become involved in more specific political activities than simply supporting broad political parties. The growth of 'single issue' politics has challenged traditional politicians, who have found electors deserting mass parties in favour of pressure groups, such as Greenpeace, Drop the Debt, activism related to the World Trade Organisation meetings and the European coalitions of Greens. The old political parties have had their activities

and compromises challenged by informed political activists. This is an alternative kind of democracy that is less concerned with the political structures and procedures than with the issues themselves. The key actor becomes the local activist.

But this is not what the politicians and public servants want political education to be about. Their concerns are - quite naturally - with buttressing the systems and institutions that brought them into existence and that maintain them. This is not just the identity question, as I argued above, but also about civic duties and obligations - to participate in political processes, to understand the need for compromise, to accept the decision-making processes. If future citizens can be told how fair the existing system is, how the machinery of government works in the interest of the citizen, how interest groups must (of course) be listened to, but how balances must be struck between competing interests - then they will accept the legitimacy of the political processes, and become part of *The Civic Culture* - good citizens.

Where do curricula come from?

Turning next to the traditions and structures of the curriculum, I want to suggest that there are three distinct approaches to constructing a curriculum. Each has a different aim and ambition, and each determines a particular pedagogic style to implement it. I will argue that it is unclear which of these traditions citizenship education belongs to: it depends on who is advocating such education, and why. Only when we understand the motives does it become clear what is meant by this term: and only then that we can calculate how to approach the subject.

For the purpose of this paper, I call these content-driven, objectives-driven, and process-driven curricula; but other writers have given different names to what is essentially the same division:

Content-driven	Objectives-driven	Process-driven	
preparatory	elementary	developmental	*Blyth, 1967 [Primary curriculum]*
classical humanist subject-centred or knowledge-centred	society-centred	progressivist	*Skilbeck, 1976*
		child-centred	*Lawton et al (1978)*
academic	utilitarian	pedagogic	*Goodson)1987)*
liberal humanist	technocratic	child-centred progressivism	*Golby (1989)*

As Goodson points out, these three types are the ‘centres of gravity in the argument about styles of curriculum ... representing three clear constellations of curriculum styles which recur in the history of school subjects’ (1987, p 26).

The ***content-driven curriculum*** has been the ground on which the official pedagogic discourse has been largely fought, the area from which ‘from a whole possible area of past and present, certain meanings and practices [have been] chosen for emphasis, [and] certain other meanings and practices ... neglected and excluded’ (Williams, 1961, p 205). This is a curriculum designed as a construction of formally delimited zones of subjects or disciplines. This has been the dominant curriculum paradigm for most European education in the 20th century: the historical review of curriculum change shows the enormous resilience of these particular subjects. Bernstein’s 1990 analysis suggests that

this dominance of the official pedagogic discourse is the consequence of a core of officials, consultants and advisers, both educational and economic, who recontextualise the curriculum into disciplines (1990, pp 195 - 6). Such a curriculum is composed of Bernstein's boundaries and frames, and is expressed through the persistence of the major disciplines. A subject-based curriculum is both traditional and the means of preserving tradition, and seeks its justification in an appeal to traditional eternal verities: it possesses a very real dynamic: 'the visible, public and changing testimony of selected rationales and legitimising rhetorics of schooling' (Goodson, 1988, p 16).

Bernstein proposed that curricula could be described by an *educational code*, which he used to characterise two broad categories (1975). Content-driven curricula are of the *collection* type, in which units or divisions of knowledge are strongly bounded, and which have a hierarchical organisation and transmission mechanism. The alternative *integrated* type of curriculum (considered here as the objectives-driven curriculum) allows for interdependence between units of knowledge in a less rigid thematic approach, with a less dependence on the position between teachers and pupils. In 'On the classification and framing of educational knowledge' (1971), he argues that the two key concepts of the code are classification and frame.

Classification describes the relationship between the contents of the curriculum: it is concerned with the existence and strength of the boundaries that are constructed and maintained between subjects: 'Where classification is strong, contents are well insulated from each other by strong boundaries. Where classification is weak, there is reduced insulation between contents, for the boundaries between contents are weak or blurred. *Classification thus refers to the degree of boundary maintenance between contents*' (p 88, emphasis as in original).

