Ian Davies, Tilman Grammes, Hiroyuki Kuno

Citizenship Education and Character Education

"Character is the continuously defined way of how man relates to the world" **(Herbart 1919, p. 524)**

1 Introduction

In discussing citizenship education and character education we intend to make a small contribution to the clarification of the meaning of each area, discuss the connections and disjunctions between them and raise the possibility of developing an academic and professional bridge between them.

Throughout this issue we are not making an argument for anything other than professional forms of education that help learners to understand and develop the skills and dispositions to take part in contemporary society. It would be an unhelpful and superficial approach if we were to pretend that it would be appropriate to promote citizenship education in ways that were exclusively distinct from character education. Rather what we wish to do is to explore some ideas and draw attention to some issues in order to help in the development of our own and perhaps others' thinking. We see this as a necessary task as otherwise the potential for valuable educational work will be reduced. Without clear thinking about these areas, the "negative stereotyping between the two fields" (Althof & Berkovitz 2006, p. 495), there may also be unfortunate political consequences in which forms of education are practised unthinkingly and unintentionally. We argue for this serious consideration as "in the absence of this clearer articulation a form of character education will develop …. and be titled citizenship education" (Davies, Gorard and McGuinn 2005, p. 354; Suissa 2015). In other words, distinct goals would be

Ian Davies is Professor of Education, University of York, UK. He is the director of the Centre for Research on Education and Social Justice. More details may be seen *at* https://www.york.ac.uk/education/our-staff/academic/ian-davies/
Tilman Grammes is Chair of Educational Science/Social Studies Education at Hamburg University and Editor of JSSE. Research interest among others: comparative and intercultural education, qualitative research*.*
Universität Hamburg, Faculty of Education Science, FB 5, Von-Melle-Park 8, 20146 Hamburg, Germany
Email: tilman.grammes@uni-hamburg.de
Hiroyuki Kuno is associate professor of Nagoya University, Japan and Executive Committee member of the World Association of Lesson Studies. His Expertise includes curriculum development and lesson and school improvement through Lesson Study.
Nagoya University, Furo-cho, Chikusa-ku 464-8601 Nagoya, Japan; Email: kuno@nagoya-u.jp

established and ways of teaching promoted unthinkingly and probably with negative effects.

A good deal of valuable thinking and action did take place in the early years of the 21st century which led to a very clear characterization of citizenship education. That positive situation, however, may no longer exist and instead we are in 2017 again faced with the shifting sands of definitions and characterizations around citizenship and character. Further, we recognize the institutional and political developments that are always relevant to changing priorities in education. The impact of the economic crisis since 2008 and recent political developments across the world mean that educators operate in contexts that are markedly different from the early years of the 21st century. We aim in this issue of JSSE - in this editorial and in the articles - to explore areas (conceptually and empirically) in ways which will not provide answers but will perhaps highlight where further discussions and actions are needed.

'Citizenship education' or 'character education' as titles for work in schools and elsewhere may be used variously across particular locations. Of course, it would be inappropriately simplistic to declare that precise and unchanging boundaries exist for character or education. But, very broadly, 'character' is perhaps most commonly emphasised in some circles in northern America and east Asia and 'citizenship' in some European locations (including the Council of Europe's commitment to education for democratic citizenship), in South America and elsewhere. But the picture is complicated by variations within as well as across geographical contexts. East Asia is a very broad context – Singapore, for example, uses both citizenship and character.

