'For People to Think of Themselves as Active Citizens'

The Creation and Revision of the Citizenship Subject in England

by Jannike Elmblom Berger

A Thesis presented to the

Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages

University of Oslo

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the MA Degree in English

Spring 2011

ii

Abstract

The thesis aims to shed light on the political background to Citizenship, a statutory subject introduced in New Labour's first term in government. Firstly, it seeks to clarify why this new subject was introduced into the National Curriculum in England, and what actors and ideas were decisive in shaping it; and secondly, why the subject was revised a few years later, what determined the direction of the review and how the results were reflected in the programmes of study. The main focus in both cases is on the political processes and in particular the role of the then New Labour government. The thesis argues that the introduction of the Citizenship subject was helped by a benevolent political and social context, but driven forward through the pulling of strings by especially significant individuals; in particular David Blunkett, the then Education Secretary, and Bernard Crick, Blunkett's former Professor and mentor. Thus, the Citizenship subject, introduced in schools in 2002, was largely in agreement with Blunkett's personal ideas on the importance of active citizenship. In terms of the revision of the subject a few years later, the thesis argues that this mainly came about due to major national and international events leading to a change in the political climate. In the aftermath of these events, Britain experienced a shift in the public debate towards a stronger emphasis on diversity and identity issues, mainly focusing on how best to foster integration, shared values and community cohesion. The shift of attention was reflected in the New Labour government's discourse and policy, and the revision of the Citizenship curriculum should be seen as part of this picture. In this respect, the thesis shows how New Labour, rather typically for a centre-left party, sought to strike a balance between the use of a 'hard' and 'soft' approach, as well as between, on the one hand, the promotion of integration, and, on the other, appreciation of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity.

Acknowledgements

I would like to offer my considerable thanks and appreciation to the following, who have contributed to this thesis in various ways.

<div align="right">

Jannike Elmblom Berger,

Oslo, May 2011.

</div>

Content

vi

Chapter One: Introduction

> We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally: for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life.
> (the Crick report)[1]

Following the recommendations of the Crick advisory group, Citizenship was introduced as a statutory subject in the National Curriculum in England during New Labour's first term in government. The subject was then implemented in key stages 3 and 4 in all maintained schools in England in 2002.[2] As reflected in the quote above, the stated aim of the Crick advisory group, as well as the final subject, was to create 'active citizens'; people who are 'willing, able and equipped' to make positive contributions to politics and society in various ways.[3] In 2006, the government commissioned a review of the Citizenship curriculum, led by Sir Keith Ajegbo, and the subject was revised in order to introduce a stronger emphasis on identity and diversity issues. The revised Citizenship curriculum has then been taught in schools since 2008.

This thesis will, firstly, aim to clarify *why the Citizenship subject was introduced into the National Curriculum, and what actors and ideas were decisive in shaping it*; and secondly, *why the subject was revised a few years later, what and who determined the direction of the review and how the results were reflected in the curriculum*. The main focus in both cases is on the political processes and in particular the role of the then New Labour government. This introductory chapter will begin by outlining some central questions relevant

---

[1] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), p. 7: (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf

[2] The English National Curriculum is divided into four key stages, and sets out different targets to be achieved in various subject areas at the different stages. The stages are as follows: key stage 1: age 5-7; key stage 2: age 7-11: key stage 3: age 11-14: and key stage 4: age 14-16. Citizenship is a statutory subject for the key stages 3 and 4, in other words between the ages 11-16.
The National Curriculum website.
Accessed: 10 January 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/

[3] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), pp. 7-8: (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf

for the thesis, before discussing the delimitation and purpose of the study. Then, the chapter will move on to discuss historiography, in this case how the introduction and revision of the Citizenship subject has been interpreted from different perspectives. In addition, the chapter will discuss the choice of method and sources, looking at how the study has made use of a wide range of material, including interviews and a wide range of written primary and secondary sources. Towards the end of this first chapter, relevant terminology is explained, before the structure of the thesis is briefly outlined.

Central Questions

The thesis aims to shed light on the political background to Citizenship, a statutory subject in the National Curriculum in England. Central questions to be answered are: *why was Citizenship introduced as a new, compulsory subject in the National Curriculum in England? What was the political and social background for this? What was the role of the New Labour government, and how was the political process leading to the subject conducted?* Moreover, the thesis will explore *what form this new subject was given and how this was linked to the political motivation for the subject*.

A few years after the implementation of Citizenship, the New Labour government commissioned a review of the subject curriculum. Following this review, the subject was revised in order to provide a stronger focus on identity and diversity issues than what had been the case until then. Through exploring this process, the study aims to answer the following questions: *why was the Citizenship curriculum revised? Why was it perceived as necessary to incorporate a stronger emphasis on issues concerning identity and ethnic, cultural and religious diversity in the curriculum? In other words, what was the political and social background for the review of the Citizenship curriculum (and to what extent did the revision process differ from the process leading to the introduction of the subject)?* Additionally, the thesis will also investigate *what explicit changes were made to the Citizenship curriculum as part of this revision, and how these changes reflected the political process and the political and social context at the time*.

In addition to its main focus, the introduction and revision of the Citizenship subject, the study will begin by exploring some central aspects of the history of citizenship education in England, and some pivotal periods in the last century when such education was particularly high on the public agenda. The thesis will look into *how the issue of citizenship education has been treated in England, and why it could be argued that such education has had a troubled*

2

past. This historical backdrop is significant to the debates about the Citizenship subject, and political actors have drawn upon it either to support the introduction of the subject or to warn against it. In addition to outlining some central aspects of the history of civic education, the study will also, in its concluding chapter, *briefly outline some implications of the subject and make some assumptions about the possible future for Citizenship*, considering the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government's current National Curriculum review. Despite the ambition to create a subject which could tackle political, possibly controversial, issues in a non-partisan way, the future of Citizenship is far from secure. As will be argued with the current curriculum review in mind, it is not obvious that Citizenship will continue as a statutory part of the education of every child in the maintained school sector in England.

Delimitation and Purpose

Citizenship education is a broad field, so some limitation is called for. It is important to stress that the scope of the thesis is *England*, not Britain. The United Kingdom (UK) is a multinational state, and education has traditionally been a local or regional matter.[4] Since Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland were granted devolution in the late 1990s, education has been a devolved matter left to the executive and legislative powers in the constituent nations of the UK. Yet, because devolution has not been extended to England, the Department for Education and the British Parliament at Westminster in London are responsible for the *English* education system.[5] Noteworthy, England is the only part of the UK where civic education is statutory, and where it is offered through a subject curriculum of its own. In the other constituent nations, citizenship is either offered as a cross-curricular theme, which is the case in Scotland and Northern Ireland, or as part of Personal and Social Education, as is the case in Wales.[6] Thus, since the Citizenship subject only applies to England, this thesis is

---

[4] Note that the terms *the UK* and *Britain* will be used interchangeably to refer to the state comprising the four nations or regions England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Even though *Great Britain* only refers to the island of England, Scotland and Wales, the term Britain is often used as an alternative to term the UK.

[5] For further insight into the issue of devolution in the UK, see for example Vernon Bogdanor, *Devolution in the United Kingdom* (Oxford, 2001).

[6] 'The purpose of the curriculum: The four capacities': (Learning and Teaching Scotland website). Accessed: 2 May 2011 from:
http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/understandingthecurriculum/whatiscurriculumforexcellence/thepurposeofthecurriculum/index.asp
'Who am I? Local and Global Citizenship Unit: This is who I am': (Northern Ireland Curriculum website). Accessed: 2 May 2011 from:
http://www.nicurriculum.org.uk/connected_learning/thematic_units/personal_understanding/citizenship.asp
'Personal and Social Education: Themes': (Welsh government website).

restricted accordingly when exploring the political processes leading to the subject and its revision. It is also worth noting that Citizenship is only compulsory in English maintained (state) schools, since independent schools are free to set their own curricula. What is more, when exploring the form the subject has been given as a result of the introduction and later revision of the curriculum, the thesis will be limited to the key stages 3 and 4, since these are the only stages where Citizenship holds statutory status. As already noted, the thesis will mainly focus on the political processes leading to Citizenship and the revision of the subject, and then in particular on the role of the then New Labour government. Thus, even though the study also will address other significant factors, the main emphasis will be on the political sphere and the government's reasons for introducing these changes to the curriculum.

The choice to analyse the introduction and later revision of the Citizenship subject in England is affected by several factors. Firstly, the writer holds a great interest in Britain, and contemporary British politics in particular. The New Labour period is seen as especially fascinating, since it paved the way for a new era in British politics which included in some respects a continuation of the Labour tradition, and in others, acknowledgement of certain aspects of Thatcherism.[7] This *Third Way* between left and right, which could also be seen in the USA and some Western European countries at the time, is seen as a fascinating period to explore.[8] Secondly, as a trained teacher, it was of interest to explore the educational field and see how this area has been affected by ideology, as well as pragmatism and contextual factors. The writer is fascinated by the tension between different interests in the educational field. Particularly intriguing is the tension between, on the one hand, the belief in a so-called 'rounded' education, which also encompasses a civic component, and on the other, the belief in an emphasis on traditional academic subjects. Thus, it has been immensely interesting to learn more about the situation for citizenship education in England in general, and the Citizenship subject in particular, in order to see to what extent these different notions have affected the debate and practice. Thirdly, the writer is interested in politics and different forms of political and societal participation, so the idea that a civic component should be central to a

---

Accessed: 2 May 2011 from:
http://wales.gov.uk/psesub/home/themes/?lang=en
[7] Anthony Giddens, *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy* (London, 1998), pp. 7-8.
[8] For presentations of the Third Way and New Labour thinking, see for example *Ibid.*; and Tony Blair, *New Britain: My Vision of a Young Country* (London, 1996). For further reading on the Third Way in an international perspective, see for example Flavio Romano, *Clinton and Blair: The Political Economy of the Third Way* (London, 2005); Giddens, *The Global Third Way Debate* (London, 2001); and Andrew Gamble and Tony Wright, *The New Social Democracy* (Oxford, 1999).

4

child's education is seen as highly interesting. Thus, the Citizenship subject, where different forms of political and societal participation are emphasised, caught the writer's attention. Fourthly, the concept of citizenship, and what it should encompass, is an issue of current interest, and the recent years have experienced increasing debate in several countries as to how citizenship should be interpreted in ethnically, culturally and religiously diverse democracies. On the one hand, there has been an emphasis on integration and shared liberal democratic values, on the other, there has also been focus on the importance of maintaining appreciation of and respect for diversity. With this in mind, it has been of interest to explore whether these positions have been applied to the controversies regarding how (and indeed, whether) Citizenship should be taught in schools.

Historiography

The introduction and revision of Citizenship as a statutory subject has been explored from several vantage points. In this section, some of these perspectives will be addressed and the thesis will position itself in relation to them. The analyses referred to here have been particularly influential in providing the analytical point of departure for the thesis. Thus, while the analysis does not draw explicitly upon theories of policy processes, network theory or similar approaches to explain political decisions, there are certain lines of argument in the literature which the thesis has drawn upon, which should be briefly summarised here.

Dr Ben Kisby has argued that statutory Citizenship education was introduced mainly due to concerns, both in and beyond New Labour, of declining levels of *social capital* in Britain, defined as the 'trust, norms and networks that […] enable citizens to achieve collective goals'.[9] He argued that social capital was a highly significant part of New Labour thinking, and that Citizenship education was seen as an important measure to increase levels of this. This was done in order for young people to learn about active citizenship and then hopefully engage in political and societal activities to a greater extent.[10] The thesis agrees with Dr Kisby that the promotion of active citizenship was the essential component of the new subject, and that the notion of political and societal disengagement and, as he also has argued, the impact of citizenship organisations, did play a role.[11] Nevertheless, the study will argue that New Labour thinking did not play a key role in this respect. As will be put forward in

---

[9] Ben Kisby, 'New Labour and Citizenship Education', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 60 (2007), pp.84, 90.
[10] *Ibid*., pp. 90, 98.
[11] *Ibid*., p. 95.

chapter three, the statutory subject came about mainly due to the commitment of certain individuals, most notably David Blunkett, the then Education Secretary, and his mentor Bernard Crick. The notion of political disengagement as well as the influence of the citizenship organisations should be seen as contributing factors, but there were also several other causes behind Blunkett and Crick's commitment to civic education. Moreover, it will be argued that the subject was not a particularly New Labour project; illustrated by how Tony Blair was somewhat indifferent to the idea and how it was not perceived as a key part of education policy in the party's first term in power.

Dr Jessica Pykett has conducted research on the Crick advisory group, the government-commissioned group which was given the mandate to provide a framework for civic education, and based on interviews with several of the group members, she has argued that the group was composed in such a way that Blunkett and Crick's ideas on citizenship and civic education would be followed to a significant degree.[12] Furthermore, according to Dr Pykett, the group was to a great extent dominated by Crick, the chairman of the group, who as leader of the committee and an authority within the field mainly had the last word in discussions.[13] Research conducted for this study has indicated that Dr Pykett's argument is reliable; the make-up of the advisory group reflected Blunkett and Crick's aspiration to gain credibility for their ideas as defined at the outset.

Professor Audrey Osler has as part of her research on Citizenship been concerned with analysing to what extent the subject has dealt with different aspects of diversity.[14] With regard to the introduction of the subject, Professor Osler has pointed out the Crick report's neglect of structural inequality, racism and discrimination, and the unfortunate effects of this.[15] The relative indifference towards these issues, she has argued, implies a notion that citizenship is a completed project. This is seen as unfortunate because different forms of inequality, linked to for instance ethnicity, gender or social background, has an impact on a person's opportunities in life and possibilities of exercising citizenship.[16] This thesis has taken particular note of

---

[12] Jessica Pykett, 'Making citizens governable? The Crick report as governmental technology', *Journal of Education Policy*, 22 (2007), p. 308.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 310.

[14] See for example Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey, 'Citizenship, human rights and cultural diversity', in *Citizenship and democracy in schools: diversity, identity, equality*, ed., Osler (Stoke-on-Trent, 2000); Osler, 'Citizenship education and the Ajegbo report: re-imagining a cosmopolitan nation', *London Review of Education*, 6 (2008), p.15; and Osler, 'Citizenship education, democracy and racial justice 10 years on', *Race Equality Teaching*, 27 (2009).

[15] Osler, 'Citizenship education, democracy and racial justice 10 years on', *RET*, 27 (2009), p. 2.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

6

Professor Osler's criticism of the Crick report. Considering the emphasis the report placed on political and societal empowerment, it is somewhat troubling that the report does not to a greater extent address inequality of resources, which could have an impact on a person's ability to engage with political and societal issues. The thesis devotes particular attention to this line of criticism towards the Crick report, but will also point out the advisory group's reasons for de-emphasising these issues.

With regard to the revision of the Citizenship curriculum, Professor Osler's critical analysis of the Ajegbo report has been taken particularly into consideration. She has argued that while the report advocated critical thinking on diversity issues, it did not offer this itself. The report, Professor Osler has argued, failed to provide a critical analysis of why a number of schools are indifferent to dealing with diversity issues, and did not present any analytical thinking on structural inequality.[17] According to Professor Osler, the Ajegbo report instead endorsed an approach to diversity which included a 'study of the other and "celebration" of different identities'.[18] This was unfortunate, she argued, because it neglected the effect structural inequality can have on people's opportunities and chances to succeed. The Ajegbo report did not explicitly deal with this diversity issue, and in that sense, it was argued, the report adopted the same approach to citizenship as the Crick report had; viewing it as a completed project, and failing to discuss structural inequality as a threat to citizenship and democracy.[19]

The study agrees with Professor Osler that the lack of critical analysis in this respect is problematic. As was argued in the case of the Crick report, a subject that aims to empower people should not avoid issues which affect people's opportunities to participate in democratic processes. However, although not excused, this omission could be explained. Leaving out these issues could be seen as a consequence of the relative lack of focus on these particular aspects of diversity at the time. Nevertheless, racism, discrimination and structural inequality could be seen as implicitly covered in the report through the focus on respect, tolerance and appreciation of diversity. Thus, even though the Ajegbo report did not explicitly deal with these issues, the report *did* address diversity issues to a larger and better extent than the Crick report had done, and the approach it adopted to these issues was strongly influenced by the political and social context at the time.

---

[17] Osler, 'Citizenship education and the Ajegbo report: re-imagining a cosmopolitan nation', *London Review of Education*, 6 (2008), p.15.
[18] *Ibid*., p.15.
[19] *Ibid*., p. 15.

Method and Sources

Being most familiar with History and its methods, the writer decided to use a historical, source-based method in order to examine and analyse the processes leading to the introduction and later revision of the Citizenship curriculum. The study has used a qualitative approach, consisting of a combination of interviews and close reading of written primary and secondary sources. A total of five people were interviewed for the thesis: David Blunkett, Lady Estelle Morris, Conor Ryan, Professor Audrey Osler and Lord Jim Knight.[20] Blunkett, Education Secretary from 1997 to 2001, was in charge of the introduction of statutory Citizenship education. As part of this study, he was interviewed about the historical background and the process leading to the introduction of the new subject, including his own role, contextual factors, the Crick advisory group and the Citizenship curriculum, as well as his thoughts on the revision, implications and the future for Citizenship. Lady Morris, junior minister in Blunkett's time as Secretary of State and Education Secretary from 2001 to 2002, was interviewed about her role (and that of Blunkett) in the process leading to statutory Citizenship, what she sees as the main causes for the introduction and the review, and the subject's implications and prospects for the future. Ryan, adviser to Blunkett from 1993 to 2001 and Tony Blair's senior education adviser from 2005 to 2007, also provided information on the process in the then Department for Education and Employment, and what he sees as the main causes for the introduction of the subject. Additionally, Ryan was also asked about the revision, how he views the subject in hindsight and what the future prospects for Citizenship might be. Dr Audrey Osler has written extensively on aspects of the Citizenship subject. As an academic, she could illuminate the political processes from a critical as well as a theoretical perspective. For this study, she has in particular provided perspectives on the Citizenship subject in relation to diversity issues. Being junior minister at the time of the

---

[20] David Blunkett and Lady Estelle Morris were interviewed in Portcullis House in London on 9 March, whereas the meeting with Conor Ryan took place at the Mint Hotel at Millbank in London the following day. Professor Audrey Osler was interviewed in the library bar at Hotel Bristol in Oslo on 23 March, whereas the interview with Lord Jim Knight was conducted via Skype on 24 March 2011 (with the interviewer in Oslo and the interviewee in London). All interviews were recorded, and transcripts were made. In addition to these five interviewees, requests for interviews were also sent to the people listed below, whom unfortunately could not find an opportunity to contribute to the thesis: Lord Kenneth Baker, Conservative politician and member of the Crick advisory group; Dame Elizabeth Hoodless, former leader of the Community Service Volunteers and member of the Crick advisory group; Sir Keith Ajegbo, the chairman of the curriculum review group; Dr Dina Kiwan, member of the Ajegbo curriculum review group; Ruth Kelly, Education Secretary at the commissioning of the curriculum review; Alan Johnson, Education Secretary at the publication of the Ajegbo report; and Bill Rammell, junior minister in the Education Department at the time of the revision.