Frame, on the other hand, refers to the context in which knowledge is transmitted and received - the relationship between the teacher and the pupil. Frame refers to the strength of the boundary between what may or may not be taught - it 'refers us to the range of options available to teacher and taught in the control of what is transmitted and received in the context of the pedagogic relationship. Strong framing entails reduced options; weak framing entails a range of options. *Thus frame refers to the degree of control teacher and pupil posses over the selection, organisation, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogic relationship*' (pp 88 - 89, emphasis as in original).

Many of the arguments for the content-matter of the classical humanist curriculum are based on little more than a self-evident appeal to tradition and common sense about the elements of high culture and its values: though Hirst, in *Liberal Education and the Nature of Knowledge* (1965) argues that the wide range of knowledge of which 'mind' is constituted can be reduced to seven fundamental 'forms of thought', each of which is a unique and essential way of understanding and knowing the world. A form of knowledge is a distinct way in which the individual's experience becomes structured, and this structure is formed around the use of publicly accepted symbols. Because these symbols have public meaning, the way in which the learner uses them can be tested, and the symbols become capable of elaboration and extension. But this is in reality the same knowledge-based classical curriculum, argued from different principles that appeal to rationality rather than tradition. This analysis has significant supporters (Phenix (1964), King and Brownell (1964), Oakeshott (1974)). In particular, the content-driven

curriculum, with its sharply delimited divisions into high-status subjects, and its emphasis on academic credentials and validation, seems to be the vehicle *par excellence* for the transmission of Bourdieu's cultural capital to an elite group of students.

The ***objectives-driven curriculum*** is rather different: it is essentially based on an instrumental view of schooling. For many children, the traditional humanist curriculum is presented to them as utilitarian - both in the sense that there is a form of usefulness in acquiring credentials in such subjects because it brings access to careers and professions otherwise unavailable, and in the sense that most subjects can be portrayed in some way that demonstrates utility. While the end result may appear to be similar, the intentions and processes of the instrumental curriculum are rather different, however. One important variant of the objectives-driven curriculum is the reconstructionist curriculum identified by Skilbeck (1976). This social need-led curriculum version of the objectives-driven curriculum - the claim that education, properly organised, can be one of the major forces for planned change in society (p 11) - was perhaps less typical of established industrial societies (one form was propounded by Nyerere in Tanzania, for example (1973), though it was also found in Benn and Simon's advocacy of comprehensive schooling in Britain (1972). Reconstructionists have taken the Enlightenment goal of rationality for education, arguing that 'attempts to plan and organise individual and social experience according to agreed ends and using agreed social procedures', particularly through educational processes, will lead to 'the deliberate cultivation of rationality, of problem-solving procedures, adaptability and flexibility and a generalised capacity to face up to the problems of practical life' (Skilbeck, 1976, p 12).

In these kinds of curriculum - whether reconstructionist or otherwise - objectives that meet specific needs for competencies - of society, of the economy, or of the individual - are specified in advance, and a curriculum is drawn up to achieve these objectives. Abilities and capabilities necessary to meet the needs of contemporary life are specified and used to justify the collection of subjects that constitute the curriculum. The justification depends not on the academic worthiness or otherwise of the subject, but in its ability to deliver the particular skills that are judged necessary. It is not essential that there are strict boundaries to subjects, so the classification code could, in theory, be weak. The frame, however, necessarily remains strong, because the dominant pedagogic model remains one of transmission from the expert teacher to the novice pupil.

This model of the curriculum can be justified in various ways. Academic subjects may be based on complex conceptual reasoning, and thus be inappropriate for all pupils. Inhelder and Piaget (1958), for example, suggest that the ability to think conceptually is limited to older pupils, and to not all of these: a curriculum that made less intellectual demands, and put more emphasis on instrumental and concrete goals, could be said to serve these pupils better. Many pupils expect and demand vocational relevance in their schooling: whether it is real transferable occupational skills or credentials that can be used in the job market, they expect to see a direct correspondence between their 'work' in school and their future work. And on grounds of fairness and justice, it could be argued that if the instrumental curriculum parallels the academic curriculum, then the problems created by the tripartite school can be avoided, or at least mitigated: since it is difficult to divide pupils accurately into different streams, it is at least possible to allow students to switch from an instrumental variant of a subject to the academic form (and vice versa) if this later appears to be better matched to their abilities.