We feel that it would be helpful to ask what lies behind these different terminologies. It is far too easy to assert in generalised (perhaps even stereotypical) terms that a combination of socialism and commitment to traditional, Confucian, values give 'citizenship' a particular meaning in one location, while a Judeo-Christian tradition with commitment to individualism gives 'character' an alternative characterization. We could just as easily make the opposite assumptions (e.g., Buber 1956). Indeed, Osler and Starkey (1999) in a review of European action programmes while praising the value of transnational projects for citizenship education in Europe also raised some questions about whether any of the programmes that they reviewed were covering the key aspects of political education. We need to recognise that within particular locations the meaning given to specific terms

varies, both by choice of term itself and the ways in which the term is applied. This may be illustrated by the choices of words which are linked to intellectual and political framing. In Hungarian, for example, the word *polgár* means 'citizen' but refers rather narrowly to a person living in a democracy with a set of attitudes relevant to an implied social standing (generally a middle class lifestyle). *Állampolgáriság,* on the other hand, can include these matters but also stresses the possibility of a legal relationship with the state and a sense of belonging to a community. What is needed is to go beyond the general labels of citizenship and character and find out what these things are intended to mean and what they actually mean in particular contexts and in general (Davies et al 2004).

In order to gain that clearer and more contextualised understanding of citizenship education and character education we will in the remaining part of this editorial, and prior to a description of the articles that are included by authors from several parts of the world, highlight very briefly some relevant factors. We draw attention to 6 key issues that help us consider the characterizations of citizenship and character: the nature of democracy; the meaning of the public-private interface; the sense of crisis that may drive the agendas for citizenship and character; the commitment by advocates of citizenship and/or character to 'right' answers in educational settings; pedagogical scaffolding; and, finally and in conclusion the alignment between character, citizenship and the fundamental purposes of education and schooling.

2 Six key issues to consider the links between citizenship and character education
2.1 The nature of democracy
This is, obviously, a very broad platform, or arena in which competing discourses meet. In part this debating space is what politics itself is centrally about. Perhaps one of the principal architects of citizenship education in the 21st century, Professor Sir Bernard Crick (1929-2008), argued that politics was the process through which the creative reconciliation of competing interest could occur (Crick 1962). We need to explore the nature of those com-peting interests. Citizenship may be potentially exclusive; character may be potentially limited and limiting. Citizen-ship may be characterised as relating to one's formally established legal position (recognized by birth in a place or through family ties) with rights and responsibilities, a feeling that one belongs, and a disposition to engage. It may also be the means by which (if the emphasis is placed on legal context) a society may easily identify those who do not belong. Whereas human rights are for some seen as universal, citizenship, in certain iterations, is much more closely proscribed. Character may be something that is innately human, the means by which an individual and other individuals, a group and other groups build connections and achieve goals. It may be generated through and for Aristotelian conceptions of the good life. Character may also be - or has been accus-ed of being – "unclear, redundant, old-fashioned, religi-ous, paternalistic, anti-democratic,

conservative, indivi-dualistic, relative and situation dependent" (Kristjansson 2013, p.269). Is citizenship likely to be more aligned with constitutional processes and character more with moral issues? This depends on the characterization of citizenship and character that is being applied. The point is not that one area necessarily must be cast in certain ways. We need to engage in democratic deliberation and promote professional forms of education that are appropriate for a diverse society.

2.2 The nature of the public-private interface
Crick, when explaining the nature of citizenship (e.g., Crick 2000), used to rely heavily on what he regarded as a division between the public and the private. He did not make this argument simplistically but we will here draw some fairly crude distinctions in order to clarify our position. A lesson that covered smoking, if it were to highlight a personal approach about an individual's health, would not be seen – using a Crick-like perspective - as relevant to citizenship education. It would be individually framed in that advice would be given to pupils not to smoke, usually on the grounds that it is unhealthy and expensive. On the other hand, a stereotypical image of a lesson about smoking in relation to character education would perhaps involve a scenario in which advice would be given about doing the right thing and having the optimism, determination and will power not to give in to peer pressure or individual desire in order to resist the temptation to smoke. Of course, things are much more complex. Smoking, when considered from the viewpoint of public health, taxation and the power of persuasion held by multinational corporations, is clearly a public issue and may be understood in citizenship lessons in such terms. Similarly, there may not be simplistic lessons about character from the smoking lesson but rather the interplay between personal decision-making and public engagement could be explored meaningfully. What may emerge is the opportunity to avoid simplistic and artificial division between citizenship on the one hand and character on the other. When Crick spoke of the public-private split it seemed odd to those who adopt feminist perspectives in which the personal *is* political. And certain critical pedagogical perspectives would perhaps claim the character education approach to smoking authoritarian and illiberal – they would criticise the democratic educational imperative as a form of subjection in order to achieve life optimization. Matters to do with power, justice, authority and so on may be seen publically *and* personally. Democratic diversity is to be celebrated (to build on the work of Westheimer and Kahne 2004) through approaches that are personally responsible and participatory and justice oriented. If this is accepted, then there is the opportunity for a clear bridge to be built between citizenship and character education programmes incorporating personal issues, moral issues, social problems, legal regulation and political participation (Reinhardt 2015).