8

revision, Lord Jim Knight could offer useful insight into the political process he was involved in. Blunkett, Lady Morris, Ryan and Lord Knight all have a great understanding of the political processes, and have contributed massively to increased knowledge about these. In addition, Professor Osler could offer an academic, critical perspective on the causes for the subject and the changes made to it in recent years, especially in terms of diversity issues.

There are both advantages and challenges with the use of interviews. Interviews with central people could give insight into processes and provide information that is not necessarily available elsewhere.[21] Thus, interviews could both provide new information and correct possible misconceptions.[22] An example as to the latter is that before the interviews with Blunkett, Lady Morris, Ryan and Professor Osler, the writer had hypothesised that the introduction of statutory Citizenship education had been grounded in Third Way and New Labour thinking and was related to the party's democratisation agenda (including constitutional reform). However, through interviews with people central to the process and from academia, together with the use of written sources, this view was altered. An understanding was gained of how the introduction of the new subject was largely detached from the main current of New Labour thinking. Instead, its introduction seemed to have been caused by the commitment of a few significant individuals within the government. Thus, interviews could be used to provide new hypotheses or problem approaches, and to supplement or correct written sources. This is especially relevant for political history, where interviews with central actors are very useful to gain insight into political processes.[23]

Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that there are also some challenges in terms of the use of interviews. Since the interviewees' accounts are primarily based on memories, there can be elements of forgetfulness or inconsistencies.[24] In addition, as to attitudes and values, the memories could have been altered in retrospect in order to be more in accordance with the present understanding of the situation, especially so in regard to controversial issues.[25] Moreover, it is worth noting that people, perhaps especially politicians, often are careful to depict themselves in a particular way in order to create or maintain a favourable legacy. Thus, the information provided through interviews could be somewhat

---

[21]Knut Kjeldstadli, *Fortida er ikke hva den en gang var: En innføring i historiefaget* [transl. *The Past is Not What It Used to Be: An Introduction to the Discipline of History*] (Oslo,1999), p. 195.
[22] *Ibid*., pp. 193-194.
[23] *Ibid*., p. 193.
[24] *Ibid*., p. 193; and Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History* (Oxford, 1978), p. 100.
[25] *Ibid*., p. 100.
Kjeldstadli, *Fortida er ikke hva den en gang var*, p. 196.

biased. As a consequence, the reliability of every interview has been cross-checked with other oral and written sources, and the information provided has been seen within the wider understanding gained from both primary and secondary sources.[26] Despite these challenges, the use of interviews has many advantages, since it could be used to shed light on significant events and processes and is a valuable addition to written accounts. Thus, the positive exceeds the negative.

The study has also made use of a number of written primary and secondary sources. In terms of primary sources, the thesis has especially used a number of official documents, most notably the reports of the two advisory groups, the Crick advisory group and the Ajegbo curriculum review group, for the chapters on the introduction and revision of the Citizenship subject, respectively. These two reports have provided useful insight into the ideas of the two committees and what provided the basis and rationale for the new subject as well as its later revision. In addition, the study has made particular use of the National Curriculum programmes of study in Citizenship for key stages 3 and 4, both the original and the revised versions. This has been done in order to see to what extent the subject was implemented according to the ideas of Blunkett and Crick, and as to the revision, whether it was in agreement with the ideas of the government and the Ajegbo curriculum review group. In addition to these particularly relevant primary sources, the study has used different political sources, including official documents such as policy papers, general election manifestos and parliamentary legislation, as well as political articles, autobiographies and other writings. All these sources have been used in order to gain a better grasp of the ideas and policies of central politicians and the New Labour government as a whole (and in some respects, also the Conservative Party). Moreover, the thesis has used a number of newspaper articles from different British news websites, both in order to understand how the introduction and revision of Citizenship was depicted in the media at the time and as a source of information about the processes. Thus, these articles have been used as both primary and secondary sources, respectively.

Additionally, a number of secondary sources have been used, most notably books and articles in books and journals. These sources have provided the necessary understanding of what has been conducted within this field of study before, and has functioned both as informational sources and as material to position oneself in relation to (see the section on

---

[26] Thompson, *The Voice of the Past*, pp. 210-211.

historiography above). Thus, these works have provided an insight into different vantage points within this area of study as well as an academic, critical perspective on the area of citizenship education in England in general, and the Citizenship subject in particular. All in all, a combination of oral and written primary and secondary sources have proved to be immensely useful for the work and essential for gaining understanding of the field of study.

Terminology

When using the term *citizenship education* written with a lower case *c*, this thesis refers to such education in general. For linguistic variation, the thesis will also use *civic education* or *education for citizenship* with the same meaning, whereas political education mainly will be used to describe the political education initiative in the 1970s. However, when the study uses *Citizenship*, *Citizenship education* or the *Citizenship subject* with a capital *C*, this is a reference to the statutory subject in key stages 3 and 4 in the English National Curriculum.

Moreover, when referring to the Labour Party and government at the time, the study uses the term *New Labour*. Even though the title of the party was never formally changed, this was a widely used term by the party itself, in the media and by the general public. Even though it was first coined in the 1980s as a description of the modernising measures introduced by the then party leader Neil Kinnock, the term first came widely in use in Tony Blair's time as leader from 1994.[27] New Labour is seen as the modernised Labour Party, placing itself on the centre-left in politics or as a Third Way between what was perceived as the statism of the traditional left and the excessive individualism of the right.[28] This perceived need for modernisation was also seen in relation to the need to capture a larger swathe of the electorate, by moving closer to the centre ground than where the Labour Party had previously been operating, particularly since the party's radicalisation in the late 1970s.[29] As a consequence, when referring to the party and government in first Tony Blair and then Gordon Brown's time as party leaders, the thesis will use the term New Labour. However, when referring to the Labour Party as its traditional members or grassroots of the party, the terms

---

[27] Iain McLean and Alistair McMillan, *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics* (Oxford, 2009), p. 366.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 529.
[29] Michael Freeden, 'The Ideology of New Labour', *The Political Quarterly*, 70 (2002), pp. 42-51; Peter Squires, 'New Labour and the politics of antisocial behaviour', *Critical Social Policy*, 26 (2006), pp.144-168; John Gray, 'Blair's project in retrospect', *International Affairs*, 80 (2004), pp.39-48; Colin Campbell and Burt A. Rockman, 'Third way leadership, old way government: Blair, Clinton and the power to govern', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 3 (2001), pp.36-48. For a vivid and well-written account of the New Labour years, see Peter Mandelson, *The Third Man: Life at the Heart of New Labour* (London, 2010).

the *Labour Party* or *Labour* are preferred. This is due to how Labour's traditional voters in many respects have been further to the left than the official ideas and policies of New Labour, represented by the party leadership.[30]

The term *multiculturalism* has to an increasing extent been replaced by the term *diversity* in the public debate in Britain. This could be seen as linked to the relative scepticism the use of multicultural policies, also called state multiculturalism, has been met with in recent years. In the aftermath of among others the race riots in northern England in 2001 and the rise of international terrorism, there has been a growing notion that state multiculturalism, meaning the belief in the advantages of a multicultural society and the use of different governmental initiatives to promote this, has been a failure.[31] As a consequence of the public rejection of state multiculturalism, the term multiculturalism in the meaning an 'ethnically, culturally and religiously diverse society' has to an increasing extent been replaced by the term diversity, which is often perceived as a less contentious one. Thus, due to its common use today, this thesis will mainly use the term diversity when referring to the ethnic, religious and cultural variation within Britain (although the term multiculturalism will also be used for linguistic variation in some cases). In order to avoid confusion, the study will use the terms *state multiculturalism* or *multicultural policies*, when referring to the political belief in, and use of, government-initiated ethnic, cultural or religious group-based rights.[32]

Structure

The thesis consists of five chapters in all: this first introductory chapter; chapter two, on the history of civic education in England; chapter three, on the introduction of the statutory

---

[30] See for example Mandelson, *The Third Man* (London, 2010).

[31] Several of the most common arguments used by the opponents to state multiculturalism could be found in this speech by Trevor Phillips, former chair of the Commission for Racial Equality:
 Trevor Phillips, 'After 7/7: Sleepwalking to Segregation' (Manchester, 2005), p. 9: (Faculty of Humanities, University of Manchester website).
Accessed: 4 March 2011 from:
http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/socialchange/research/social-change/summer-workshops/documents/sleepwalking.pdf
For elaborate discussions on the idea of multiculturalism as a policy, see for example Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship* (Oxford, 1995) and Tariq Modood, *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea* (Cambridge, 2007).

[32] It is worth noting that the UK never has had an official state Multiculturalism Policy like that found in Canada. Still, several multicultural policies have been adopted in the last decades; including exceptions for issues of conscience and multicultural language policies, such as providing official information in a variety of languages. For further reading on the use of multicultural policies in the UK, see for example:
Espen Kallevik, 'Multiculturalism in Britain: An Analysis of Historiographical Perspectives and the Development of Multicultural Policies from the 1960s to the New Millennium' (MA thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, 2008).

Citizenship subject; chapter four, on the revision of the Citizenship curriculum; and chapter five, which will summarise the key findings in the study and briefly discuss implications and future prospects for the subject. Chapter two will provide a historical background to Citizenship as a statutory subject through exploring three particular decades in the last century when civic education was especially high on the public agenda in England. The chapter will then look into how the issue of citizenship education has been treated in the past and why it has not become a compulsory part of education before. Both the complexity of British citizenship and the relative contentiousness of civic education will be put forward as contributing factors. In chapter three, the causes for the introduction of Citizenship are discussed. The chapter will explore the political process leading to the subject, looking at contextual causes as well as the role of significant individuals and the New Labour government. It will be argued that some individuals, especially the then Education Secretary David Blunkett and the political scientist Bernard Crick, played an especially important role for the introduction of the new subject and the form it was given. As will be discussed, the main emphasis in the new subject was on the importance of active citizenship, including political and societal knowledge, skills and participation. These ideas were strongly in accordance with those of Blunkett and Crick on citizenship and education for citizenship. Thus, due to their commitment and the circumstances of the political process, the subject was largely created in accordance with their initial scheme.

Chapter four will deal with the revision of Citizenship, which granted a more prominent space in the curriculum to identity and diversity issues. It will be argued that a significant backdrop to the revision was the changing political and social context, followed by a change in the political climate, seen both in Britain and abroad. Following certain national and international events, the public debate centred to an increasing extent on issues like immigration, diversity, integration, shared values and cohesion. The New Labour government strongly adapted to this transformed context and felt the need to place a greater emphasis on these issues also in education, and then particularly in the Citizenship subject. As will be seen, the decision to revise the Citizenship curriculum could also be seen as related to the party's need to strike a balance between a so-called 'hard' and 'soft' or liberal approach. This could partially be seen in relation to how New Labour, rather typically for a modern centre-left party, aimed to please both the general electorate and the party grassroots respectively. In the final chapter, chapter five, the main findings in the study will be summarised, and, towards the end, some implications of Citizenship will be briefly discussed in order to see whether the

subject could be said to have achieved its main aim of promoting active citizenship. In addition, the chapter will, in brief, discuss the present political situation for the subject, in order to provide some comments on the future prospects for Citizenship.

Chapter Two: A Troubled Past

The Complexity of British Citizenship and a Historical Background to Citizenship Education in England

> the main aim of the Programme has been to enhance 'political literacy' by which we mean the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to make a man or woman informed about politics; able to participate in public life and groups of all kinds, both occupational and voluntary; and to recognise and tolerate diversities of political and social values.
> (Bernard Crick and Alex Porter, the Programme for Political Education)[1]

> …teaching children to believe what their teachers read in the Guardian.
> (John Vincent, a New Right theorist, on political education).[2]

Citizenship education, indeed the whole idea that civic engagement should be part of basic education, has a troubled past in Britain. This has been linked to several factors, such as the complex nature of British citizenship and the suspicion against politicised tuition in Britain. This chapter explores these factors and outlines the history of citizenship education from the 1930s until today. In terms of the latter, the focus is restricted to England, the scope of the thesis. This historical background is structured around what John Greenwood and Lynton Robins have called the first, second and third wave, the 1930s, 1970s and 1990s, the three periods in the last century when citizenship education was particularly high on the public agenda in England. In addition, the chapter will explore the impact of the New Right and Thatcherism in the 1980s on the concept of citizenship and the situation for civic education in England.[3]

The chapter begins by looking at why citizenship is a complex concept in Britain and the impact this has had on citizenship education. Then it moves on to point out some additional factors which can contribute to explaining the relatively weak position such

---

[1] Bernard Crick and Alex Porter (eds.), *Political Education and Political Literacy* (London, 1978), p. 1.
[2] John Vincent, quoted in John Greenwood and Lynton Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education: Embedding a Concept', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55 (2002), p. 517. The Guardian is a British, left-liberal newspaper.
[3] Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55 (2002), pp. 505-522. *The New Right* describes an ideological right-wing wave in the late 1970s and 1980s, emphasising the importance of individualism, the free market and a limited role for the state. Here the term is used when describing the theoretical approach to politics, seen with New Right theorists like John Vincent. However, when describing the thoughts, ideas and policies of former Prime Minister Thatcher and the Conservative Party, even though these were strongly influenced by the New Right, the more common term *Thatcherism* has been chosen instead. Iain McLean and Alistair McMillan (eds), *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 366-367.

education has held in England. The four periods in the last century when such education was particularly high on the public agenda will be explored: the first wave, with the 1930s Association for Education in Citizenship; the second wave, with the 1970s Political Education Programme; the impact of Thatcherism in the late 1970s and 1980s; and the third wave in the 1990s. Throughout, the chapter will discuss the changing notions of citizenship and citizenship education, aiming to provide an insight into the troubled past of politicised education in England, and providing a significant backdrop to why such education was not fully embraced until the change of government in 1997.

The Complexity of British Citizenship

The rather weak position of citizenship education in England could be linked to citizenship being a somewhat vague concept in the British context, meaning that there has been little agreement on what qualities, rights and responsibilities being a British citizen entails. There are several factors which explain this situation. Firstly, citizenship is often linked to nationality. Put differently, in addition to civil, political and often social rights, national identity has been seen as an important component of citizenship.[4] However, due to the British Empire and the Commonwealth, there are few countries where citizenship and nationality are more complex than in the UK. Until 1962, people in the colonies held the same citizenship as those born in Britain. Thus, Irish, colonial and Commonwealth citizens had unrestricted rights of entry and settlement within the British borders. Later restrictions on citizenship have been made, but the whole concept of British citizenship has still been somewhat difficult to get the grasp of. This confusion is exemplified in the 1981 Nationality Act, where as much as five different categories of British citizens were defined.[5] Such a situation has made citizenship a highly complicated concept, leading to circumstances where, as put by Greenwood and Robins, 'some British citizens […] have more rights than others'.[6] Thus, there is no doubt that Britain's past has left a complex and problematic legacy in terms of nationality and citizenship entitlement.

The second factor which has contributed to the awkward situation for citizenship in Britain is that British people in legal terms are *subjects* to the Crown, rather than *citizens*. Traditionally, citizenship has not been a commonly used term in Britain, and it has been seen

---

[4] Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55, (2002), p. 511.
[5] *Ibid*., p. 511.
[6] *Ibid*, p. 511.

16

as something slightly 'foreign' and 'distant'; a term linked to other Western countries, most notably republican countries such as France and the USA.[7] In these countries, due to historic circumstances, a tradition for civic republicanism has evolved. Republicanism implies the idea that rulers are accountable to the citizens who are thus the ultimate source of political power. This involves a strong position for the political participation of the people, based on an emphasis on how citizens hold both rights and responsibilities to their country.[8] As shall be seen in chapter three, the concept of active citizenship as put forward by Bernard Crick was partially derived from a civic republican tradition.[9] Traditionally in Britain, however, the only common bond among British 'citizens' around the world has been their allegiance to the Crown. Thus, their citizenship has been connected to their common loyalty to the monarch, an unelected Head of State, instead of their political rights.[10] Furthermore, Parliament rather than the people has historically been the mainstay of political power. This authority is neither codified in a Constitution nor dependent on the enfranchisement of the entire people as citizens.[11]

The notion of subjecthood has clearly influenced how British people have viewed the state and their role in relation to it. Greenwood and Robins have pointed out how the concept of subjecthood is deeply embedded in British political culture. Even though the supremacy of the monarch is gone, the powers have been transferred to 'Her Majesty's Government', and the concept of a citizen as a subject is reflected in parliamentary sovereignty and the exercise of executive and judicial powers in the name of the Crown.[12] Furthermore, notably, viewing people as subjects rather than citizens have traditionally led to a rather restricted definition of a 'good' subject or citizen as someone who follows laws and conventions, is morally good and leaves politics to those in charge, the monarch in the past and then later politicians.[13] As will be discussed, this view of citizenship has been central throughout the period which will be explored in this chapter. Moreover, this definition of citizenship was clearly in opposition to how the then Education Secretary David Blunkett and his mentor Bernard Crick perceived

---

[7]John Potter, *Active Citizenship in Schools: A Good Practice Guide to Developing a Whole School Policy* (London, 2002), p. 18: and Terence H. McLaughlin, 'Citizenship Education in England: The Crick Report and Beyond', *Journal of Philosophy of Education* , 34 (2000), p. 543.