Goodson preferred to refer to the 'utilitarian' curriculum, rather than the 'vocational' curriculum when referring to 'low status practical knowledge ... Utilitarian knowledge thus becomes that which is related to those non-professional vocations in which the majority of people work for most of their adult life' (Goodson 1987, p 27). The academic curriculum has always therefore had a specific vocational cachet. A belief in utility as the defining factor in selecting a curriculum challenges arguments that curriculum construction is a matter of debate. Utilitarianism, as proposed in the Benthamite 'calculus of pleasures', attenuates discussion of social outcomes, individual development and epistemological arguments about the curriculum in favour of a calculation of overall advantage. Golby identifies this as the 'technocratic tradition' (1989, p 30) in the curriculum, in which positivism proposes that planning by objectives will result in a rational curriculum.

Ralph Tyler (1949) was one of the principal exponents of managing the curriculum by setting objectives that were capable of evaluation. His analysis was deceptively simple: define clearly what are the desired outcomes of education, and do so in terms of the specific desired behaviour that is expected after the educational process is completed, and then the curriculum that will be the means to achieve that end will also be defined. The most technically apposite way to achieve these behavioural changes will be the 'best' curriculum. The means are determined by the ends. Having identified the necessary learning experiences, a coherent programme for their delivery must be organised to achieve continuity through the reiteration of the material, through breaking down the material into a logical progressive development of the understanding or skill, and integrating experiences so that the student gets a unified view and can develop his or her behaviour in an integrated manner. Objectives-driven models assume that one can pre-determine the shape to which a learner will be moulded.

The third variant - the ***process-driven curriculum*** - has variously been described as the pedagogic curriculum in secondary schools (Goodson (1987), the developmental curriculum in primary schools (Blyth, 1967) (sometimes also as the child-centred curriculum (Lawton *et al*, 1978; Golby, 1989)), and also as the progressive curriculum (Skilbeck, 1976, Golby, 1989). Its distinguishing characteristic seems to be that it is principally concerned with, or guided by, the *processes* of learning. It can often be sharply distinguished from the traditional academic/classical humanist curriculum, and was often therefore aligned with the utilitarian curriculum: the two sometimes formed an uneasy alliance in the secondary modern schooling system, and in many comprehensive schools: a simple dualism made categorisation and description easier. Thus Shipman could write of 'a schools system that is still clearly divided into two sections, one geared to a system of external examinations, the other less constrained .... it is the consequence of innovation into these two separate sections rather than the curricula themselves which may be producing a new means of sustaining old traditions' (1971, p 101-2). On the one hand was the academic tradition, 'planted in revered academic tradition, adapted to teaching from a pool of factual knowledge and has clearly defined, if often irrelevant subject boundaries' and on the other an area that was 'experiential ... focuses on contemporary problems, groups subjects together and rejects formal teaching methods' (p 104).

Aspects of the three types

Autonomy is used in rather different ways in these three major curricular models. The traditional autonomy of the content-driven (or academic, or classical humanist)

curriculum model is reserved for the few who have mastered the discipline and can demonstrate their control over the defined cultural capital (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). The objectives-led curriculum and the progressive curriculum have both rather different conceptualisations of autonomy as something that the learner - that all learners - ought to acquire in the processes of learning. But while for the objectives-driven, this means pupil-centred learning, with the negotiation over tasks, the use of the teacher as a guide and facilitator rather than as an authority (Bernstein's (1975) weak framing model), for the process-driven it is more of a consumerist autonomy, the freedom to choose a different course, to select modules and learning styles from a specified range, towards pre-selected objectives (Bates *et al*, 1998).

The three models of curriculum have other distinguishing characteristics. For example, the academic tradition sees knowledge as a distinct body of data, hierarchically arranged, which needs to be acquired. The progressive tradition is that education is a process: rather than knowing *what*, one should know *how* - and in particular, learning how to learn (about knowledge) is more important than knowing knowledge itself. For the objectives-driven curriculum, knowledge becomes a simple commodity.

Each type has its own particular characteristics, and they tend to be regarded in some ways as polar types. That is, many of those engaged in curricular discussion treat one or other of the types as desirable, and everything else as undifferentiated and undesirable (or one of the types as undesirable, and everything else as undifferentiated and desirable). Thus, for example, there is an 'academic'-'non-academic' axis for debate, in which debate groups around those advocating a classical-humanist style curriculum and those against it.