2.3 A sense of crisis

A perception of our living through crisis may be seen in many places and in some ways is a reasonable approach to expectations around education and schooling. If education were not to influence society it would seem as if reasonably anticipated goals were not being achieved. Of course, often the crisis in question may be more imagined than real and the effect of relying upon it may in certain contexts be rather counter-productive (Sears & Hyslop-Margison 2007). But as long as we maintain our commitment to rationality and our sense of what, realistically, schools and others can achieve, then the relationship between individual, social and political goals and education should be elaborated in order to improve individual lives and society. Academics and professionals who are interested in citizenship and character are essentially being encouraged to solve problems; or, to put it more positively, to make the world a better place. There is a good deal of overlap in these endeavours. But there is also difference (including commitment to consider more sceptical considerations regarding the relationships between adults and young people and their education). Citizenship may in its commitment to constitutional politics (if not, for the moment, other things as well) be engaged in issues of democratic engagement broadly and voter turnout particularly. In many parts of the world community is a vitally important matter with many high profile pieces of work asserting a crisis (e.g., Putnam 2000) and politicians around the world are appealing to educators to act. Character may respond to a differently framed crisis. Mental health and well-being are now seen as areas of grave concern. This may be related to the highly competitive nature of societies (including examination preparation within schools); more mobile, and so, perhaps, less traditionally supported individuals and communities; the rise of social media which may encourage a pressurised 24 hour a day lifestyle; a competitive, perhaps neo-liberal, environment in which commitment to welfare (and, by extension, the public space) is shrinking. It is possible that there are meeting points between citizenship and character in the contexts for - and responses to - these crises. Societies and communities are made up of individuals <u>and</u> structural social and political factors are influential. Support for individuals would not be denied by citizenship educators; recognition of structural forces would not be rejected by character educators. Crisis is a cause of the rise of attention being devoted to citizenship and character; it is a determinant of how responses are shaped to those crises; and, importantly, across both fields it is a means of contributing to the management and perhaps even solution of those problems.

2.4 The commitment to 'right' answers

There are connections between citizenship and character over the debate about the specifics of guidance provided by teachers; or, more simply, whether or not students are told the 'right' answers. At times across social studies education unhelpfully firm positions have been established. In curriculum theory, the work of the influential academic Lawrence Stenhouse (1926-1982), for example, was interpreted by some to position the teacher as neutral chair where all contributions to a discussion would be accepted, against the supposedly authoritarian and potentially indoctrinatory politically inspired activist-educator. Issues may also be raised by considering the 4 scenarios given by Reinhardt (2017, 12). Similar debates may relate to character: for example, the proponents of moral inculcation could be positioned against those who supported providing opportunities for moral clarification. Attempts to avoid these accusations are fraught with difficulty. The determination to avoid a "postmodernism of the streets" (Crick 2000) in citizenship discussions does not mean that commitment to procedural (rather than substantive) values (Crick & Porter 1978) were necessarily understood or practised by all. The examples of some US character education programmes in which marks are awarded for 'right' responses in moral situations seem superficial and there is also opposition to more developed moral reasoning systems (such as those proposed by Kohlberg). All these things operate in a context in which increasingly specific thinking and actions are encouraged. Across the world there are initiatives about perceived and actual terrorism. In the UK for example the anti-terrorism, anti-radicalisation strategy of *Prevent* is now firmly embedded in educational policy and school inspection routines as well as within higher education (Department for Education (DfE), 2015a, 2015b; Higher Education Funding Council for Education (HEFCE), 2015). This complex picture is in our minds of obvious relevance to citizenship and character and we need to explore how we can best think and act together.