[8] For an eloquent presentation of the links between civic republicanism and active citizenship, see Bernard Crick, 'Civic Republicanism and Citizenship: The Challenge for Today', in *Active Citizenship: What Could it Achieve and How?*, eds., Bernard Crick and Andrew Lockyer (Edinburgh, 2010), pp. 16-25.

[9] *Ibid*., pp. 16-25.

[10] Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55, (2002), p. 512.

[11] See for example Walter Bagehot, *The English Constitution* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 99-105.

[12] Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55, (2002), p. 512.

[13] *Ibid*., p. 512.

citizenship, and this proved to have significant consequences for how the new subject turned out. What is more, another factor which has contributed to the complexity of British citizenship is the vague definition of the relationship between the individual and the state. The British constitution is largely unwritten and there is no single document containing the Bill of Rights (as is the case with the USA). Thus, as Greenwood and Robins have put it, traditionally British 'citizens [have] enjoyed not rights as such but only liberty to do what Parliament did not forbid'.[14]

A third factor contributing to the complexity of British citizenship is the fact that Britain is a multinational state, consisting of the four constituent nations England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. This means that national identity and citizenship do not always correlate. Of course, territorial diversity does not prevent a shared and overarching conception of citizenship – similar to that seen in many federal states – but the criteria on which a common citizenship should be built have been difficult to establish in Britain. The lack of correlation between national identity and citizenship is especially the case for a significant number of Scots, who have a distinct Scottish identity and does not necessarily feel especially close to Britain and the concept of a British identity. Thus, for many Scottish people, the scope of their national identity and their citizenship does not necessarily correspond, nor is it clear, historically, what British citizenship should imply except for loyalty to the Crown and equality before the law.[15] Citizenship and nationality are even more complex concepts in Northern Ireland, deeply affected by the conflict between the two main communities in the region. The mainly Protestant Unionists feel connected to their British and Ulster identities and would prefer for Northern Ireland to remain a part of the UK. The predominantly Catholic Nationalists, however, feel primarily Irish and would like for the region to be united with the Republic of Ireland.[16]

Thus, citizenship in a British context has been far from a simple concept. The impact of the Empire and Commonwealth; the legal definition of British people as subjects rather than citizens; and the complexity of multinational Britain have been the main factors contributing to this notion. The concept of British citizenship has been relatively little used and difficult to define, and could be seen as a significant contributing factor to the weak

---

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 512.

[15] For further reading on the issue of Scottish identity, see for example: Tom Devine and Paddy Logue (eds.), *Being Scottish: Personal Reflections on Scottish Identity Today* (Edinburgh, 2002); and William Ferguson, *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: A Historic Quest* (Edinburgh, 1998).

[16] For a more elaborate discussion of the conflict in Northern Ireland and its impact on identities, see for example John Whyte and Garret FitzGerald (eds.), *Interpreting Northern Ireland* (Oxford, 1991).

18

position civic education traditionally has held in Britain. In a state where citizenship traditionally has been seen as a somewhat 'foreign' concept, it has been difficult for supporters of citizenship education to gain enough support for the stance that such education should be a central part of a child's schooling.[17] However, this is not the only factor which could explain the relatively limited role civic education has played in England, and a set of additional reasons will be summarised below.

Citizenship Education's Limited Role in the School System: Additional Factors

While the complexity of British citizenship has made citizenship education a difficult project to pursue, there are also other causes behind the somewhat poor status this kind of education traditionally has had in Britain. Derek Heater has placed these factors within three main categories: political, social and pedagogical. The first *political* factors he has mentioned have already been dealt with; the lack of any developed consciousness of citizenship (British people traditionally being viewed as subjects, rather than citizens), and the established, somewhat limited nature of democracy in Britain (including parliamentary sovereignty and the executive and the judicial powers in the name of the Crown). In addition, Heater has argued, a third political factor has been the fear that citizenship education would be an arena for partisan bias and even indoctrination.[18] As shall be seen both in this chapter and the next, this factor has played a crucial role in the history of citizenship education in England. Fears of partisan bias have been especially apparent on the right in politics, and most notably so with Thatcher and her government in the late 1970s and 1980s. As discussed in chapter three, fears of accusations of bias also had impact on the process leading to the introduction of the Citizenship subject and how this process was conducted by the government.

Among the *social* factors, Britain's traditional class divisions, which led to a belief that roles in society depended on class belonging, has been central. This notion of a distinction between the rulers and the ones being ruled was particularly apparent in the late 19th and early 20th century, when the limited civics education that existed was adapted to the social class the pupils belonged to.[19] Nevertheless, a somewhat 'elitist' view of citizenship, where politics should be left to the qualified politicians, was also apparent with the

---

[17] Potter, *Active Citizenship in Schools*, p. 18.
McLaughlin, 'Citizenship Education in England', *JPE*, 34 (2000), p. 543; and Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55, (2002), p. 511.
[18] Derek Heater, 'The History of Citizenship Education in England', *The Curriculum Journal*, 12 (2001), p. 104.
[19] P. Gordon and D. Lawton, *Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (London, 1978).

Thatcherites in the 1980s. The perceived relevance of this argument has also been bolstered by the barriers between different educational pathways and, fundamentally, between schools in the maintained and private sector. Put differently, class division has been a conscious part of the educational system.[20] Furthermore, there has also been a notion, as pointed out by Ian Davies, of politics as an adult domain, where children had no place. Thus, civic education was often seen as irrelevant to a child's schooling.[21]

Moreover, there have been a number of *pedagogical* factors behind the relatively limited position civic education has held in Britain. Among these factors, a lack of specialist teacher training in citizenship education, as well as general nervousness among teachers related to dealing with issues which could be seen as controversial, could be found.[22] What is more, as will be discussed in further detail in chapter five, insufficient training and nervousness among teachers have also played a role for the provision of such education after the introduction of statutory Citizenship in England. Another pedagogical factor has been the common idea that there was no need for a discrete Citizenship subject, and that such education could be sufficiently offered as part of the school ethos and through other subjects.[23] It is also worth noting that before the 1988 Education Act and the implementation of the National Curriculum (for maintained schools) in 1990, England had no single official curriculum.[24] Thus, it has been difficult for the proponents to gain support for their ideas on a nationwide basis. When moving on to explore the history of citizenship education in England from the 1930s until the 1990s, it will be seen how these different factors have been expressed through this period.

The First Wave: The 1930s and the Association for Education in Citizenship

The 1930s experienced the first major wave of interest for the concept of citizenship and the

---

[20] P.J. Pulzer, *Political representation and elections in Britain* (London, 1967), p. 98.

[21] Ian Davies, 'What has Happened in the Teaching of Politics in Schools in England in the Last Three Decades, and Why?', *Oxford Review of Education*, 25 (1999), p. 127.

[22] Heater, 'The History of Citizenship Education in England', *TCJ*, 12 (2001), p. 104.

[23] McLaughlin, 'Citizenship Education in England', *JPE*, 34 (2000), p. 543.

[24] Ken Fogelman, 'Citizenship Education in England', in *Citizenship Education and the Modern State*, ed., Kerry Kennedy (London, 1997), p. 85.
'Scottish Schools': (Scottish Government website).
Accessed: 7 February 2011 from:
http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education/Schools
'Education and Skills' – 'Schools': (Welsh Assembly Government website).
Accessed: 7 February 2011 from:
http://wales.gov.uk/topics/educationandskills/schoolshome/?lang=en

explicit teaching of citizenship in schools.[25] There was, however, also before this a notion that civic and social education should play a part in children's education. Still, this notion was clearly based on class and social belonging, and aimed to prepare the children for their expected roles in society. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, private school boys were taught to be prepared for leadership and how to take part in political life in Britain and the Empire.[26] At the same time, working-class children were through their education prepared for *their* roles in society. At one school in London, the children were taught Social Economy from the age of seven, so 'that they may properly understand their own position in society and their duties towards it'.[27] Thus, social belonging had an impact on the kind of civics education the pupils were taught, and on the roles they were expected to have in society. In addition to the class-based approach, civic education was mostly concerned with the rather limited emphasis on institutions and the offices of government.[28]

In the 1930s, citizenship and the direct teaching of citizenship education (in other words, citizenship as a clear component of other subjects or even as a subject in its own right) fully came on the public agenda for the first time. In 1934, the Association for Education in Citizenship was established. The main aim of this organisation was to promote, on a national scale, the defence of democracy through direct education for citizenship. The founding of the organisation reflected the response of a group of political and intellectual liberals to the Nazi, Fascist and Communist threats in Europe at the time.[29] They strongly believed in the capacity of education to engage young people on issues such as democracy, politics and society. The Association advocated a direct approach to citizenship education, involving it even being taught in schools, colleges and universities as a subject in its own right, and as one of the most important subjects, as such. This was in opposition to the general idea up until then that it was satisfactory to teach citizenship indirectly, in other words as a cross-curricular theme or as part of the 'school ethos'.[30]

Despite several attempts to influence public educational policy, the Assocation did not

---

[25] Gordon Batho, 'The history of the teaching of civics and citizenship in English schools', *The Curriculum Journal*, 1 (1990), p. 94.
[26] *Ibid*., p. 91.
[27] P. Gordon and D. Lawton, *Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*.
[28] Batho, 'The history of the teaching of civics and citizenship', *TCJ*, 1 (1990), p. 91.
[29] Guy Whitmarsh, 'The Politics of Political Education: An Episode', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 6 (1974), p. 134.
[30] *Ibid*., p. 135.

succeed in their project.[31] The government-commissioned 1938 Spens and 1943 Norwood reports, as well as the 1944 Education Act, all opposed the idea of direct teaching of citizenship. The three documents gave little support to the proponents of direct citizenship teaching and continued to advocate what had been government policy up until then, the indirect approach.[32] In addition, the documents argued in favour of avoiding controversial topics in education. Again, there was an evident fear that direct civic education could involve political propaganda.[33]

The Second Wave: The 1970s and the Programme for Political Education

After direct citizenship teaching was rejected by the government in the late 1930s and early 1940s, the issue of citizenship education faded from the public debate. Not until the late 1960s and into the 1970s, the period Greenwood and Robins have called the second wave, did the issue again receive significant attention. In 1969, the Politics Association, the professional association of politics teachers, was founded. The main aim of the new association was to promote political studies as a discipline in its own right in schools and universities. Among the initiators was Bernard Crick, a strong proponent of political and citizenship education, and later heavily involved in the process leading to the introduction of the statutory Citizenship subject.[34] After the founding of the Politics Association, a next significant step took place with the establishment of the Programme for Political Education. This project ran from 1974 to 1977 and its main purpose was to give advice on how to organise political education by providing a theoretical framework. At the completion of the project, a report was published, which emphasised the importance of developing what was called *political literacy*:

> the main aim of the Programme has been to enhance 'political literacy' by which we mean the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to make a man or woman informed about politics; able to participate in public life and groups of all kinds, both occupational and voluntary; and to recognise and tolerate diversities of political and social values.[35]

In other words, the Programme aimed to change political and citizenship teaching

---

[31] The Association actively continued its project until 1949, after which it faded, and was finally dissolved in 1957. *Ibid.*, p. 134.
[32] Heater, 'The History of Citizenship Education in England', *TCJ*, 12 (2001), p. 107; and Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55, (2002), p. 514.
[33] Heater, 'The History of Citizenship Education in England', *TCJ*, 12 (2001), p. 107.
[34] Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55, (2002), p. 515.
[35] *Ibid.*; and Crick and Porter (eds), *Political Education and Political Literacy*, p. 1.

through a shift to an educational approach more in line with the time, centred on skills and issues, rather than just knowledge about political institutions. The report argued that young people should develop knowledge, skills and attitudes, 'each one conditioning the other two', in order to be able to understand political life and, just as important, take part in it.[36] This was a democratic approach to citizenship education, aiming to engage all pupils in political and societal issues through education - no matter the child's social background and class belonging. In this respect, it was very different from the citizenship teaching of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

The Politics Association and the Programme for Political Education received much attention, and by the mid-1970s, a stronger role for political education was widely considered by the government. The Schools Council endorsed some of the main ideas of the Programme's report, and argued that 'pupils may reasonably expect to receive a political education appropriate to participation in the life of a democratic society'.[37] This view was supported by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools and two reports from the Education Department. Like the Programme for Political Education, these reports argued that political education should play a significant part in childrens' education and that it should be a clear element in the curriculum. It was argued that political education did not necessarily need to be taught as a subject in its own right (due to an already extensive timetable), but that it should be strengthened as a significant component of related subjects, such as History, Geography, English and Economics.[38]

Despite an increased attention to political education and political literacy, the second wave has later been referred to as the 'the false dawn' of citizenship education.[39] The work of the Politics Association and the Programme for Political Education did not lead to any significant practical changes to the way politics and citizenship were taught in English schools. However, David Blunkett, who supported the programme at the time, has argued that the then Labour government was in fact close to granting education for citizenship a stronger role. This did not happen, however, because Shirley Williams, the then Education Secretary,

---

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[37] Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55, (2002), p. 515.
[38] In fact, the Programme did not aim to establish a political education subject of its own, since they feared that introducing such a subject would be a burden on what they called an 'already grossly over-crowded timetable'. Instead, the proponents wanted to introduce political education as a core component in already existing relevant subjects. Crick and Porter (eds), *Political Education and Political Literacy*, pp. 4-5; Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55 (2002), p. 515.
[39] Crick, quoted in Ben Kisby, 'New Labour and Citizenship Education', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 60 (2007), p. 87.

saw it as a too contentious issue considering the upcoming general election.[40] The election paved the way for Margaret Thatcher and the Conservatives, and a very different approach to citizenship and citizenship education.[41]

The Impact of Thatcherism

Towards the end of the 1970s, the Programme for Political Education had attracted criticism from a new political force, the New Right. As early as 1975, Sir Keith Joseph, later to become Education Secretary in Margaret Thatcher's government, questioned the need for political education, which he feared could be tainted by partisan bias.[42] Moreover, the Programme and their report were also rejected by notable New Right theorists. In a review in the Times Literary Supplement, John Vincent argued that political education had no place in schools, and he rejected the concept of political literacy because he feared that it would increase instability and conflict. According to Vincent, the democratic process depended on 'a great mass of passivity as ballast'. This showed a somewhat elitist view of citizenship and democratic participation as something reserved to certain groups in society, who were seen as qualified to hold such positions. Furthermore, Vincent argued that political education could potentially be biased, since the Programme and their initiatives were, according to him, significantly left-wing. As put by Vincent, political education was mainly about 'teaching children to believe what their teachers read in the Guardian'.[43]

When Margaret Thatcher became Prime Minister in 1979, the New Right ideas on citizenship and citizenship education gained foothold. The concept of citizenship was re-defined according to the ideals of Thatcherism. The rights of citizenship, especially social rights, were reduced and there was a greater emphasis on personal responsibility and entrepreneurship as a guarantee of wealth and liberty.[44] Due to the Thatcherite strong beliefs in a limited state, free market and individualism, the duties of citizenship were individualised and removed from any form of state control; responsibility to other people was not seen as an act of citizenship, but rather as one of charity.[45] Moreover, Thatcherism advocated a restricted model of democracy where politics was best left to politicians and where high levels of political literacy in the public was considered to a large extent as a threat to the 'natural order'

---

[40] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
[41] Kisby, 'New Labour and Citizenship Education', *PA*, 60 (2007), p. 87.
[42] Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55 (2002), p. 517.
[43] Vincent, quoted in Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55 (2002), p. 517.
[44] Keith Faulks, *Citizenship in Modern Britain* (Edinburgh, 1998), p. 77.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

24

of things, rather than as an asset.[46] This perspective was directly opposed to that of the Programme for Political Education, but was clearly in agreement with that of the New Right thinker John Vincent. Notably, it also chimed well with the traditional view of British subjecthood: the great masses are being ruled rather than participating in ruling, and the area of politics is largely left to professional politicians.[47] From this vantage point, it is hardly surprising that Thatcher and the Conservative government were largely opposed to citizenship education. As had been the case with John Vincent, there was a fear that such education could lead to the political indoctrination of pupils by teachers. An instructive example appeared with the 1986 Education Act, which made it illegal for pupils to engage in partisan activities in schools and teachers to put forward what could be interpreted as partisan political views in the classroom.[48]

Interestingly, in the late 1980s the Thatcherites changed direction to some extent. Douglas Hurd, then Home Secretary, introduced the concept of 'active citizenship' and argued in favour of increased participation in society. According to Kisby, this initiative was launched in order to counteract the increasing criticism of Thatcherism for what was perceived as a restricted definition of society.[49] It is interesting that the term *active citizenship* in fact was introduced by the Conservatives, when it a decade later became such a significant part of David Blunkett and Bernard Crick's idea of what civic education should encompass. However, as seen in the next chapter, despite the use of the same term, their definition of active citizenship had more in common with the Political Education Programme in the 1970s, than with the Thatcherite definition.