Characterising citizenship education within this debate

Citizenship education does not fit simply into one of these three types: confusingly, it can be variously described to meet any one of them. It can be seen as a body of knowledge: the pupil can be asked to know about parliamentary procedures, democratic norms, the rule of law, European Union institutions, and so on. Such knowledge can be tested and graded, and will be of high esteem. Or the activity can be classed instrumentally, within the objectives-driven curricula: such education will be presented as useful to the individual and socially desirable: it can be presented to the pupil as empowerment (*Civic Culture* form - this is how you be a good citizen and vote; local activist form - this is how you make political action work); and it is presented by politicians as ensuring participation, acquiescence to decisions and legitimacy. Finally, citizenship education can be presented in a process-driven way: this will nurture the development of the individual's value system, will enable reflective and critical participation (or non-participation) on a reasoned, personally-validated basis.

Disentangling different statements about citizenship education in different states may help us see how intentions differ. We have a growing body of literature about different countries' curricula (there is a growing database at the INCA website – http://www.inca.org.uk, which is based on information collected about various curricula by EURYDICE units; and there is the CiCe database). Three broad sets of statements emerge, corresponding to the three curricula types.

First, there are statements that pupils should know about and understand society and its institutions. Many curricula used to fall within this area: for example, in Portugal and

Greece in the early 20th century (Chelmis, 1999; de Freitas, 1999). Interwoven with civic education are threads of determining national identity, and establishing a civic culture and pride. Some of the newer programmes in the East and Central European states include such aspects: Estonia is a case in point (Valdmaa, 2000). Hungary has some similar elements, but as Le Metais (1997) puts it, the Hungarian curriculum combines 'the reassertion of national identity after political upheaval' with 'national assertiveness within an international framework' (see also Gocsal, 1999). The German curriculum values have also been revised to re-establish unity following reunification by some stress on the teaching of political and organisational information (Le Metais, 1997). Sometimes it appears that the curriculum is not explicit about content in the sense that the objectives are written in terms of attitudes, values and behaviour, but the details of what is to be taught focus on information about political institutions (contemporary Greece may be such a case (Chelmis, 1999)). In other situations, the teachers themselves may stress political institutional content over values and instrumental norms, despite the formal curriculum documents not doing this, for example in Sweden (Vernersson, 2000).

Secondly, there are statements that pupils should develop the capacity to act as 'good' citizens and members of society. These may tend to be described in terms of empowerment of the individual, providing them with skills to make informed choices and to act. However, it may be that in at least some instances, what is meant by a 'good citizen' is one that is 'good' for the state: participating at the required instances of elections, accepting of the legitimacy and authority that the process offers, and little more. A good citizen is one who fulfils her/his civic obligations, accepts his/her duties - and perhaps makes little use of her/his rights. It is necessary for the preservation of existing societies and institutions that citizens participate to the extent of accepting: such arguments are instrumental in nature. Some of the various states' aims for education reveal these tendencies: for example, the French curriculum seeks 'to prepare students for work, not just for qualifications'; the English curriculum is even more explicit as to who such utility is to benefit: 'to prepare young people for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life and to increase the relevance of student achievement to the world of work so as to enhance the nation's international competitiveness' (in Le Metais, 1997).

Thirdly, there are statements that pupils should become reflective and critical participants. The emphasis here is clearly on process. Thus an educational aim in Sweden is 'to instil those values on which society is based [an objectives-driven element] and to help students develop the ability to critically examine facts and relationships and appreciate the consequences of the various alternatives facing them [clearly process-driven]' (le Metais, 1997). Sweden also refers to enabling young people 'to keep their bearings in a complex reality, with a vast flow of information and rapid change'. Spain refers to the 'promotion of progressive independence'.

Citizenship and national identity

Goodson observed that the selection of the content of particular subjects - and the selection of the subjects themselves - suggested that ideas and concerns about national identity were regarded as more important than possible industrial or commercial considerations.

> The national curriculum ... can be seen as a response to the 'nation at risk' at two levels. First, there is the general sense of the nation-state being in economic decline and subject to globalisation and to amalgamation in the wider European Community. There the response is paradoxical. Nation-building curricula are often favoured over commercially 'relevant' curricula. The solution may therefore exacerbate the problem. .... Secondly, given that the UK is clearly a divided nation, investigation of the national curriculum allows insights into precisely *which* nation is at risk. ... elite and middle class groups ... have the greatest historical connections to the 'traditional subject' (Goodson, 1994, p 104)

The ways in which the curriculum may influence social reproduction may be contested, but the fact that it does have an influence on the nature of future society is no longer an issue. The curriculum has a role in shaping future identities. If social identities and cultures were secure and static, then the role of education in this would not be at issue, but this is not the case in Europe, nor in much of the rest of the world. Social mobility, migration, increased awareness of gender, environmental concerns, social exclusion and class all continue to contribute to a general challenge to traditional verities. Even if there was once a notional stability - and what stability and coherence there was may have been at best an invention - it does not continue today.