2.5 The implementation of citizenship and character

Of course, it does not mean if similar problems are faced then the same ways forward may be agreed. But similarly framed challenges do perhaps suggest that there is the potential for shared work. Perhaps the most entrenched challenge is to do with pedagogical scaffolding. Should discrete subjects be created, or we should operate through infusion through longer-established subjects, through the culture of the school and/or in collaboration with a programme of community (local through to global) engagement? The contributions in this issue avoid simplistic responses and encourage creative professionalism. They call for a clearer characterization of the knowledge forms that exist within and across both areas, to give the work a status appropriate to its position as one of the central purpose of all schooling (helping people to understand society and engage in it) and to ensure that the work that emerges has practical, concrete expression rather than the vague commitment of rhetorical support.

2.6 What matters in the development of discussion around citizenship and character?

As in many aspects of what broadly could be referred to as social science education there is not so much a lack of clarity as a lack of consensus. There are coherent, firmly

held positions that may arrange character education and citizenship education against each other. This sort of institutional positioning is not uncommon in many areas of education and is not surprising given political differrences and very concrete matters to do with generating resources for particular initiatives. There are potentially very real, significant and honestly-held differences between citizenship educators and character educators. It will be necessary at times for members of one group to distance themselves very firmly from the other. But while difference is important so are areas of agreement. And even more important is the need to develop each area. Debate in social studies education is always essential; division may be necessary. But neither fragmentation nor uniformity are likely to provide a valuable educational experience; diversity and consensus may be more productive and more an indication of the sorts of character and citizenship we would wish to promote. For those who see one of the prime purposes of schooling and education more generally as the means by which to help people to understand society critically and to have the skills to engage democratically we are ready to explore citizenship *and* character.

3 The contributions to this issue

The articles contained in this edition of JSSE draw from and deal with different regions, including South Korea, Singapore, Australia, U.S., Turkey, Netherlands, Germany and England. All have passed double blind peer review and are result of a kind of collaborative discourse. They give different perspectives about citizenship and/or character and use a range of research methods.

Ben Kisby (University of Lincoln, UK) examines the development of both citizenship education and character education in England in recent years. It shows how the level of legitimation and official support vary over time depending on the ideological and political preferences of governments. The article also illuminates the nature of these 2 fields. Citizenship education, unlike character education, places great emphasis on the development of appropriate knowledge and skills, not just values and attitudes, among young people. The focus of character education is on personal ethics rather than public ethics, and with addressing important moral or political issues at the level of the individual rather than at any other level. It concludes that the cultivation of character is necessary, but far from sufficient, for the preparation of young people for their roles as citizens, and that therefore while character education can support citizenship education it is not appropriate as an alternative.

Sun Young Park (Korea National Sport University) clarifies the characteristics and explores possible collaborations between citizenship and character education in South Korea. There is discussion of the national government's promotion of character education and the work by Gyeonggi Provincial Office of Education for democratic citizenship education. It is argued that there are different rationales in which citizenship education focuses on citizens' active participation as a member of society, whereas character education is aimed at educating an individual who has a good character. Professor Park suggests that non-formal education such as youth work can provide an ideal channel to implement both citizenship and character education.