The active citizen, according to the Thatcherites, was a self-reliant individual, who was proud of his or her country and took an interest in the local community.[50] This definition managed to combine the individualism and limited role of the state so vital to Thatcherism with patriotism and a concept of society, namely social and moral responsibility on a local level. Significantly, however, whereas the Thatcherites were concerned with individual responsibility and voluntarism, political literacy was left out. This neglect of the political

---

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 90.
[47] Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55 (2002), p. 512.
[48] Kisby, 'New Labour and Citizenship Education', *PA*, 60 (2007), p. 87.
Education (No. 2) Act 1986: (UK legislation website).
 Accessed: 7 February 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/61/enacted
[49] Kisby, 'New Labour and Citizenship Education', *PA*, 60 (2007), p. 87.
[50] Faulks, *Citizenship in Modern Britain*, p. 128.

aspect could be viewed as problematic. Historically, citizenship has been a political concept, linked to civil, political and social rights, and thus a definition with no reference to civil rights or democracy could be seen as somewhat restricted. The Thatcherite definition of active citizenship lacked the connection between the individual and the political community, and failed to acknowledge that the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in many respects are two sides of the same coin.[51]

Given its principled scepticism to the teaching of citizenship in schools, it is a slight paradox that the Conservative government in fact turned out to strengthen the formal role of citizenship education. Through the 1988 Education Act, an official National Curriculum for England was established for the first time.[52] At the time, Kenneth Baker (later Lord), the then Education Secretary and a supporter of civic education, was in fact interested in giving citizenship a central place in the curriculum. This did not happen, however, because Thatcher was strongly opposed to it. This position was partially due to her fear that this could be a potentially biased subject, and partially linked to a belief that civic education should not play a central part of a child's schooling.[53] Thus, when completed, the National Curriculum did not provide a direct approach to civic education, but citizenship was instead launched as one of the five cross-curricular themes.[54] The idea behind these themes was to supplement the National Curriculum with various cross-curricular elements in order to develop the 'whole' person.[55] Nevertheless, the cross-curricular themes were not part of the statutory National Curriculum and the government emphasised that it was up to the individual school how these issues should be dealt with.[56] As a result, in many schools civic education was to a large extent neglected and even ignored.[57]

The Third Wave: 'The Decade of the Citizen'

The Thatcherites had excluded the political aspect from their definition of citizenship, but provided for a role for citizenship education in the National Curriculum, albeit a limited one.

[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 130-132.
[52] *Education Reform Act 1988*: (UK Legislation website)
Accessed: 7 February 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/40/content/
[53] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011); and Crick, 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55 (2002), p. 488.
[54] The four other cross-curricular themes were Economic and industrial understanding, Careers education and guidance, Health education and Environmental education. Fogelman, 'Citizenship Education in England', p. 87.
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 86.
[56] *Ibid.*, p. 87.
[57] Kisby, 'New Labour and Citizenship Education', *PA*, 60 (2007), p. 88.

26

The 1990s, which has been coined 'the decade of the citizen', saw increasing support for civic education which included a political component and a belief in the use of the direct approach.[58] The new wave started out with the establishment of the Speaker's Commission on Citizenship, led by Bernard Weatherill, then Speaker of the House of Commons. In 1990, the Commission published a report, *Encouraging Citizenship*, which made clear their commitment to education for citizenship. The report recommended that citizenship education should be part of every young person's education, and it included knowledge, skills and community involvement among the essentials of citizenship education.[59] Another significant factor was the founding of several new independent citizenship organisations, including the Citizenship Foundation, the Centre for Citizenship Studies in Education and the Institute for Citizenship, which participated in the public debate and later supported the New Labour government in their work for the introduction of the statutory Citizenship subject.[60] Another influential actor was the Community Service Volunteers, established in the 1960s, which was strongly committed to volunteering and participation in local communities.[61] These organisations all aimed to make citizenship an important part of the public agenda and to promote the engagement of individuals in politics and local communities. [62]

This newfound interest in citizenship and citizenship education which included a central political strand, was also linked to the notion that political alienation and ignorance, especially among young people, was an increasing phenomenon in Britain. Several studies indicated that British people, especially young people, felt increasingly alienated from public life and that they had little knowledge of and interest for the political sphere.[63] Thus, when New Labour appeared as a significant force in British politics in the 1990s, the picture

---

[58]Davies, 'What has Happened in the Teaching of Politics in Schools',*ORE*, 25 (1999), p. 130.

[59] The Speaker's Commission on Citizenship, *Encouraging Citizenship: Report of the Commission on Citizenship* (London, 1990); and Fogelman, 'Citizenship Education in England', p. 88.

[60] Interviews with David Blunkett, Lady Estelle Morris and Conor Ryan (London, 9-10 March 2011).

[61] Interviews with David Blunkett and Conor Ryan (London, 9-10 March 2011).

[62] Kisby, 'New Labour and Citizenship Education', *PA*, 60 (2007), p. 88; Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education: Embedding a Concept', *PA*, 55 (2002), p. 519.

[63] See for example Helen Wilkinson and Geoff Mulgan, *Freedom's Children: Work, Relationships and Politics for 18-34-Year-Olds in Britain Today*: (Demos website).
Accessed: 3 November 2010 from:
http://www.demos.co.uk/files/freedomschildren.pdf?1240939425
'State of Citizenship in Britain Survey': (Ipsos MORI website).
Accessed: 18 January 2011 from:
http://www.ipsos-mori.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/poll.aspx?oItemId=1986

included increased interest in a definition of active citizenship which incorporated political literacy; influential citizenship organisations; and the notion, supported by research, of growing political alienation and ignorance among British youth. With New Labour's election victory in 1997, David Blunkett became Secretary of State for Education and Employment. Being personally committed to active citizenship and civic education, his engagement, combined with the factors mentioned above, paved the way for a stronger role for civic education in English schools.

Summary

The history of citizenship education in England has been a long and thorny one. This is partly linked to the complexity of the concept of British citizenship. There are few states where citizenship is as intricate as in the UK, due to the legacy of the Empire; British people being legally defined as subjects rather than citizens; the UK being a multinational state, comprising the four constituent nations England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland; and class providing an obstacle in the way of a shared conception of citizenship. In addition, there have been other factors, of a political, social and pedagogical nature, behind the limited position citizenship education has held. Such education has often been met with distrust, including fear that it could lead to partisan bias. Moreover, among those who believed that education for citizenship should play a part in children's education, there was often agreement that an indirect approach, where citizenship could be taught through other subjects or as part of the school ethos, was sufficient. It is worth noting that citizenship education initiatives often have come from outside the political sphere, as was the case with the 1930s Association for Education in Citizenship, the 1970s Programme for Political Education and the independent citizenship organisations in the 1990s. In the political domain, including the government and Parliament, there has often been scepticism to the idea, most often linked to bias, fears of such, or a belief that civic education was not a necessary part of a child's schooling. However, with the emergence of David Blunkett and a left-of-centre government in 1997, increased political interest for these issues emerged, and prepared the ground for the introduction of statutory, direct Citizenship education in England.

Chapter Three: The Pulling of Strings
The Creation of the Citizenship Subject

> Politics is too important to be left to politicians.
> (Bernard Crick)[1]

> So it all disappeared into a black hole [with the emergence of Thatcherism] until the 1990s, when I became Opposition Spokesman for Education in 1994, when Tony Blair was elected Leader of the Labour Party. I said to the people I had been involved with all these years: We will do it. We will this time. If I am made the Education and Employment Secretary, we will do it.
> (David Blunkett)[2]

Up until the 1990s there had been a long and winding road for citizenship education in England. This situation changed, however, with New Labour coming to power in 1997. With a personal drive for active citizenship and civic education, David Blunkett, the Secretary of State for Education and Employment, set out to strengthen the role of education for citizenship in English maintained schools. The government established an advisory group with a mandate to explore how such education could be included in the National Curriculum, and what form it would have. In 1998, the advisory group, led by Bernard Crick, Blunkett's friend, mentor and one of Britain's most notable political scientists, launched its report, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (the Crick report). The report argued for the introduction of statutory Citizenship education as part of the National Curriculum, and presented recommendations on how to implement this. The Citizenship Order, with additional programmes of study for key stages 3 and 4, was laid before Parliament in June 2000, and from August 2002 Citizenship has been a statutory subject in these key stages in all maintained schools in England.[3]

This chapter will explore the background to and causes behind the introduction of the statutory Citizenship subject under New Labour, and why it took the precise form it did. As

---

[1] Crick, 'Civic Republicanism and Citizenship: the Challenge for Today', in *Active Citizenship*, eds., Crick and Lockyer, p 22.

[2] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).

[3] *The Education (National Curriculum) (Attainment Targets and Programmes of Study in Citizenship) (England) Order 2000*: (UK legislation website, 2000).
Accessed: 17 January 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2000/1603/made
Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*: (National Curriculum website, 1999).
Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf

always when discussing causality in political processes, there are differing views as to whether reform has come about primarily as a result of structural forces, sheer coincidence or the pulling of strings by individuals. In the case of the introduction of statutory Citizenship education in England, it will be argued that the causes are a mix of all three. Still, the chapter will emphasise the crucial role of the then Education Secretary David Blunkett, combined with the support and involvement of Bernard Crick, his long-time mentor and friend, who was a well-known proponent of citizenship education. The social and political climate, including the impact of the citizenship organisations; the support from within the Labour Party, the Liberal Democrats and even among some Conservatives; and the generally accepted notion of social and political disengagement among young people, were all part of a highly significant backdrop. Nevertheless, it will be argued that without Blunkett's personal commitment, it is likely that education for citizenship would not have been put on New Labour's agenda, and if it had, that it is far from certain that it would have achieved statutory status on the curriculum.

The chapter begins by defining the concept of *active citizenship*, which was put forward as an essential part of the new subject. It looks into how this concept was interpreted by Bernard Crick, and what makes this definition of the concept different from that of the Conservatives who used the concept in the late 1980s. Then the chapter moves on to discuss the important role of David Blunkett, the Education Secretary in New Labour's first term. The significance of his strong commitment becomes even more apparent when exploring Prime Minister Tony Blair's relative indifference to the idea of Citizenship education and the limited role it played within New Labour's education policies. Blunkett was, however, allowed to go on with his project, and it was strengthened by a benevolent political environment, characterised by cross-party support and a weak political opposition. Furthermore, the shared recognition that political disengagement had increased among British youth provided a window of opportunity for Blunkett's scheme to reach fruition. As will be seen, the idea also turned out to have particular resonance in New Labour, as a welcome concession to inherited ideas from the left in a government which was often accused of neglecting its traditional supporters.

After discussing the importance of Blunkett and the political and social climate, the chapter moves on to explore the role of Bernard Crick and the *Advisory Group on Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*. It is argued that in addition to Blunkett, Crick was perhaps the single most significant figure in the process leading to compulsory Citizenship education. Furthermore, the chapter also looks into the cross-party and cross-institutional

30

composition of the advisory group, and the importance of this for achieving consensus and avoiding accusations of bias and indoctrination. What is more, it will also be argued that the educational sphere was marginalised due to differences of opinion between Blunkett and Crick on the one side, and the educational bodies on the other. The chapter then moves on to explore the recommendations set out by the advisory group, and how Blunkett and Crick's ideas, as well as the need to achieve consensus, were reflected in the report.

Lastly, towards the end of the chapter, the process leading to the Citizenship Order and the Citizenship programmes of study (the subject curriculum) for key stages 3 and 4 will be discussed. It will be argued that the programmes of study to a great extent reflected the recommendations in the Crick report, and that this is largely due to the strong presence of Bernard Crick and to some extent David Blunkett, also in this part of the process. At the same time, some significant differences between the Crick report and the programmes of study will also be presented and discussed.

The Concept of Active Citizenship

The term *active citizenship* was first coined by the Conservative government in the late 1980s. Nevertheless, even though David Blunkett and New Labour used the same term, their definition of the concept was significantly different. Blunkett was a close friend and great admirer of Bernard Crick, who had been his lecturer in university and was an influential political theorist, especially on the concept of citizenship.[4] According to Crick, in order to become an active citizen you need first to have knowledge about the functions of political and societal life and the skills to understand and engage in society, such as the abilities of critical assessment, analysis and argumentation. However, knowledge, skills and liberal democratic values, which encompass what Crick calls 'political literacy', are not enough. Interest in politics and society and a willingness to engage in such issues are also significant features of what Crick calls an active citizen, as opposed to merely a *good citizen*.[5]

Thus, whereas the good citizen may be politically literate, he or she does not necessarily use his or her knowledge and skills to any significant extent. The good citizen is

---

[4] Interviews with David Blunkett, Lady Estelle Morris and Conor Ryan (London, 9-10 March 2011); and David Blunkett, *Politics and Progress* (London, 2001), p. 64. For a succinct account of Bernard Crick's position within political science in Britain, see for example Andrew Gamble's obituary:
'Intellectually tolerant, never': (Guardian website, 19 December 2008).
Accessed: 30 March 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/dec/19/georgeorwell-education?INTCMP=SRCH
[5] Crick, 'Civic Republicanism and Citizenship: the Challenge for Today'.

concerned with obeying laws and satisfying personal aims through rational (and socially accepted) means. As seen in the previous chapter, an idea similar to that of the good citizen has been idealised through British history. According to Crick, there is not necessarily anything wrong with being a good citizen, but it is not enough in order to attain a well-functioning society and democracy. Whereas the good citizen is mostly concerned with the guarantee given to him or her by the state in terms of personal safety, the active citizen is not just able, but also willing, to contribute to society.[6]

Notably, the political component is highly significant to this definition of active citizenship. According to the Institute for Citizenship, active citizenship can be divided into two main areas, *vertical* and *horizontal participation*. Vertical participation, or *civic engagement*, is engagement in political processes and institutions, whereas horizontal participation, or *civil engagement*, is engagement at the community level, for example through voluntarism.[7] This definition of active citizenship is clearly different from the citizenship ideal of the Conservative government in the 1980s. The Thatcherites emphasised individual self-reliance and voluntarism, whereas the definition of active citizenship promoted by Blunkett, Crick and the citizenship organisations in the 1990s focused on the political aspect, combined with various forms of community involvement.[8]

To sum up, the active citizen is in possession of knowledge, skills and understanding of political and societal life, as well as an interest and willingness to engage with these issues. Unlike the requirements for a good citizen, the active citizen is interested and willing to use his or her knowledge and skills in order to contribute to collective deliberation and problem-solving, that is, in deepening democracy through informed debate as well as participation. Put differently, the active citizen is concerned with his or her rights *and* responsibilities as a citizen. These contributions to society can take place on a local, national and global level, as well as both on a vertical and horizontal level.

David Blunkett's Commitment to Citizenship Education

Following the 1997 general election, the Labour Party returned to power after 18 years in opposition, and along came a man who would prove to be highly significant for the process

---

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] 'What is Citizenship': (Institute for Citizenship).
Accessed: 18 January 2011 from:
http://www.citizen.org.uk/What_is_Citizenship.htm

[8] Faulks, *Citizenship in Modern Britain*, pp. 77, 128. For further reading on Thatcherite individualism, see for example Eric J. Evans, *Thatcher and Thatcherism* (London, 2004).

leading to the introduction of compulsory Citizenship education in England. The new Education and Employment Secretary David Blunkett had been deeply committed to civic education for a long time. Between 1969 and 1972, he had been a student under Bernard Crick, and had experienced the beginning of the political education movement where Crick was heavily involved. Strongly inspired by Crick, Blunkett became increasingly concerned with what he saw as the importance of political literacy for political participation and empowerment, and, in due course, for the well-being of democracy.[9] Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Blunkett kept in touch with Crick, who became his friend and mentor, as well with a swathe of professional associations for people who worked with politicised tuition or citizenship education.[10] With the election of a new Labour Party leader in 1994, new opportunities opened up for the citizenship agenda:

> It all disappeared into a black hole [with the emergence of Thatcherism] until the 1990s, when I became Opposition Spokesperson for Education in 1994 when Tony Blair was elected Leader of the Labour Party. I said to the people I had been involved with all these years: we will do it. We will this time. If I am made the Education and Employment Secretary, we will do it.[11]

Blunkett began exploring the possibility of strengthening the role of civic education even before the party came to power in 1997. The issue was first put on the official agenda with the 1995 education policy document *Excellence for Everyone*, where the party stated that they would 'examine the role of citizenship education in the curriculum' in order to 'foster confidence and responsibility' and encourage 'young people to respond to the world around them – including an understanding of the workings of democracy and the personal power relationships which exist in the wider community'.[12] After the party came to power, the pledge to citizenship education, including active citizenship, democratic understanding and political and societal participation, was confirmed. In the 1997 White Paper *Excellence in Schools*, it was stated that the government would 'strengthen education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools'.[13] These pledges were then followed by the establishment of an advisory group on civic education, which Bernard Crick was asked to lead. The recommendations in the Crick report led in due course to the Citizen Order, which came

---

[9] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011); and Blunkett with Alex MacCormick, *On a Clear Day* (London, 1995), p. 87.
[10] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
[11] *Ibid*.
[12] Labour Party, *Excellence for Everyone* (1995), p. 30.
[13] Labour Party, *Excellence in Schools* (1997).

through Parliament, and the introduction of statutory Citizenship education in key stages 3 and 4 in England.

David Blunkett's commitment to active citizenship and education for citizenship was fostered by several factors. The inspiration from Bernard Crick and the proponents for political education in academia and the professional associations was central.[14] Political education had developed as a distinct discipline in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, and there was a strong belief among these groups that such education should also have a stronger position in schools.[15] As seen in chapter two, unlike what was the case in most other liberal democracies, there was no statutory obligation in Britain to teach about political institutions, the workings of democracy, and political and societal participation. Instead, since the introduction of the English National Curriculum, these issues had been covered by citizenship being a cross-curricular theme and to some extent through non-statutory Personal, Social and Health Education. Blunkett believed that there needed to be a stronger and more secure place for civic education in schools, and that statutory status was the only way of fully achieving this. According to Conor Ryan, an adviser to Blunkett at the time, the status as a cross-curricular theme was not seen as sufficient in terms of achieving successful citizenship teaching:

> …cross-curricular themes can go any branch […] With a lot of cross-curricular themes, the extent to which it has happened or not, has been up to the enthusiasm and whims of the individual teachers within schools. So he [Blunkett] felt that if it was in the curriculum and if it was an expectation that it had a space within the curriculum, that then it would happen. I think the legislative aspect was quite important to him.[16]

Moreover, Blunkett was inspired by the work of the citizenship and community involvement organisations, such as the Citizenship Foundation, the Institute for Citizenship and the Community Service Volunteers (CSV). With regard to the influence from these organisations, the CSV and their then leader, Elizabeth Hoodless (later Dame) was a particularly strong inspiration to Blunkett, and contributed to his commitment to not just *political* education, but citizenship education in the fullest sense; in addition to the political component the subject was also to have a strong focus on community involvement and

---

[14] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
[15] *Ibid*.
[16] Interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).

voluntarism.[17] Later on, with the advisory group and the process leading to the Citizenship Order and the implementation of the subject, the organisations functioned as support and provided guidelines for the teaching of the subject.[18]

Additionally, there was an increasing notion in Britain that young people grew up having little understanding of the society around them and in what ways they could influence political and community issues. It is evident that Blunkett was concerned about this:

> ...the realisation of just how politically illiterate this country was, and to much extent, still is [...] I was horrified that we were so ill-informed. Although instinctively you would know it, because their [the young people's] knowledge was so limited. It worried me.[19]

The notions of political and societal disengagement and ignorance were supported by the findings of several research studies and surveys. An influential 1995 study from the centre-left think tank Demos, which was later referred to in the Crick report, argued that 'for many young people in Britain today politics has become something of a dirty word' and that 'in effect, an entire generation has opted out of party politics'.[20] According to the report, people under 25 were four times less likely to vote, join a political party or be politically active than any other age group.[21]

The study then linked this disengagement to high levels of ignorance about political issues. A survey published shortly before the report showed that 65% of the respondents thought that they knew 'just a little' or 'hardly anything' about how Parliament works, and even a higher number, 69% felt the same about the British constitution.[22] A survey published three years later, the 1998 MORI 'State of British Citizenship' survey supported the same view. This survey displayed that British people, and especially young people, showed a discomforting lack of knowledge in political institutions. As much as 90% of the young people asked in the survey claimed that they knew 'just a little or less' about their local council, and as much as 81% claimed that they knew little about 'the way Parliament

---

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Interview with Lady Estelle Morris, junior minister under David Blunkett 1997-2001, and Education Secretary, 2001-2002 (London, 9 March 2011).