Society is plural and fragmented. This is not a cause of concern for many people: the multiple identities that we are now able to take on have done much to liberate groups that have been hitherto suppressed. But for many others, it has been of concern that inherited and established patterns and groupings are breaking up. One of the motivations behind the various national curricula movements has been the desire to use the educational system to weld together the various parts of society, to ensure that a 'whole' society was reproduced in the future. Some curricula in Europe specifically acknowledge national diversity: the Netherlands, for example, state that their curriculum 'bases education on the principle that pupils grow up in a multi-racial society'; Hungary's curriculum makes explicit 'the recognition and integration of the numerous minorities', and Sweden's refers to the internationalisation of Swedish society, combined with increasing cross-border mobility' leading to pupils developing 'the ability to live together and appreciate the values that are to be found in cultural diversity' (le Metias, 1997). Sweden and the Netherlands also refer to the preservation of cultural diversity (the Netherlands specifically to preserve the Friesian languages, while Sweden refers to pupils being taught to be aware of their own cultural origins and to share in a common cultural heritage, in order to 'provide a secure identity'). Searching for a common identity has its dangers. Some members of the polity will resist the imposition of a dominant culture on them; others will resist what they will see the hybridisation of tradition. Perhaps more importantly, the only way to create a common identity is to distinguish 'the other': to create a group that is outside, that is used to make 'us' different from 'them'. Sometimes 'the other' is created by hiving off a particular sector - the underclass, the ethnic or linguistic minority, the welfare-dependants. In order to create a commonality between the rest, groups such as these are isolated and demonised as 'the other'. A synthetic idea of 'society' or 'the nation' is created by stigmatising the outsiders, those who do not belong. Another strategy, equally divisive and dangerous, is the nationalistic path: 'the other' is here identified as the foreigner, whether resident here or abroad.

The implications for teaching and learning: What do we tell our students?

Content-driven curricula are traditionally easiest to develop, teach and to assess. They involve the selection of appropriate content - arguably the most difficult and contentious part - and then its delivery, usually didactically, to pupils. A well-founded programme will add to the factual content a concept-based analysis, that addresses curriculum objectives in terms of understanding particular underlying principles, rather than the fripperies of detail (Crick, 1974 is a good example: his matrix of twelve core concepts is given as an appendix). Assessment is largely based on the ability to recall, and (at higher levels) the performance of specific intellectual tasks (for example, of analysis or synthesis, of comparison and contrast). Material, once selected, can be simply processed into textbook form, or other suitable delivery media.

Objectives-driven curricula are more complex. It is likely that there will be perennial debate about the precise objectives in such an area, and teaching is likely to be focussed around themes and issues that are deemed to be 'relevant'. There may well be a deliberate attempt not to include concepts, but to focus on 'issues' and 'relevance' - some critics may say to the point where generalisation and transference of ideas becomes difficult to establish. Assessment is certainly not easy: the accomplishment of a 'good citizen' is, after all, something that will be only evidenced in future political/civic participation. Probably this is just as well: the problems of what to do about pupils who were judged to be 'failed citizens' or 'poor at citizenship' is not easy to address!

Process-driven curricula are more likely to depend on enactive modes of learning, on action, discussion and expression. From experience, they are more likely to be concept-based, but to focus on issues, and to lead to critical reflection on the systems. Assessment would be the subjective analysis of critical output from the pupil, not political action.

What do we tell out students? Firstly, to be cautious and analytic themselves. Whatever the stated objectives of a citizenship education programme, they need to question other intentions, and other agendas that may be more covert than the formal statements. Secondly, they probably need to construct a curricula approach that combines a variety of elements: issue-based, but also reflective and enactive; and one that requires pupils to debate and rehearse arguments. In a situation where the authority is pressing one particular approach, the teacher may need to redress the balance by using complementary approaches - for example, if there is great stress on institutions and structures, to deliberately focus on teaching these through an issue-based approach, that can (if challenged) be justified by an underlying mapping of concepts to the institutions. Or, if necessary, vice versa. This is a subversive counter-activity by teachers: it needs to be: politicians do not advocate political education without subversive intentions.