Jia Ying Neoh (University of Sydney, Australia) compares character and citizenship education in Singapore with civics and citizenship education in Australia. This study broadens our focus in its use of 2 countries rather than one and also demonstrates the sort of international and global forces that are shaping educational agendas. Set within the context of globalisation, the paper argues that some approaches to-wards civics, character and citizenship education can inadvertently work towards supporting the goals of neoliberalism, which can be at odds with the classical tradition of democracy.

The following two articles open the German section of our featured topic. '*Politik verdirbt den Charakter'* [politics spoils character] is a saying in the German language, and thus it is hardly surprising that there is a complex relationship between character and citizenship education. Despite a tradition of classical educational theorists such as Johann Friedrich Herbart (Rucker 2014, 17), Georg Kerschensteiner (1912) or Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster (1953), it seems, as if the term character (education) is mostly avoided in recent German discourse in educational science. Today, "character" is attached to old fashioned, "conservative" pedagogical approaches, and by some seen near to racial theories evident in the German pedagogies of the pre-Nazi ideologies of colonialism. The relatively new term *Persönlichkeitsbildung (*education of personality) is being used and a school subject "Glück" (happiness, luck) which is similar to a subject like "social and emotional learning" in U.S. and UK has been introduced in some schools in Germany and Austria, promoted by an initial book (Fritz-Schubert 2014).

Jürgen Budde and Nora Weuster (Europa-Universität Flensburg, Germany) investigate the nature of a class council in relation to the learning of democracy and character education, arguing that the possibilities of a democratic pedagogy are limited. They suggest that participation in class council does not always contribute to democracy, that personal development rather than political or democratic education is emphasized and as a result a class council may camouflage a de-politicization of the school.

Ewa Bacia and Angela Ittel (Technische Universität Berlin, Germany) on the basis of participative action research in 3 Berlin schools, argue that citizenship and character education require constant engagement in relationships. These relationships work well if they are based on the mutual trust, openness and respect that is essential in the context of heterogeneity in democratic classroom.

Jane Lo (Florida State University, U.S.) and Gavin Tierney (University of Washington Bothell, U.S.) explore issues about maintaining students' interest in politics. Drawing from Schwartz and Bransford's (1998) 'A Time for Telling', they write about a case study of three students, who experienced 'engagement first' activities

in a class, and report on their interests about political issues highlighting the need for educational follow-up. Closely connected to our featured topic, Isolde de Groot (University of Humanistic Studies, Utrecht, Netherlands) focuses on formal political participation, and explores teachers' stated intentions and rationales for using mock elections to encourage critical democratic citizenship development in civic education in schools in the Netherlands. All interviewed teachers highlighted the use of mock elections with the aim to introduce and encourage engagement in political practice. The act of participation is of course a matter of citizenship education. In the roles played by individuals and groups, in the motivations and outcomes associated with virtue and in the reactions of the authorities there are obvious strong links with character.

"Turkish nation has a noble character." This quote by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk can often be found in national holidays celebrations in schools in Turkey, accompanied by so called uniting rituals such as flag raising ceremonies and student's pledge. In their cultural study approach and ethnographic documentation, Mehmet Acikalin and Hamide Kilic (Istanbul university, Turkey) explore the role of Turkish national holidays in promoting character and citizenship education. After the recent military coup attempt in July 2016, a new emerging national unity day has been introduced, which is celebrated in schools. National holidays are sometimes seen as not only patriotic, but nationalistic and as such perhaps relate to a biased sort of citizenship and character education. The authors explore whether in a changing social and political context there could be other civic virtues presented implicitly during the national days which may help to foster character and citizenship education. (National holidays at schools and other educational contexts will be the focus of forthcoming issue (JSSE 2019-1), see recent call for papers here: www.jsse.org/index.php/jsse/announcement/view/24)

References[1]

Althof, W. & Berkowitz, M.W. (2006). Moral Education and Character Education: Their Relationship and Roles in Citizenship Education. *Journal of Moral Education* 35(4), 495-518

Buber, M. (1956). Character Change and Social Experiment in Israel. In: Davis, Moshe: *Israel, it's role in civilization*. New York: Harper, 204-213.