[19] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).

[20] Wilkinson and Mulgan, *Freedom's Children: Work, Relationships and Politics for 18-34-Year Olds in Britain Today* (London, 1995), pp. 84-85: (Demos website).
Accessed: 3 November 2010 from:
http://www.demos.co.uk/files/freedomschildren.pdf?1240939425

[21] *Ibid.*, p.84.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

works'.[23] Hence, there were signs of worryingly high levels of disengagement and ignorance in terms of politics, democracy and society among British youth, which contributed to the notion that it was time for the government to act on these issues.

Blunkett's passion for citizenship and what could be called civic engagement also has a personal dimension. He came from an economically deprived neighbourhood in Sheffield, and born blind, his chances in life seemed limited. His rise was then fostered by education, and eventually he gained entry to the University of Sheffield, where he graduated with a degree in Politics, with Crick as one of his lecturers. Blunkett's political career began at an early age. In 1970, he was elected as a councillor on the Sheffield City Council, where he sat until 1988.[24] In 1987 he became a Labour MP, and has later held positions as Education Secretary, Home Secretary and Work and Pensions Secretary in Tony Blair's government. In his book *Politics and Progress*, Blunkett pointed out how important education and politics has been for him personally:

> For me, learning was a ladder out of disadvantage, and it enabled me to achieve what at the time seemed impossible. This personal experience was transformed into political commitment by the recognition that my opportunities in life were not the result of chance but of the political struggles of those who had battled against inequality in the past.[25]

Thus, Blunkett's own experience with empowerment through education and politics could be seen as a significant backdrop to his strong attachment to political and societal empowerment of young people, and citizenship education as a means of achieving this.

Furthermore, Blunkett's commitment to political and community participation, civil society and citizenship education could be seen as rooted in a Labour tradition. The empowerment of people from different backgrounds, the belief in equal opportunity, and the importance of a strong civil society for the well-being of communities, are values that traditionally have held a strong position in the Labour movement. In *On a Clear Day*, his autobiography from 1995, Blunkett argued that 'politics is important because it is the only way in which those without wealth and power can exercise any form of influence'.[26] Thus, to

---

[23] 'State of Citizenship in Britain Survey': (Ipsos MORI website, 1998).
Accessed: 18 January 2011 from:
http://www.ipsos-mori.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/poll.aspx?oItemId=1986
[24] For an account of Blunkett's childhood, youth and early political career, see his autobiography *On a Clear Day*.
[25] Blunkett, *Politics and Progress*, back cover.
[26] Blunkett with MacCormick, *On a Clear Day*, p. 87.

36

Blunkett and the Labour movement, civic education could be seen as a measure not only to empower people, but also to distribute power in favour of the dispossessed. Lady Estelle Morris, junior minister in Blunkett's time as Education Secretary and later Education Secretary herself, has supported this view:

> ..given our political left-of-centre background as a party, it is a subject that is attractive to left-of-centre politicians [...] I suppose if you look back at left-of-centre political history, in terms of the cooperative movement, the trade union movement, it is about empowering people and enabling people from different branches of backgrounds or people who are not as powerful to use the political system.[27]

Nonetheless, it could convincingly be argued that despite fitting within a *Labour* tradition, compulsory Citizenship education was not a particularly *New Labour* project.

New Labour and Citizenship Education

Citizenship education was never an important part of the New Labour agenda, and it was met with relative indifference by the party leader Tony Blair. When Blunkett told him that he was interested in pursuing making civic education a compulsory part of schooling, Blair was at most lukewarm to the idea:

> Tony Blair said to me, 'Do you really want to make this a priority?' […] 'Do you really want to be involved in something which might be a diversion, which might work to take your attention away?' If I had not been committed to it, I could easily have said 'Yeah well, ok, we will forget it'. But I said to him: 'No, this is a contribution to raising standards, not an alternative to it' […] He said, 'Ok, I trust you. Go on with it'.[28]

Despite publicly advocating the advantages of active citizenship, democratisation and a 'thriving civil society', Blair was seemingly not an advocate for a stronger role for civic education in schools.[29] This is indicated in his autobiography from 2010, where the former Prime Minister does not mention civic education in general, or the Citizenship subject in particular, at all.[30] Neither is the Citizenship subject mentioned in the autobiography of Peter

---

[27] Interview with Lady Estelle Morris (London, 9 March 2011).

[28] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011). Both Lady Estelle Morris and Conor Ryan, former adviser to Blunkett, support this view (interviews, London, 9-10 March 2011).

[29] Tony Blair, *New Britain: My Vision of a Young Country* (London, 1996), p. 217; and Blair, 'The Third Way: New Politics for the New Century', in *The New Labour Reader*, eds., Andrew Chadwick and Richard Heffernan (London, 2003), p. 131; interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).

[30] Blair, *A Journey* (London, 2010).

Mandelson, one of the most important New Labour strategists.[31] This implies that education for citizenship never was considered to be a significant part of the New Labour project.

Thus, while education was a top priority for New Labour and the party leadership in the first term in power, Citizenship education was never a crucial part of this picture. The main focus of the government was to raise standards in primary schools through focusing on the basic skills literacy and numeracy, the 'building blocks of all learning that must be taught better'.[32] Education for democratic citizenship is not mentioned once in New Labour's 1997 general election manifesto, and it is mentioned only briefly in the 1997 White Paper *Excellence in Schools*. The primary focus in both the election manifesto and the White Paper is instead on the improvement of standards, and then especially through an emphasis on literacy and numeracy.[33] The implication was that there would be little space for initiatives towards a more 'rounded' education, emphasising social and communicative skills. This view is supported by Conor Ryan, adviser to Blunkett at the time, who has argued that the basic skills occupied most of the time in the Department for Education and Employment during the first period in power. Citizenship education, Ryan has argued, was put on the agenda because the Secretary of State had a commitment to it:

> Our big issue at the time was literacy and numeracy. That was the big drive in terms of education, certainly school level education, in Labour's first term. So a lot of our time was occupied with that. But David [Blunkett] was keen to see this [Citizenship education] happening, as well. It was something in addition. It was very much a personal mission, I think, for him.

Despite Tony Blair's lack of commitment to Citizenship education and the party's focus on basic skills, Blair allowed David Blunkett to pursue his project. There were several reasons for this decision. Firstly, Blunkett was a person Blair deeply respected and who held a strong position in the party and the government. As an appreciated figure who signalled that this was something he was personally committed to, it was accepted that he could pursue it.[34]

---

[31] Peter Mandelson, *The Third Man* (London, 2011).
[32] Labour Party, *Because Britain Deserves Better* (1997 general election manifesto): (labour-party.org.uk website)
Accessed: 23 March 2011 from:
http://www.labour-party.org.uk/manifestos/1997/1997-labour-manifesto.shtml
[33] *Ibid*; and Labour Party, *Excellence in Schools* (1997).
[34] In his autobiography, Blair described Blunkett as a person he 'adored and deeply admired' and as a 'truly decent guy, a great political talent'. Blair, *A Journey*, p. 514; and interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).

Secondly, civic education was not perceived as a particularly controversial issue by the party leadership at the time. Thus, it was not seen as a clear risk to allow Blunkett to follow his idea. As reflected in Blair's comment on priorities, citizenship education was seen as an idea whose potential harm was limited to diverting attention away from more essential educational reforms. Thirdly, and significantly, New Labour was criticised in some quarters for having a too narrow educational focus, due to the party's emphasis on basic skills. As a result, a greater emphasis on civic education was seen as a way to counter this criticism. The party could point to the combination of basic skills and education for citizenship and argue that they were indeed offering a 'rounded' education.[35] Fourthly, the introduction of compulsory Citizenship education was placed within the broader 2000 National Curriculum review.[36] A broad revision of the curriculum made it easier to put Citizenship education on the agenda.[37] Fifthly, Blunkett found a large amount of support within his own party. The ideals of the subject, including empowerment of the people and the development of political literacy, political participation and community involvement, were, as seen, principles drawing upon a strong Labour tradition, and thus welcomed by the grassroots in the party.[38]

Among Labour MPs and members of the cabinet, however, there was some scepticism as to whether it was right to devote time to Citizenship or whether it could be a strain on what was seen as an already overloaded curriculum. Still, there were no significant protests, and the project was to a great extent seen as within the remit of the Education Secretary and the Department for Education and Employment.[39] Thus, interestingly, while Citizenship education was never seen as a significant part of the New Labour project, (nor was it perceived as a crucial part of the party's education policy in its first term), it was allowed to unfold largely in accordance with Blunkett's initial scheme.

Cross-Party Support and a Weak Opposition

In order to see compulsory Citizenship education come about, it was certainly crucial for Blunkett to have support from within his own party, but it was also significant to gain backing

---

[35] Interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).
[36] Director of Education, Norfolk County Council, *Changes to the School Curriculum – 2000: Report by the Director of Education* (Norfolk County Council website).
Accessed: 23 March 2011 from:
http://www.committees.norfolk.gov.uk/Documents/education/14-07-1999/sc2000.pdf
[37] Interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).
[38] Interviews with David Blunkett and Lady Estelle Morris (London, 9 March 2011).
[39] Interviews with David Blunkett and Conor Ryan (London, 9-10 March 2011).

from within other political parties. When civic education had been on the political agenda before, the largest problem had been accusations of it being a potentially leftist, biased project. This time around, however, the project found support within the Liberal Democrats, and even with some Conservatives. Among the Liberal Democrat supporters, the most notable were Lord David Alton, who had founded the Foundation for Citizenship at the Liverpool John Moores University in 1997, and Lord Andrew Phillips, President and founder of the Citizenship Foundation.[40] Among the Conservatives, there was a larger degree of scepticism. Many Conservatives either saw civic education as a potential arena for (leftist) bias and indoctrination, or they did not see the need for such a component in education.[41] Still, Blunkett found an important supporter in Lord Kenneth Baker; who had been chairman of the Hansard Society in the 1970s, and been interested in the political education initiative back then.[42] He had also been Education Secretary in Margaret Thatcher's government, and been interested in introducing citizenship education as part of the National Curriculum back then.[43] Lord Baker was committed to civic education and saw it as an important contribution to education and as a cross-party project.[44] It is also worth noting that the Conservative Party was considered to be a weak opposition at the time. They had just lost their position in government to New Labour, which had won with a landslide. Thus, the Conservatives were not a particularly effective opposition in terms of gaining support for their opposition to New Labour's policies. At the time, the party was also mostly concerned with rebuilding their own image under William Hague, the new, fairly inexperienced leader, who was perceived as politically weak.[45]

The Advisory Group

As a vital part of the process, Blunkett and the Department for Education and Employment

---

[40] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
'Professor the Lord Alton of Liverpool – Director of the Foundation for Citizenship': (Liverpool John Moores University website).
Accessed: 26 March 2011 from:
http://www.ljmu.ac.uk/roscoe/97598.htm
'Andrew Phillips OBE': (Citizenship Foundation website).
Accessed: 26 March 2011 from:
http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/contacts.php?p30
[41] Vincent, in Greenwood and Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education', *PA*, 55 (2002), p. 517; and Faulks, *Citizenship in Modern Britain*, p. 77.
[42] Crick, 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', *PA,* 55 (2002), p. 490.
[43] *Ibid*., p. 488.
[44] *Ibid*., p. 494.
[45] Interview with Lady Estelle Morris (London, 9 March 2011); and Tim Bale, *The Conservative Party: From Thatcher to Cameron* (London, 2010), pp. 67-133.

commissioned an advisory group with the mandate to explore the introduction of Citizenship education in the National Curriculum. Blunkett was determined to see such education as a statutory requirement, and when he approached his former professor and mentor Bernard Crick regarding the position as chairman, the question was not *whether* the subject should be introduced, but *how* it best could be achieved.[46] It was of particular importance for Blunkett and the Education Department to avoid accusations of bias and indoctrination, which so often had been the case with the teaching of politics in the past. Thus, in his conversations with Crick, Blunkett emphasised that this was an issue of teaching all aspects of citizenship, not just politics. It was important that the subject was not seen as partisan, and that it was conveyed that the concept of citizenship extended to areas beyond politics, including areas of societal participation such as voluntarism and local community involvement.[47]

The fact that Bernard Crick was asked to take on the position as chairman of the committee derived from two main reasons. Firstly, Crick and Blunkett had known each other for a long time, ever since Crick was Blunkett's professor and mentor at the University of Sheffield in the late 1960s and early 1970s. He had been a huge inspiration to his young student, particularly on issues relevant to civic education.[48] Secondly, Crick was one of the most acknowledged political scientists in the country, having active citizenship and education for citizenship as his main fields of expertise. He had been a proponent of citizenship education for decades, and had also been involved in the last serious effort to introduce such education in schools, the Programme for Political Education in the 1970s. Thus, Crick was perceived as the person who had the integrity and credentials to take on the position as chairman of the group which was to outline the new Citizenship subject.[49]

As to the composition of the advisory group, it was seen as essential to put together representatives from various parts of British society, in order to more easily gain support from across the political and societal spectrum and thus avoid accusations of partisan bias.[50] In relation to political parties, the Conservatives had traditionally been particularly sceptical to the teaching of politics and citizenship in schools, and it was thus seen as crucial to gain the support of a Conservative senior politician.[51] As a consequence, Lord Kenneth Baker, who

---

[46] Crick, 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', PA, 55 (2002), p. 493.
[47] *Ibid*., p. 493; and interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
[48] Blunkett with MacCormick, *On a Clear Day*, p. 87; and Blunkett, *Politics and Progress*, p. 64.
[49] Interviews with David Blunkett and Conor Ryan (London, 9-10 March 2011).
[50] *Ibid*.
[51] *Ibid*.

was a known supporter of citizenship education, was persuaded to join the advisory group.[52]

In addition, it was seen as important to have the support of the media, and Michael Brunson, the then political editor of the Independent Television Network was given a place on the committee.[53] In the end, the advisory group consisted of a varied selection of people from different branches of English public life. Its members included, among others, people from the citizenship and community involvement organisations, academia, school leadership, the Church of England and the New Labour-friendly think tank Demos.[54]

There are also clear indicators that the remit and composition of the advisory group was made so that these could provide increased credibility for Blunkett and Crick's broad ideas as initially defined. The mandate of the group stated that the new subject should include 'the nature and practices of participation in democracy; the duties, responsibilities and rights of individuals as citizens; and the value to individuals and society of community activity'.[55] Thus, this clearly reflected the ideas of Blunkett and Crick on citizenship as *active* citizenship. Furthermore, the advisory group was composed in such a way that the ideas of Crick and Blunkett gained hold to a large extent. This view has been supported by Jessica Pykett, who, partly based on interviews with several of the group members, has argued that the advisory group was heavily dominated by Crick, and that the work of the group was 'clearly the realisation of a vision he and Blunkett shared'.[56] According to Pykett, the group was to a large degree dominated by Crick as chairman and an authority within the field.[57] As a consequence, in areas of conflict, his views were most often followed.[58]

Furthermore, it is fair to argue that the members of the group to a large extent were selected because they already agreed with Blunkett and Crick on how citizenship should be viewed, and the space such education should be granted in the curriculum. Representatives from groups that were more critical to the introduction of compulsory Citizenship education were, however, either not included in the advisory group at all, or merely given status as

---

[52] *Ibid*.

[53] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).

QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), p. 5: (Tesis en Xarxa website).

Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf

[54] *Ibid*., p. 5.

[55] *Ibid*., p. 4.

[56] Jessica Pykett, 'Making citizens governable? The Crick report as governmental technology', *Journal of Education Policy*, 22 (2007), p. 308.

[57] *Ibid*., p. 310.

[58] *Ibid*., p. 310.

42

observers, in other words as non-voting members. It is striking that the committee did not include a single ordinary teacher, nor were any of the teacher unions represented.[59] In addition, representatives from significant educational bodies, such as the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), the Teacher Training Agency and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) were only present as observers.[60]

The aforementioned educational bodies were all lukewarm to giving statutory status to civic education. The National Union of Teachers, the largest teacher union, based their scepticism on two main reasons. Firstly, they believed it would 'place increased strain' on what was perceived as an already 'overloaded' curriculum. Secondly, the union argued that citizenship was best provided as a cross-curricular theme, and that giving it statutory status was an unnecessary limitation of the freedom of the individual teacher.[61] Ofsted and the QCA also voiced fears that citizenship as a legal requirement would be too much of a strain on an already excessive curriculum.[62] Thus, it seems as if the most critical voices within the area of education were merely given observer status or left out of the committee altogether, in order for the work of the group to achieve consensus and set out a role for citizenship education which was largely in line with David Blunkett and Bernard Crick's ideas.