Appendix

Crick's 1974 Matrix of core political concepts

Government	Power	Authority	Force	Order
relationship between government and society	Law	Justice	Representation	Pressure
Society	Natural rights	Individuality	Freedom	Welfare

References

Almond G & Verba S (1965) *The Civic Culture; political attitudes and democracy in five nations.* Boston: Little Brown & Co

Anderson B (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections in the origins and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso

Bates I et al (1998) 'Progressivism and the GNVQ: Context, ideology and practice', *Journal of Education and Work*, 11, 2, pp 109 – 125

Benn C & Simon B (1972) *Half way there.* Harmondsworth: Penguin

Bernstein B (1971) 'On the classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge', in Young, M F D (ed) *Knowledge and Contol: New Directions in the Sociology of Education.* London: Collier-Macmillan

Bernstein B (1975) *Class, Codes and Control. Volume 3: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmission* (2nd ed). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Bernstein B (1990) *Class, Codes and Control. Volume 4: The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse.* London: Routledge

Blyth , W A L (1967) *English Primary Education, Vol 1* (2nd ed) London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Borhaug, K (1999) 'Education for Democracy', in Ross A (ed) *Young Citizens in Europe*. London: CiCe TNP

Bourdieu P & Passeron J-C (1990) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (2nd ed) Transl. R Nice. London: Sage

Chelmis S (1999) Citizenship Values and Political Education in Greek Primary Schools: An historical perspective, in Ross A (ed) *Young Citizens in Europe*. London: CiCe TNP

Crick B (1974) 'Basic Political Concepts and Political Development', *Teaching Politics*, 3, 1

De Freitas M L (1999) 'Civic Education, Social and Personal Development and Citizenship Education: Changes in Portugal through the 20th Century', in Ross A (ed) *Young Citizens in Europe*. London: CiCe TNP

European Commission (1993) *Green Paper on the European Dimension in Education*, 29 September 1993

European Commission (1997) *Towards a Europe of Knowledge*, 1997

European Council of Ministers (1988) *Council and the Ministers of Education*, 24 May 1988

Fumat Y (1999) Ecole et Citoyenneté, in Ross A (ed) *Young Citizens in Europe*. London: CiCe TNP

Golby M (1989) 'Curriculum Traditions', in Moon B, Murphy, P & Raynor J (eds) *Policies for the Curriculum.* London: Hodder and Stoughton

Goodson I (1987) *School Subjects and Curriculum Change: Studies in Curriculum History* (rev ed). London: Falmer

Goodson I (1988) *The Making of Curriculum: Collected Essays*. London: Falmer

Goodson I (1994) *Studying Curriculum: Cases and Methods*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Hirst P (1965) 'Liberal Education and the Nature of Knowledge', in Archanbauld R (ed) *Philosophical Analysis and Education.* London: Routledge

Inhelder B & Piaget J (1958) *The Growth of Logical Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Kerr, D. (1999) Citizenship Education: an International Perspective *(International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks, Paper 4).* London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority

King A & Brownell J (1964) *The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge*. New York: Wiley

Lawton D et al (1978) *Theory and Practice of Curriculum Studies*. London: Routledege and Kegan Paul

Le Métais, J. (1997) Values and Aims in Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks *(International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Paper 1)*. London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority.

Nyerere J (1973) 'The Intellectual needs Society' and 'Relevance and Dar es Salaam University', in *Freedom and Development: Uhuru na Maendeleo*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press

Oakeshott M (1974) *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*. London: Methuen

Phenix P (1964) *Realms of Meaning: A Philosophy of the Curriculum for General Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill

Qualifications & Curriculum Authority (1999) *Citizenship Education*. London: QCA

Shipman M (1971) 'Curriculum for Inequality' , in Hooper R (ed) *The Curriculum: Context, Design and Development.* Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd

Skilbeck M (1976) 'Three Educational Ideologies', *Curriculum Design and Development: Ideologies and Values.* Buckingham: Open University Press

Tyler R (1949) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: Chicago University Press

Valdmaa S (1999) Identities in Estonia; Challenges to Citizenship Education, in Ross A (ed) *Young Citizens in Europe*. London: CiCe TNP

Vernersson, F (2000) Teachers' didactic work: compulsory school teacher' conceptions of their own civics teaching, *Children's Social and Economics Education*, 4, 1 (2000)

Williams R (1961) *The Long Revolution*. London: Chatto and Windus