Crick, B. (1962). *In defence of politics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Crick, B. (2000). *Essays on citizenship*. London: Continuum.

Crick, B. and Porter, A (eds.) (1978). *Political education and political literacy*. London: Longman.

Davies, I., Fülöp, M., Hutchings, M., Ross, A., and Berkics, M. (2004). Citizenship and enterprise: issues from an investigation of teachers' perceptions in England and Hungary *Comparative Education Review* 40(3), 363-384.

Davies, I.,Gorard, S. & McGuinn, N. (2005). Citizenship studies and character studies: Similarities and contrasts. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(3), 341-358

Department for Education (DfE) (2015a) *The prevent duty: Departmental advice for guidance: For schools and childcare providers*. London: DfE.

Department for Education (DfE) (2015b) *Prevent Duty Guidance: For Higher Education in England and Wales*. London: DfE.

Foerster, F. W. (15th edition: 1953, first edition: Zürich 1908). *Schule und Charakter. Moralpädagogische Probleme des Schullebens* [School and character. Problems of moral-education in school]. Recklinghausen: Paulus. (translations in Hungarian 1913, Russian 1914, Polish 1919, Czech 1928, Italian 1957, Spanish 1941, French 2003)

Fritz-Schubert, E. (2/2014). *Schulfach Glück. Wie ein neues Fach die Schule verändert*. [School subject hapiness. How a new subject changes our schools.] Freiburg: Herder.

Gradziel, D. (2014). *Educare il carattere. Per una pratica educativa teoricamente fondata*. [Educating Character. For an educational practice with theory foundation] Enciclopedia delle scienze dell'educazione (Encyclopedia of educational sciences). Rome: Le Pubblicazioni dell'Università Pontificia Salesiana (LAS).

Herbart, Johann Friedrich. 1919. Die ältesten Hefte. In: Willmann, Otto; Fritzsch, Theodor (eds.). Johann Friedrich Herbarts Pädagogische Schriften. Mit Einleitungen, Anmerkungen und Registern sowie reichem bisher ungedrucktem Material aus Herbarts Nachlass. Vol. 3. Osterwieck/Harz, Leipzig, 504-540.

Higher Education Funding Council for Education (HEFCE) (2015) *The prevent duty: Monitoring framework for Higher Education*. London: HEFCE.

Kerschensteiner, G. (1912). *Charakterbegriff und Charaktererziehung* [The concept of character and character education]. Leipzig: Teubner.

Kristjansson, K. (2013). Ten Myths About Character, Virtue and Virtue Education – Plus Three Well-Founded Misgivings. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 269-287.

Łobocki, M. (2002). *Wychowanie moralne w zarysie* [The Outline of Moral Education]. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza: Impuls.

Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (1999). Rights, identities and inclusion: European action programmes as political education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 25(1&2), 199-216.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. London: Simon and Schuster.

Reinhardt, S. (2015). *Teaching Civics. A Manual for Secondary Education Teachers*. Opladen, Berlin, Toronto: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

Reinhardt, S. (2016). The Beutelsbach Consensus. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 15(2), 11-13.

Roesgaard, M. H. (2017). Moral education in Japan. Values in a global context. London: Routledge.

Rucker, T. (2014). Political Bildung in the Context of Discipline, Instruction, and Moral Guidance. *Journal of Social Science Education* 13(1), 11-21.

Schwartz, D.L. & Bransford, J. D. (1998). A time for telling. *Cognition and instruction*, 16(4), 475-522.

Sears, A. & Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2007). Crisis as a Vehicle for Educational Reform: The Case of Citizenship Education. *The Journal of Educational Thought,* 41(1), 43-62.

Suissa, J. (2015). Character Education and the Disappearance of the Political. *Ethics and Education* 10(1), 105-117.

Endnote