The way the advisory group was appointed shows Blunkett's determination to ensure that an outline for Citizenship education was produced without further delay. The process also indicates that without political momentum, decisiveness and a clever hand, Blunkett's plan would not have succeeded to the same extent it did. Still, it is worth noting that political commitment to a cause and backing from a mentor is far from a guarantee for translating ideas into policy reform. As seen with the Jenkins Commission on electoral reform from about the same time, stated beliefs in a cause and intellectual groundwork by an inspirational figure, in this case Roy Jenkins, whom Tony Blair greatly admired, could also end in a standstill caused by political risk or diversion of attention.[63] However, interestingly, in the case of Citizenship education, the process worked: education for citizenship was brought to

---

[59] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), p. 5: (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-
130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[61] National Union of Teachers, 'Citizenship Demystified': (National Union of Teachers website, 2000).
Accessed: 26 March 2011 from:
http://www.teachers.org.uk/files/active/0/1700.pdf
[62] Interviews with David Blunkett and Conor Ryan (London, 9-10 March 2011).
[63] For further reading, see Anthony Seldon, *Blair: The Biography* (London, 2004), pp. 265-278.

the government's attention, maintained on the agenda and then implemented through a consistent reform. This supports the view that Blunkett' commitment to the cause was exceptionally strong, that he was willing to put a considerable amount of effort into seeing Citizenship education happening, and that there were no insurmountable obstacles in his way.

The Crick report

In their report, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (commonly known as the Crick report), the advisory group stated that Citizenship should become a statutory requirement in the English National Curriculum, and set out their recommendations on what the subject should consist of and how it should be implemented.[64] Not surprisingly, considering the make-up of the advisory group, the Crick report defined citizenship as *active* citizenship, and made the distinction between the *good* and the *active* citizen. The committee stressed that citizenship did not only involve holding rights granted by the state, but also responsibilities. The group argued in favour of a strong civil society, because a well-functioning society and democracy were not only dependent on the actions of the state, but also on 'what people can do for each other in voluntary groups and organisations, whether local or national'.[65] The committee stated rather boldly that their aim was 'a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally', and argued that Citizenship education could contribute to a transformation of the notions of citizenship and political and societal participation:

> We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally: for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life and with the critical capacities to weigh evidence before speaking and acting; to build on and 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.[66]

Though participation in *civil* society was perceived as a necessary condition for full citizenship and democracy, the report stated that it was not sufficient. It was highlighted that

---

[64] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998): (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf
[65] *Ibid*., p.10.
[66] *Ibid*., pp. 7-8.

an active citizen is also a *political* citizen.[67] Active citizenship requires both knowledge about the functions of politics, and the skills needed in order to participate in public debate and contribute to making changes to society. Furthermore, one of the most significant features of an active citizen is that he or she is able to make the distinction between law and justice. This makes him or her able to point to aspects of political or societal life which he or she feels is unjustified, and he or she can aim to change these aspects by political means.[68]

The committee's recommendations on the content of the Citizenship subject clearly reflected their definition of citizenship as active citizenship, which included participation in civil, as well as political society. It was recommended that in order to achieve 'effective education for citizenship' the curriculum should include three main strands: *social and moral responsibility*, *community involvement*, and *political literacy*.[69] In terms of the first strand, the committee pointed to how children from the start learn 'self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom, both towards those in authority and towards each other'.[70] Guidance on values and personal development were considered as essential parts of citizenship, and reflections on these issues should be encouraged and guided through Citizenship education.[71] The second strand placed emphasis on the significance of civil society, and especially the local level. The pupils should be encouraged to participate actively in their communities, and the report pointed to how community involvement is dependent on the political citizen. Even though many people perceive voluntary groups as non-political, it is more correct to describe them as non-partisan. In other words, the groups are often not linked to a particular political party, but they are related to issues which are of a political nature. Voluntary groups exercise persuasion, fundraising, the recruiting and activating of members, as well as interaction with public authorities, and all these actions require political knowledge and skills.[72] Thus, active involvement in politics and society was seen as dependent on what is included in the third strand, *political literacy*. The term political literacy was selected in order to use a concept that is wider than political knowledge alone, since it also encompasses relevant skills and values. The committee stressed that in order to encourage active citizenship, Citizenship education should be viewed as 'education for citizenship, behaving and acting as a citizen,

---

[67] *Ibid.*, p.10.
[68] *Ibid.*, p.10.
[69] *Ibid.*, p.11.
[70] *Ibid.*, p.11.
[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

therefore it is not just knowledge of citizenship and civic society; it also implies developing values, skills and understanding'.[73] A natural consequence of this emphasis on skills as well as knowledge was that the subject could not only include classroom-based activities. As the committee pointed out, 'it is difficult to conceive of pupils as active citizens if their experience of learning in Citizenship education has been predominantly passive'.[74] Thus, the report argued, the students should be involved in activities and experiences, such as case studies or class, school and community projects, where 'the emphasis should be on learning through action'.[75]

Not surprisingly, the report also included a section on how to deal with controversial issues in Citizenship education. Contentious issues had been at the heart of what had made a central place for civic education in schools problematic to many people, including politicians, before. It was of high importance to the advisory group to counter possible claims that Citizenship could be an arena for leftist propaganda. In the report, the committee argued that indoctrination is not acceptable, but that complete non-bias is 'simply not possible'. Instead, it was emphasised that Citizenship should be an arena for developing critical skills, and that it thus could provide the students with the abilities to avoid being victims of indoctrination. In Citizenship, the students would be trained in critical assessment; how to recognise bias, evaluate opinions and how to look for alternative views. In other words, 'to give good reasons for everything they say and do, and to expect good reasons to be given by others'.[76]

Furthermore, the report argued, controversial issues *should* not be avoided, and ought to be seen as a significant part of education for citizenship. Firstly, controversial issues could be important in themselves, and leaving these out of the children's education could fail to prepare them for adult life. Controversial issues, the report argued, are 'major issues of the day [...] which young people ought to know about either because the issue could directly affect them or because they will in some way in a democratic society have opportunities to take a part in influencing the outcome'.[77] Moreover, the report argued, exploring controversial issues develops the students' 'qualities of mind', such as empathy, reasoning and decision-making.[78]

Considering the impact of Blunkett and Crick, the remit of the advisory group, and the

---

[73]*Ibid.*, p. 13.
[74] *Ibid.*, p.37.
[75] *Ibid.*, p.37.
[76] *Ibid.*, p. 56.
[77] *Ibid.*, p. 57.
[78] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

46

political and social context at the time, it was far from surprising that the main rationale for introducing Citizenship education was the promotion of active citizenship. The committee did, however, also include a *second* argument in favour of introducing compulsory Citizenship education, namely to strengthen British national identity and common bonds in a multinational and multicultural Britain. However, whereas active citizenship was highlighted as the most significant argument, the identity argument was seen as part of the 'broader aim' of the subject.[79] Thus, the committee argued, there was a need for a common identity in an ethnically, culturally and religiously diverse society such as Britain; a national identity based on a common citizenship culture, which was still pluralistic enough in order to encompass the diversity of Britain:

> a main aim for the whole community should be to find or restore a sense of common citizenship, including a national identity that is secure enough to find a place for the plurality of nations, cultures, ethnic identities and religions long found in the United Kingdom. Citizenship education creates common ground between different ethnic and religious identities.[80]

Thus, identity and diversity issues were put forward in the report, but these issues were clearly de-emphasised in favour of active citizenship. There were several reasons behind this decision. Firstly, since the main commitment of Blunkett, Crick and the advisory group was on political and societal engagement, most of the report centred on these issues. Secondly, identity issues did not yet play a major role in British public debate at that time. As will be discussed thoroughly in chapter four, issues concerning identity, diversity and belonging became more apparent a few years later. Thirdly, according to Blunkett, he had a personal commitment to developing and promoting the issue of identity and a sense of belonging, but identity and diversity issues were de-emphasised at the time because they were seen as potentially controversial: 'We were very keen in this first period not to make this so ideological that people could feel that it was pushing a particular political line [...] I think it helped to achieve consensus'.[81] With these circumstances in mind, it is understandable that diversity issues were not granted more space in the Crick report.

Nonetheless, critics from several vantage points have pointed to the unfortunate effects

---

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[80] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[81] This commitment became more apparent later on, in Blunkett's time as Home Secretary from 2001 to 2004 (this issue will be expanded on in chapter four). Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).

of the report's lack of focus on aspects of diversity issues, such as structural inequality, racism and discrimination.[82] As argued by Professor Audrey Osler, the neglect of these issues suggested that citizenship is a completed project once certain virtues are in place. The report thus avoided the question of how inequality and discrimination impact on citizenship.[83] From this critical perspective on the Crick report, it is obvious that different forms of inequality, related to for example ethnicity, gender and class, still constitute a potential threat to citizenship and democracy. The fact that a person belongs to an ethnic or religious minority, is a woman, or come from a socially deprived background still affect that person's opportunities in life and his or her chances of gaining political and societal influence. Considering the report's emphasis on empowerment and democratisation, it could be seen as a weakness that the report did not deal with potential threats to citizenship and democratic opportunities to a larger extent than it did. Instead, where the Crick report did deal with diversity, it emphasised common values and how citizenship could be used as a shared bond. Interestingly, this approach to diversity issues, focusing on values and citizenship as a unifier, would partially foreshadow the way diversity was addressed in the revision of the Citizenship curriculum, which will be returned to in chapter four.

The Citizenship Order and the Programmes of Study

Following the publication of the Crick report on 22 September 1998, the Citizenship education process continued in the then Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), an executive non-departmental public body responsible for the development of the National Curriculum and related assessment. However, rather unusually for such a process, the work was closely followed by the Education Secretary, who placed Bernard Crick to lead the process.[84] This was because of fears that the process could be hindered within the agency, due to a large degree of scepticism to a greater emphasis on civic education, especially with a statutory status. Thus, the proponents feared that the recommendations in the Crick report would be largely ignored if the process was not closely monitored. According to Blunkett, as

---

[82] For elaborate discussions on the Crick report and its dealings with diversity and structural inequality, see for example Audrey Osler, 'Citizenship education, democracy and racial justice 10 years on', *Race Equality Teaching*, 27 (2009); and Osler and Hugh Starkey, 'Citizenship, human rights and cultural diversity', in *Citizenship and democracy in schools: diversity, identity, equality*, ed, Osler (Stoke-on-Trent, 2000).
[83] Interview with Professor Audrey Osler (Oslo, 23 March 2011); and Osler, 'Citizenship education, democracy and racial justice 10 years on', *RET*, 27 (2009), p. 2.
[84] Interviews with David Blunkett and Lady Estelle Morris (London, 9-10 March 2011).

a consequence of these fears, he was persuaded by Crick to establish a unit within the QCA, with Crick as leader and with support from himself, the Education Secretary:

> Bernard [Crick] persuaded me that there needed to be a number of people brought together as a unit to actually take this forward to develop within the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, with Bernard [Crick] having an office and supports system within the department, and my backing. And of course, he was never slow of coming to me if things were going wrong […] I used to say, Bernard, I will only intervene when it is really crucial […] So come to me when things are really bad and I will sort them out for you.[85]

When presented to Parliament on 23 June 2000, the Citizenship Order, being a legally enforceable document, only included a brief set of relatively broad aims for each intended statutory key stage, and no suggestions on methods of delivery, learning techniques or teaching methods.[86] Guidelines on methodology were provided, however, but then by the QCA and the citizenship organisations rather than by the government.[87] Unlike the programmes of study presented with the Citizenship Order, these guidelines did not have a statutory status. This approach, called 'light touch' by Blunkett and 'strong bare bones' by Crick, left a large degree of freedom to the schools and the individual teacher, and, according to Crick, this approach was preferred for two main reasons.[88] Firstly, it was seen as inappropriate for the government and governmental agencies to give prescriptions on possibly controversial political issues: 'the detail should be at "arm's length" from the state'. Secondly, 'in the very nature of citizenship', it was perceived as important that local considerations should be taken. A 'light touch' approach was seen as needed to give the teachers enough freedom to adapt their teaching to the local community context. In addition, it is likely that these measures also could be linked to the scepticism within the educational sphere. The 'light touch' method could be seen as a sort of compromise between the proponents of statutory civic education and those who were more critical to this. In other words, this approach was preferred to avoid accusations of partisan education and bias, and seemingly also to give concessions to the somewhat sceptical educational sphere.

There were some significant differences between the Crick report and the programmes of study due to the different genres of the two documents. Being part of a legal document, the programmes of study were brief and prescriptive, whereas the report to a larger extent

---

[85] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
[86] Crick, 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', PA, 55 (2002), p. 498.
[87] *Ibid*., p. 498.
[88] *Ibid*., p. 499.

provided rationale and explanations for its recommendations.[89] Overall, the Crick report

provided more statements, including specific topical terms for the pupils to learn, than what

the programmes of study did.[90] Besides that, there were only slight differences in terms of

structure and wording, and only a few changes had been made with regard to content. The

language in the programmes of study was a bit more careful than that in the Crick report. The

report included a discussion on the teaching of 'controversial issues', whereas the

programmes of study mentioned 'topical political, spiritual, moral, social and cultural

issues'.[91] Again, this could be read as an attempt to cover up the controversial aspects of the

subject and counter criticism of partisan education. Crick argued that this change in wording

did not matter to him, since this, as he saw it, would not mean that controversial issues would

not be discussed in the classroom: 'teachers are not blind horses'.[92]

It is worth noting that whereas the Crick report provided 'learning outcomes' which

stated what the pupils should know at the end of each key stage, the programmes of study

presented aims which told what the pupils 'should be taught about'.[93] This seemingly subtle

difference reflected somewhat different approaches to education. Learning outcomes, on one

hand, present the knowledge, understanding and skills the *pupil* is expected to have gained

---

[89] *Ibid*., p. 500.

[90] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), pp. 49- 52: (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf
DfEE and QCA, *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*, pp. 14-16: (National Curriculum website, 1999).
Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf

[91] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), p. 27: (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf
DfEE and QCA, *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*, pp. 14-15: (National Curriculum website).
Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf

[92] Crick, 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', PA, 55 (2002), p. 498.

[93] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), pp. 49- 52: (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf
DfEE and QCA, *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*, pp. 14-16: (National Curriculum website, 1999).
Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf

after a certain stage in his or her education.[94] Aims, on the other hand, present what the *teacher* is expected to have covered at a particular stage.[95] Thus, whereas the use of learning outcomes is pupil-centred, focusing on what the learner has achieved, the use of aims is teacher-centred, placing emphasis on what the teacher is expected to have been through at a certain stage.[96] The shift from learning outcomes in the Crick report to aims in the programmes of study could be seen as somewhat ill-judged. Learning outcomes can be advantageous precisely because they are learner-centred and specific in terms of what the pupils are expected to know after a certain stage. Thus, such outcomes are also easier to assess than aims: statements concerning what the teacher *should teach* can never precisely tell what the pupils actually know, neither can it be used to assess what the pupils *have learned*. Put differently, if the Citizenship curriculum had included learning outcomes instead of aims, it is likely that this would have made the assessment in the subject easier. Moreover, in a subject with a focus on active citizenship, it would also have been beneficial to adopt an approach to the pupils as active learners also on this level.

Still, with regard to content, the aims presented with the Citizenship Order to a large degree reflected the recommendations in the Crick report. This is far from surprising, considering the circumstances leading to the Order. The two documents both dealt with issues such as legal rights and responsibilities; the workings of Parliament; central and local government and public services; different forms of democracy; community and voluntary groups and organisations; human rights; and the 'world as a global community', including the UK's relations with the European Union, the Commonwealth and the United Nations.[97]

It is worth noting, however, that whereas diversity in Britain was not mentioned among the recommended learning outcomes in the Crick report, it was included among the aims in the programmes of study. According to the aims, the pupils in key stage 3 should be

---

[94] Declan Kennedy, Aine Hyland and Norma Ryan, 'Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: A Practical Guide': (The Bologna Process website).
Accessed: 25 March 2011 from:
http://www.bologna.msmt.cz/files/learning-outcomes.pdf
[95] *Ibid*., p. 5.
[96] *Ibid*., p. 3.
[97] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), pp. 49-50: (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf
DfEE and QCA, *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*, pp. 14-15: (National Curriculum website).
Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf

taught about 'the diversity of national, regional, religious and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom and the need for mutual respect and understanding', whereas the pupils in key stage 4 were to be taught about 'the origins and implications of the diverse national, regional, religious and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom and the need for mutual respect and understanding'. [98] Diversity being included among the aims in the programmes of study, when it was not in the Crick report, might be linked to several reasons. Firstly, since the publication of the Crick report, devolution to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland had come into effect. Thus, it could have been seen as increasingly significant to include learning about the regional identities in the UK.[99] Secondly, in the period after the report, the results of an enquiry on the racially motivated murder of Stephen Lawrence in 1993 had been published. Due to this enquiry, there was an increased emphasis on racism, and the need for tolerance and respect, in the public debate.[100] Thirdly, it is likely that due to the circumstances mentioned and to a concern that the Crick report did not deal with diversity to a sufficient extent, there were voices within the QCA who pushed this issue forward.[101] At the same time, it is worth mentioning that the programmes of study did not address racism and other forms of discrimination to any more explicit extent than what had been done in the Crick report. When dealing with diversity, the focus in the Citizenship curriculum was on appreciation of the multicultural state of Britain, including the promotion of 'mutual respect and understanding'.[102] Inequality and discrimination could be interpreted as being implicitly covered by several aims, but there was not a single aim that explicitly addressed any of these issues. Thus, the curriculum did not extend the link between citizenship, equality and empowerment to the area of diversity to any specific degree.

In terms of skills, the programmes of study notably included community participation and emphasised participative skills, where the Crick report did not. Even though the report had argued strongly in favour of societal participation, it had not been incorporated into the recommended learning outcomes. According to Crick, this was due to fears of overloading the

---

[98] *Ibid*., pp. 14-15.

[99] Interview with Lady Estelle Morris (London, 9 March 2011).

[100] Interview with Professor Audrey Osler (Oslo, 23 March 2011); and
Sir William MacPherson, *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*: (Official Documents Archive website).
Accessed: 26 March 2011 from:
http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm42/4262/4262.htm

[101] Interviews with Lady Estelle Morris and Conor Ryan (London, 9-10 March 2011).

[102] DfEE and QCA, *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*, pp. 14-16: (National Curriculum website).
Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf

curriculum and perceived difficulties on offering prescriptions on community and school projects. Nevertheless, on David Blunkett's initiative, participation was included in the statutory requirements.[103] Probably as a result of this, a slightly different structure was selected for the programmes of study than what had been in the Crick report. Whereas the report had suggested dividing the learning outcomes into *Skills and Aptitudes* and *Knowledge and Understanding*, the programmes of study were grouped into three sections: *Knowledge and Understanding about becoming informed citizens*, *Developing skills of enquiry and communication* and *Developing skills of participation and responsible action*. Thus, in the programmes of study, participative skills were emphasised by singling them out and placing them in a section of their own.[104] This choice was clearly linked to the emphasis on citizenship as *active* citizenship, aiming to develop young people who are willing and able to take part in political and societal life.

Summary

In this chapter it has been argued that the process leading to the introduction of statutory Citizenship education in the English National Curriculum was helped by a benevolent political and social context, but driven forward through the pulling of strings by particularly significant individuals. In terms of context, notions of youth disengagement and ignorance; the emergence of a number of influential citizenship organisations; and support from within the major political parties, combined with a weak Conservative opposition, have been put forward as important contributing factors. Moreover, the passive consent of the Prime Minister to Blunkett's reform and the relative insignificance Citizenship education played within the party's educational policies helped secure the necessary political leeway. Without these two factors operating in conjunction, it is improbable that the reform process had taken such immediate effect in the government's programme of reform.

However, as this chapter has strongly argued, compulsory Citizenship education

---

[103] Crick, 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', PA, 55 (2002), p. 500.
[104] QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998), pp. 49-50: (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf
DfEE and QCA, *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*, pp. 14-16: (National Curriculum website).
Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf

would not have been introduced without the personal commitment of David Blunkett, the then Education Secretary, who held strong beliefs in the advantages of civic education. Much of his support for this was rooted in his time as a student of Bernard Crick and a proponent of the work of the Political Education movement in the 1970s. In addition, his upbringing, background and political career, as well as the Labour tradition he brought with him, contributed to this interest. When Blunkett became Education Secretary in 1997, he was determined to do what he could to bring about a more prominent role for civic education in schools.

Another crucial figure was Bernard Crick, Blunkett's former professor and mentor, a respected political scientist and long-time proponent of education for citizenship. Crick was selected as chairman of the advisory group on Citizenship education, and he also played an important role in the part of the process leading to the Citizenship Order. The advisory group was crucial in gaining consensus, support across the political and societal spectrum and in avoiding harmful accusations of this being a biased project. In addition, the critical voices within the educational sphere, such as the teacher unions, Ofsted and the QCA, were given a limited role. Thus, the advisory group in many ways worked as a supporting team of Blunkett and Crick's ideas on citizenship and education for citizenship. The two men's determination to see their ideas through, also led to a close monitoring of the work within the QCA and thus to programmes of study which were largely in agreement with the recommendations in the Crick report.

Consequently, this was a relatively rare example of a politician who designed a reform and monitored it closely throughout the process. Thus, the Citizenship subject, which was introduced in schools in 2002, was largely in agreement with Blunkett's personal ideas on the importance of active citizenship, political literacy and community participation. The next chapter will explore the revision of the programmes of study in Citizenship in the National Curriculum a few years later, and the background for this decision. It will be argued that the revision project differed significantly from the process described in this chapter, both in terms of the driving forces behind the process and the kind of issues that were raised.

Chapter Four: 'Striking the Right Balance'
The Revision of Citizenship

> …the curriculum on these issues [ethnic, cultural and religious diversity], and issues of identity and so on, needed to be quite a strong curriculum. Ofsted [the schools' inspectorate] was going to make sure that schools were not being hotbeds to extremism.
>
> (Conor Ryan)[1]

> The Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review was commissioned in response to a growing debate about whether UK society engages with issues around 'race', religion, culture, identity and values in the UK today, in a way that meets the need of all pupils. Do we, as individuals and as a nation, respect each other's differences and build on commonalities? […] This 'education for diversity' is fundamental if the UK is to have a cohesive society in the 21st century.
>
> (Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review Group)[2]

A few years after the implementation of the Citizenship subject in England, the New Labour government commissioned the Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review group. Its mandate was to explore how identity and diversity issues were dealt with across the curriculum, and whether these issues could be strengthened through Citizenship education in particular. In January 2007, the curriculum review group, led by Sir Keith Ajegbo, published their report, *Curriculum Review: Diversity and Citizenship* (commonly known as the Ajegbo report). The most significant recommendations in the report were followed, and the revised curriculum, including inter alia a new strand on identity and diversity issues, was implemented in maintained schools in England in August 2008.[3]

This chapter explores the context and causes for this process and the revision of the Citizenship curriculum which it resulted in. In chapter three, it was argued that the most significant factor for the *introduction* of the subject was notable individuals pulling strings, in particular David Blunkett and Bernard Crick with their commitment to a stronger role for civic education and clear agenda for what the new subject should contain. With regard to the

---

[1] Interview with Conor Ryan, Tony Blair's senior education adviser from 2005 to 2007 (London, 10 March 2011). A 'strong' curriculum in this sense meant a curriculum where these issues held a central position.
[2] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 16: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[3] Association for Citizenship Teaching, 'The Secondary Curriculum': (Association for Citizenship Teaching website).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/page?p=27

revision, however, it will be argued that there were no individuals who played a similarly highly significant role. Instead the revision came about due to a shift in the public mood and within the New Labour government due to influential national and international events, such as the 2001 race riots, and the rise of international terrorism. These events contributed to a shift of emphasis towards collective identity, cohesion and public security. Moreover, it will be argued that the process and outcome of the revision reflected a left-of-centre response to the challenge which was markedly different from how it would have been resolved under a Conservative government.

The chapter begins by outlining some central social and political events in the years prior to the revision and how these events contributed to an increased public debate in Britain and abroad on issues such as immigration, diversity, integration and the role of Islam in Western liberal democracies. Then the chapter moves on to discuss the role of New Labour in this changing political climate. It will be argued that the government strongly adapted to the altered context, and sought to strike a balance between a 'hard' and a 'soft' approach on these issues. In this regard, a 'hard' approach on security and immigration was combined with a 'soft' approach in the area of education. A 'hard' approach, in this respect, refers to a strong emphasis on law and order, where undesired actions are sanctioned through the penal system and public authority prioritised. A 'soft' or liberal approach should be seen as one highlighting tolerance and individual autonomy, where law and order issues are downplayed and authority is a much less prioritised concern. With regard to New Labour, it will be argued that the 'hard' approach towards security and immigration was combined with the 'soft' approach in the area of education. This field thus provided a useful opportunity for New Labour to counterbalance the tough approach to crime, immigration and welfare with a softer touch in the area of education policy.[4]

Additionally, in the field of education, the government aimed to balance integration and shared values on the one hand, with appreciation of diversity on the other. These balancing acts – both between education and crime and within the educational field itself -

---

[4] A key aspect of the renewal of the Labour Party (resulting in New Labour) had precisely been the promise to be tougher on crime prevention, to repair what was seen as a lack of credibility outside the party's core voters. Freeden, 'The Ideology of New Labour'. *TPQ*, pp. 42-51; and Squires, 'New Labour and the politics of antisocial behaviour'. *CSP*, pp.144-168. For an interesting illustration, see also John Reid, 'We're tough on crime – and we're going to get even tougher': (Daily Telegraph website, 12 November 2006). Accessed: 20 April 2011 from: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3634170/Were-tough-on-crime-and-were-going-to-get-even-tougher.html

could be seen as rather typical for New Labour and other centre-left parties in the Third Way era: aiming to strike a balance between a reliable and responsible image to please the general electorate and a socially liberal image promoting equality, tolerance and respect for diversity to please its traditional supporters. This field thus provided a useful opportunity for New Labour to counterbalance the tough approach to crime, immigration and welfare with a softer touch in the area of education policy.

Following the section on context and backdrop, the chapter moves on to deal specifically with the revision of the Citizenship curriculum. It will be argued that this review should be seen in relation to the political and social context, and the government's commitment to striking a balance both between 'hard' and 'soft' approaches and between integration and appreciation of diversity. Whereas identity and diversity issues had been de-emphasised in the Crick report, due to fears of these being too contentious, at the time of the revision the situation was very different. Instead, due to the changing security context, there was a pressure both within the New Labour government and from elsewhere that such issues should be dealt with to a greater extent. In extension to this, the chapter will discuss to what extent the revision could be seen as a *(New) Labour* project, and how it differed from what could have been expected in the case of a *Conservative* government.

After discussing the main causes behind the revision, the chapter moves on to discuss the composition of the curriculum review group and the key findings and recommendations outlined in the Ajegbo report. Since the focus of this thesis is on Citizenship, only the key recommendations concerning this particular subject will be discussed here. The last part of the chapter will then discuss the revised programmes of study in Citizenship for key stages 3 and 4, looking at to what extent the ideas in the Ajegbo report were followed. The chapter will show how the most important recommendations in the report, concerning the new strand on identity and diversity, were incorporated into the curriculum. Thus, these issues were granted a significantly more important position in the Citizenship curriculum than what had been the case up until then. Moreover, the curriculum, as the report, aimed to strike a balance between integration on the one hand, and fostering respect and tolerance for diversity on the other. In this respect, the chapter will argue, the Citizenship curriculum reflected a left-of-centre stance on these issues.

The Changing Social and Political Context

The 2000s saw the emergence in Britain and other Western countries of an increased public

debate revolving around issues such as diversity, immigration, integration, citizenship, national identity and the role of Islam in Western liberal democracies. In Britain, this shift began with the riots in the northern English cities of Oldham, Bradford, Leeds and Burnley in the spring and summer of 2001. Both white and South Asian-Muslim youths were involved in the riots, which were fuelled by confrontation between the then Anti-Nazi League and far-right groups such as the British National Party and the National Front.[5] In response to the riots, David Blunkett, who had been appointed Home Secretary after the 2001 general election, commissioned an independent review team to investigate the background to the riots and how to better achieve social cohesion in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods. In December 2001, the review team, chaired by Ted Cantle, published its report which argued that the riots had happened largely due to 'polarisation' and segregated communities living a 'series of parallel lives'.[6]

After the riots, the debate in Britain increased with the terrorist attacks in the USA on 11 September 2001 and particularly with the London bombings on 7 July 2005. Following the London attacks, the need to counter radicalisation and terrorist activity was not only linked to the fight against terrorism internationally, but also to the struggle against extremism at home. The four terrorists behind the London attacks all had strong connections to Britain, and three of them were born and raised in the country.[7] The debate centred on how such radicalisation could have occurred, and whether Britain showed increasing signs of polarisation and segregation, which in some cases could lead to extremism.[8] Even though only a small minority of the British population supports far-right parties and movements, a disturbing consequence of the abovementioned events has been the revival of the far-right British National Party (BNP). During the 2001 general election, Oldham and Burnley, which had

---

[5] 'Race "segregation" caused riots': (BBC News website, 11 December 2001).
Accessed: 31 March 2011 from:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/1702799.stm
Paul Harris, 'Bradford under siege after day of race riots': (Guardian website, 8 July 2001).
Accessed: 31 March 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2001/jul/08/news.race
[6] Home Office, *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team Chaired by Ted Cantle*: (Guardian website, 2001).
Accessed: 31 March 2011 from:
http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Guardian/documents/2001/12/11/communitycohesionreport.pdf
[7] Charles A. Lieberman and Serguei Cheloukhine, 'Chapter 13: 2005 London Bombings', in *A New Understanding of Terrorism: Case Studies, Trajectories and Lessons Learned*, eds., M.R. Haberfield and Agostino von Hassell (London, 2009), pp. 233, 243-244.
[8] See for example 'What turned them into zealots?': (Guardian website, 14 July 2005).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/jul/14/july7.theeditorpressreview

experienced riots a few months before, polled highest for the BNP, and the party continued to improve its results on local, national and European levels in the following elections.[9] All the mainstream parties have condemned the BNP and its growth, and former and present party leaders, including New Labour's Gordon Brown, David Cameron from the Conservatives and Nick Clegg from the Liberal Democrats, have in recent years criticised the BNP in public.[10]

Thus, the changing social and political context contributed to a shift in the public mood on how to deal with a multicultural and multi-religious society.[11] Britain has since the riots and terrorist attacks experienced a general change in the public mood from an embrace of diversity and multicultural policies to a more critical attitude to ethnic and religious diversity, and especially to the place of Islam in a liberal democracy. However, due to the multicultural composition of Britain and the fear of the consequences of a far-right revival, there has also been a perceived need to promote the positive aspects of diversity. The latter is a task that, as discussed later in the chapter, perhaps has been particularly central to a left-of-centre government. Thus, the New Labour government adapted to this new context with both a 'hard' and a 'soft' approach in several policy areas. Whereas a strengthened emphasis on integration and cohesion was the most notable in the Home Office, the school system proved to be a place where the party was more concerned to use a 'soft' approach, and thus aiming to

---

[9] Andrew Geddes, *Labour's Second Landslide: The British General Election 2001* (Manchester, 2002), p. 194.
'History of the BNP': (BBC News website, 24 January 2003).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/2690555.stm
'BNP sees increase in total votes': (BBC News website, 6 May 2005).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/vote_2005/frontpage/4519347.stm
'Will BNP election gains last?': (BBC News website, 5 May 2006).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4968406.stm
[10] Ben Leach, 'Gordon Brown urges voters not to back BNP': (Daily Telegraph website, 1 June 2009).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/5418918/Gordon-Brown-urges-voters-not-to-back-BNP.html
'David Cameron attacks "fascist" BNP: (Daily Telegraph website, 27 May 2009).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/mps-expenses/5395358/David-Cameron-attacks-fascist-BNP.html
Ben Padley, 'Nick Clegg attacks "evil, vile" BNP': (Independent website, 20 April 2010).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/nick-clegg-attacks-evil-vile-bnp-1949289.html
[11] It is worth noting that increased public debate in recent years concerning diversity, integration, shared values and the role of Islam in Western democracies has been far from exclusive to Britain. There have been examples of similar debates in all Western European countries. Some examples are the veil controversy in France; debate sparked by the murder of Theo van Gogh in the Netherlands; the Muhammad caricatures in Denmark; and public debate in Norway concerning exceptions for issues of conscience, more specifically whether Muslim police women should be allowed to wear the hijab with their uniform.

strike a balance between integration and cohesion on the one hand, and respect for diversity on the other.

The New Labour Government: Adapting to the Changing Context

In the wake of international terrorism, the New Labour government became increasingly concerned with imposing restrictions on immigration and launching new security measures in order to fight radicalisation and terrorism. With regard to immigration, the government introduced several restrictions, where the most notable was the points-based system. This system opened up for granting points to immigrants based on education and skills, and thus, as stated in the 2005 Labour general election manifesto, the more points, the 'more chance of being allowed to come here'.[12] As to security issues, several controversial policies were launched, both in the aftermath of the 2001 riots and terrorist attacks and especially after the 2005 London bombings. During Blunkett's time in the Home Office, several reductions in legal safeguards were introduced, such as the right to trial by jury, the double jeopardy principle and an increase in the right of the police to stop and search.[13] The most controversial security policies, however, were launched in the wake of the terrorist attack in London. In 2006, Parliament ratified the Terrorism Act 2006, a highly controversial Act dealing with offences related to terrorism. The Act was accused by many as a strain on civil liberties, and one of the key votes resulted in the first ever House of Commons defeat for the New Labour government.[14]

---

[12] The points-based system was proposed in New Labour's 2005 general election manifesto, and was implemented in 2008. Labour Party, *Britain forward not back* (2005 general election manifesto), p. 52; and 'Working in the UK': (Home Office - UK Border Agency website).
Accessed: 4 April 2011 from:
http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/workingintheuk/
[13] 'The abolition of double jeopardy will undermine confidence in British justice' (leading article): (Independent website, 18 July 2002).
Accessed: 10 April 2011 from:
http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/leading-articles/the-abolition-of-double-jeopardy-will-undermine-confidence-in-british-justice-648652.html
'Blunkett unveils stop and search measures': (Guardian website, 11 March 2002).
Accessed: 10 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2002/mar/11/immigrationpolicy.ukcrime
[14] The most contentious measures in the Terrorism Act 2006 were detention without trial and the offence of 'glorification' of terrorism. The government first proposed detention of terrorist suspects without trial for a maximum period of 90 days. After massive protests, this was cut down to 28 days in the final Act. Additionally, 'glorification' of terrorism, which was met with accusations of being a rather vague concept and a potential threat to civil liberties, was for the first time incorporated into terrorism legislation in the UK.
Terrorism Act 2006: (UK legislation website, 2006).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/11/contents/enacted

In Blunkett's time in the Home Office, a 'hard' approach also included a tougher stance on citizenship naturalisation. In 2002, Blunkett commissioned an advisory group, again with Bernard Crick as chairman, to devise the content of a citizenship naturalisation programme. This led to the introduction of a citizenship test, made a legal requirement in 2002, although not implemented until 2005 for naturalisation and 2007 for permanent residence.[15] In order to become a British citizen (and from 2007, also a resident), a person would have to go through a test consisting of questions related to British politics, society, history and culture. Moreover, immigrants who did not have sufficient language skills to complete the test would have to go through a combined English language and citizenship course. In addition to the citizenship test or course, the 2002 Act also introduced a naturalisation ceremony with an oath of allegiance and pledge to the UK.[16] This initiative is an apparent example of how citizenship was explicitly linked to national identity and shared values. Citizenship was now actively used as a measure to promote integration and belonging to Britain.

This newfound emphasis on using citizenship and national identity to promote integration and belonging can also clearly be seen in the Britishness debate, where several New Labour personalities were involved, albeit then as part of a 'soft' approach.[17] Gordon Brown, one of the most eager voices in the debate, related his interest in Britishness to 'just about every central question' Britain faced. He linked the promotion of shared values to the challenges coming about due to international relations; devolution and nationalism in the constitute nations of the UK; constitutional reform; and notably, the debates concerning immigration and diversity.[18] In other words, Brown's Britishness was linked to the perceived

Matthew Tempest, 'Terrorism Act comes into force': (Guardian website, 13 April 2006).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/apr/13/uksecurity.terrorism
[15] *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002*: (UK legislation website, 2002).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/41/contents/enacted
[16] *Ibid*.
[17] See for example:
Blunkett, 'For far too long we have left patriotism to the extremists': (Guardian website, 19 March 2005).
Accessed: 25 February 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2005/mar/19/britishidentity.uk
Jack Straw, 'We need a British story': (Times Online website, 29 April 2007).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article1720349.ece
[18] Brown, British Council Annual Lecture (7 July 2004): (Guardian website, 8 July 2004).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/jul/08/uk.labour1

need for the promotion of shared values in a changing Britain. Among the values he put forward as essentially 'British' were liberal democratic values like liberty, justice, tolerance, duty and 'fair play'.[19] He then linked British patriotism and the development of what he saw as British values to developments in the history of the islands, from the signing of Magna Carta in 1215 until the present day.[20] According to Brown, citizenship and shared values should to a larger extent be related to democratic developments in British history. In addition, he also argued for a greater prominence for these issues in Citizenship education in schools, as a way of engaging young people to reflect upon the perceived common ground provided by British values.[21]

New Labour and the Conservatives: Convergence and Conflict

New Labour's adjustment to the changing circumstances, and the form this adjustment was given, could both be seen as a product of the time and a reflection of the party's ideological position. The then government's adaptation to the changing context was not surprising, and it is likely that any British government, no matter party belonging, would have felt the need to shift the course in the wake of these significant events. Thus, it is likely that also a Conservative government would have imposed strict security and immigration policies, perhaps even more so than a Labour government. As stated in the Conservative 2005 general election manifesto:

> A Conservative government will place the highest possible priority on combating the threat from terrorism. This requires a co-ordinated response right across government, including funding for the intelligence services, training for the emergency services, robust anti-terror laws, controlled immigration and rigorous arrangements for the extradition and deportation of terrorist suspects.[22]

Thus, it seems fair to argue that also a Conservative-led government would have been

---

[19] *Ibid*.
Brown, 'We need a United Kingdom': (Daily Telegraph website, 13 January 2007).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1539367/We-need-a-United-Kingdom.html
Brown, 'The Future of Britishness' (14 January 2007): (Fabian Society website).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.fabians.org.uk/events/speeches/the-future-of-britishness
[20] *Ibid*.
[21] *Ibid*.
[22] Conservative Party, *It's Time for Action*, p. 16: (2005 Conservative Party general election manifesto): (Conservative Party website).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.conservatives.com/pdf/manifesto-uk-2005.pdf

committed to a tough response to terrorism. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the Conservatives opposed the original terrorism Bill, which eventually led to the 2006 Terrorism Act, on the grounds that the proposed detention for 90 days without trial was a limitation of individual liberty. This is an example of a situation where ideological differences led to dissimilar approaches to how to counter terrorism, since liberals within all three major parties in Britain opposed the Bill on the ground that it was a limitation of civil rights.[23] Thus, even though it is highly probable that also a Conservative government would have imposed stricter security policies in the face of international terrorism, it seems as their approach would have been coloured by their party belonging and ideological background. In terms of immigration, it is also likely that the Conservatives would have introduced strict policies as a response to the change in the political climate, perhaps even more so than the New Labour government. This is illustrated by how the Conservatives, like the New Labour government, were in favour of introducing the points-based system for immigration.[24] Moreover, in other areas they advocated an even stricter approach to immigration than the then government, arguing in favour of stricter border control, a separate British Border Control Police and an annual immigration limit set by Parliament.[25]

Nonetheless, when it came to the promotion of Britishness, there were some evident differences between New Labour and the Conservatives. As seen with the citizenship naturalisation programme and Gordon Brown's contributions to the Britishness debate, New Labour's definition of national identity emphasised the promotion of common citizenship values, such as justice, tolerance, equality and duty, as a shared bond for Britain's diverse population. Moreover, Brown emphasised the use of British history to foster an understanding of the development of these values through time.[26] The Conservatives have, however, fronted

---

[23] Tempest, 'Terrorist Act comes into force': (Guardian website, 13 April 2006).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/apr/13/uksecurity.terrorism
[24] Conservative Party, *It's Time for Action*, p. 19: (2005 Conservative Party general election manifesto) (Conservative Party website).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.conservatives.com/pdf/manifesto-uk-2005.pdf
[25] *Ibid*., p. 19.
[26] *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002*: (UK legislation website, 2002).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/41/contents/enacted
Brown, British Council Annual Lecture, 7 July 2004: (Guardian website, 8 July 2004).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/jul/08/uk.labour1
Brown, 'We need a United Kingdom': (Daily Telegraph website, 13 January 2007).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:

a somewhat different approach to British national identity and the use of history. The Conservative definition of Britishness has been closely linked to a traditional concept of nationhood, with an emphasis on history, key institutions, culture and even the 'nature' or 'character' of the people.[27] Also after New Labour came to power, the Conservatives have, despite acknowledging devolution and constitutional reform, been careful to depict themselves as the party that protects British interests against what they perceive as threats to the British nation, most notably de-centralisation or supra-nationalism, mass-scale immigration and 'extreme nationalism within the UK'.[28] Alongside central institutions, such as the UK Parliament, the Conservatives have emphasised the importance of British history and culture in the shaping of the British national 'character'.[29] As argued by Michael Gove in his contribution to a book on Britishness from 2009, being British includes having a 'coherent sense of the narrative of British history'; being familiar with 'the importance of institutions in giving shape, voice and character to national identity'; and having extensive knowledge of traditional British culture, including 'the one which defines our character the most', literature.[30] Thus, a Conservative view of nationhood has been more closely linked to tradition, history, mainstream culture, and even to the 'nature' or 'character' of the people, than what has been the case with New Labour.[31]

It seems fair to argue that the left-of-centre perspective on Britishness, with its emphasis on values rather than tradition and 'character', could be seen as providing a more open and inclusive approach to national identity in a multicultural state like the UK. Significantly, a plausible argument seems to be that the New Labour approach to Britishness, citizenship and diversity was reflected in the party's policy at the time, since the party sought to achieve a balance between integration and common bonds on the one hand, and an appreciation of the diversity of the UK on the other. In the changing social and political context, the government saw it as increasingly important to provide this balanced approach.

The mixture between a 'hard' and a 'soft' approach on these issues is somewhat

---

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1539367/We-need-a-United-Kingdom.html
Brown, 'The Future of Britishness', 14 January 2007: (Fabian Society website). Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.fabians.org.uk/events/speeches/the-future-of-britishness
[27] Philip Lynch, 'The Conservative Party and Nationhood', *The Political Quarterly*, 71 (2000), pp. 59-67; and Michael Gove, '1688 and All That', in *Being British: The Search for the Values That Bind the Nation*, ed., Matthew D'Ancona (Edinburgh, 2009), p. 197.
[28] Lynch, 'The Conservative Party and Nationhood', *TPQ*, 1 (2000), p. 62.
[29] *Ibid*., pp. 59-67; and Gove, 1688 and All That', in *Being British*, ed, D'Ancona, pp. 197-205.
[30] Gove, 1688 and All That', in *Being British*, ed, D'Ancona, pp. 201-203.
[31] *Ibid*., pp. 197-205.

typical for left-of-centre parties at the time, including New Labour.[32] The party sought to create a 'tough' image on issues such as immigration, justice and crime in order to be perceived as a trustworthy and thus electable party for the centre-ground, where the majority of the electorate can be found. At the same time, the party was concerned to secure its image as a *left*-of-centre party, apprehensive with issues typically linked to the left, such as social equality and appreciation of diversity. This 'soft' approach was needed in order to secure the support of the traditional left and the grassroots of the Labour Party. Thus, for the New Labour government, representing a left-of-centre stand in politics, it was highly significant to provide *both* a 'hard' and a 'soft' stance, in order to please *both* the grassroots of the party and the general electorate.[33] In this respect, *education* was perceived as a 'soft' field.

Especially in the aftermath of the 2005 London bombings, did the government to an increasing degree see education as such an arena. This may be linked to schools, especially from a left-of-centre perspective, often being seen as a place for a 'rounded' education and a natural arena for contemporary issues to be addressed. Since a majority of children and young people in Britain attend the maintained school sector, this is a field where the government easily can address significant contemporary issues and contribute to the forming of future citizens.[34] Thus, education was perceived as a natural place for addressing crucial issues at the time; a place where the government could aim to strike a suitable balance between integration and common values on the one hand, and tolerance and respect for diversity on the other. These developments then paved the way for the revision of the Citizenship curriculum. It will thus be argued that the revision mainly came about due to the shift in the political and social climate, but that the form the revision was given must be seen in relation to the left-of-centre perspective of New Labour.

New Labour and the Citizenship Revision

Whereas the introduction of the Citizenship subject had come about largely due to the determination of David Blunkett, the then Education Secretary, the revision was instead largely a consequence of the pressure created by changing contextual circumstances, and the

---

[32] Freeden, 'The Ideology of New Labour'. *TPQ*, 70 (2002), pp. 42-51; and Squires, 'New Labour and the politics of antisocial behaviour'. *CSP*, 26 (2006), pp.144-168. See also Tim Newburn and Robert Reiner, 'Crime and penal policy', in *Blair's Britain, 1997-2007*, ed., Anthony Seldon (Cambridge, 2007).

[33] Gray, 'Blair's project in retrospect'. *IA,* 80 (2004), pp.39-48; and Campbell and Rockman, 'Third way leadership, old way government. *BJPR*, 3 (2001), pp.36-48.

[34] For an eloquent elaboration of this argument, see Margaret Cole, 'Education and social democracy', in *New Fabian Essays*, ed., R.H.S. Crossman (London, 1952).

perceived need within the New Labour government that these issues needed to be tackled. Citizenship education was, however, not the only educational arena where this new emphasis on integration and community cohesion was imposed. As part of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, all maintained schools in England were given the statutory duty to 'promote community cohesion'.[35] The ideal, a cohesive society, was in this regard defined as a place with a 'common vision' and 'sense of belonging'.[36] This legal requirement imposed on schools supports the argument that the government to an increasing extent saw education as an arena to promote integration, belonging and shared ground in a multicultural and multi-religious society.

Around the same time, Citizenship was put forward as a particularly relevant arena within schools to engage with identity and diversity issues.[37] In Citizenship, the pupils were to learn about their rights and responsibilities as citizens, liberal democratic values and the workings of democracy. Thus, it is fair to argue that the emphasis on linking diversity and identity issues more closely with shared citizenship and the rights and responsibilities of being a citizen, made Citizenship a natural field to promote these issues.[38] These factors, combined with a large secondary curriculum review taking place at the time, paved the way for the revision of the Citizenship curriculum.[39]

Interestingly, the decision to explore a possible revision of Citizenship could be seen as related to the limited way in which diversity and identity had been dealt with in the Crick report and the original programmes of study. The decision to commission the curriculum review group was made within the then Department for Education and Skills in Ruth Kelly's time as Secretary of State. The immediate cause for it was the Ofsted findings that ethnic, cultural and religious diversity was dealt with to an insufficient extent in schools; that there was a large amount of variation in terms of the amount and quality of Citizenship education; and that issues of identity and diversity were more often neglected than not in the teaching of

---

[35] *Education and Inspections Act 2006*: (UK legislation website, 2006). Accessed: 20 April 2011 from: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/40/section/38

[36] Department for Children, Schools and Families, *Guidance on the duty to promote community cohesion*, p. 3: (Department for Education website, July 2007). Accessed: 20 April 2011 from: http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DCSF-00598-2007.pdf

[37] Interview with Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011).

[38] This view is supported by Derek Heater, *What is Citizenship?* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 174.

[39] QCA, *Preparing for the Future: Secondary Curriculum Review Explained*: (SecEd website). Accessed: 5 April 2011 from: http://www.sec-ed.co.uk/public/downloads/supp-scre.pdf

the subject.[40] As noted in chapter three, diversity and identity issues were not addressed to a large extent in the Crick report or the original programmes of study.[41] Considering the lack of emphasis on diversity and identity, and the relatively little space it was granted in the curriculum, it is not particularly unexpected that these issues were not explored to any greater degree in schools. As seen in the previous chapter, the focus at the introduction of the subject was not on diversity issues, but rather on active citizenship and this emphasis was then reflected in the teaching of citizenship. The Ofsted findings which indicated uneven teaching of diversity issues signalled that something needed to be done, and the opportunity arose within a larger curriculum review for key stages 3 and 4 at the time.[42] This reform provided a chance to explore the findings to a greater extent and see whether the subject should be revised in order to strengthen the emphasis on diversity and identity issues.[43]

Even though the immediate cause for the revision was the Ofsted findings and the opportunity of a curriculum review, the changing political and social context should be seen as the underlying cause.[44] Consequently, the revision of the Citizenship curriculum should be seen as part of the wider picture at the time. Even though the decision to commission a review of the Citizenship curriculum was made within the then Department for Education and Skills,

[40] *Ibid*.
Ofsted, *Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools* (London, 2006), p. 2: (Ofsted website, 28 September 2006).
Accessed: 6 April 2011 from:
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Education/Curriculum/Citizenship/Secondary/Towards-consensus-Citizenship-in-secondary-schools
Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), pp. 6-7.
(Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[41]QCA, *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998): (Tesis en Xarxa website).
Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf
DfEE and QCA, *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*: (National Curriculum website).
Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf
[42] QCA, *Preparing for the Future: Secondary Curriculum Review Explained*: (SecEd website).
Accessed: 5 April 2011 from:
http://www.sec-ed.co.uk/public/downloads/supp-scre.pdf
[43] Interview with Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011).
[44] Interviews with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011) and Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011).
Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), pp. 16-18: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf

this was a decision which fitted well with New Labour's integration and cohesion scheme. Education was in this regard perceived as a suitable arena to impose a 'soft' approach to these issues. As seen, around the same time, the government introduced strict immigration and security policies, which were met with much controversy. Dealing with these issues in education was considered to be both a way to achieve a rounded approach to integration and cohesion and as a measure to counter the criticism against the party's 'hard-line' approach in other areas.[45] The government was concerned about 'striking the right balance' between promotion of integration on the one hand, and appreciation of the multicultural make-up of Britain on the other.[46] Anti-Muslim resentment and a resurgence of racism and xenophobia were perceived as disturbing consequences of the changing political and social context. Both Lord Jim Knight, Minister for Schools and Learners during most of the revision process, and Conor Ryan, the senior education adviser to Tony Blair from 2005 to 2007, have argued that New Labour felt that something needed to be done to counter anti-diversity, and especially anti-Muslim, resentment:

> I think in some communities within Britain there were tensions. We were seeing also the rise of the British National Party, a far-right, centrally racist, political party, getting elected into the European Parliament. The tensions were there within some communities, with resentments towards migrants being confused in some people's minds […] The government was committed and concerned to do whatever we could to reduce that sort of anti-Muslim tension, and to understand that there was a respect regardless of race.
>
> (Lord Jim Knight)[47]

> I think Tony Blair was very concerned at the time about striking the right balance, so that you did not get a lot of tensions building up. So that there was an understanding of what it meant to be a British citizen, but also he was quite keen that people understood different faiths and that there was an understanding of Islam as well.
>
> (Conor Ryan)[48]

This commitment to 'striking the right balance' was also linked to New Labour's support of faith schools.[49] Government-funded religious schooling was an issue Tony Blair

---

[45] Interview with Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011).

[46] Interviews with Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011) and Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011). The quote is from Conor Ryan.

[47] Interview with Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011).

[48] Interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).

[49] Interviews with Lady Estelle Morris (London, 9 March 2011) and Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011). In England about a third of the maintained schools are so-called faith schools, which are government-funded but with a particular religious character. Except for religious education, faith schools have to follow the National Curriculum.
'Faith Schools': (Department for Education website, 8 February 2011).
Accessed: 30 March 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/typesofschools/b0066996/faith-schools/

was personally committed to, and faith schools had been put forward as a significant part of the government's educational policies, related to New Labour's beliefs in promoting diversity in the school system and increasing autonomy for schools.[50] Until New Labour was elected into government in 1997, all faith schools in England were either Christian or Jewish. In New Labour's years in power, however, the party both made a significant increase to the number of faith schools in general and opened up for the establishment of several schools with a different religious character, including Muslim and Sikh schools.[51] Especially following the 2005 London bombings, which initiated a debate on whether British communities were becoming increasingly segregated and British Muslim youth more radicalised, the faith schools scheme was met with strong criticism. The critics argued that faith-based education lead to social divisions, and that it was thus a step in the wrong direction in terms of achieving integration and community cohesion.[52] Subject to this criticism, it became ever more significant for New Labour to achieve a balance between allowing for faith-based education on the one hand, and promoting shared values and social cohesion through education on the other.[53] According to Conor Ryan, the decision to look into a revision of the Citizenship curriculum should be seen as a reflection of this balancing act. Since all government-funded faith schools in England are legally required to follow the National Curriculum, New Labour was concerned that issues of diversity, tolerance, cohesion and identity should be emphasised in the curriculum:

---

[50] Blair is himself a devout Catholic and deeply interested in religion and religious diversity. His belief in faith schools was also reflected in his wife Cherie and his decision to send their children to the Oratory, a Catholic maintained school in London ; a decision that sparked controversy at the time. Blair, *A Journey* (London, 2010), pp. 87-88, 690.
Stephen Bates, 'After 30 years as a closet Catholic, Blair finally puts faith before politics': (Guardian website, 22 June 2007).
Accessed: 15 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2007/jun/22/uk.religion1
Robert Jackson, 'Should the State Fund Faith-Based Schools? A Review of the Arguments', *British Journal of Religious Education*, 25 (2003), p. 91.
[51] Roy Gardner, 'Faith Schools Now: An Overview', in *Faith Schools: Consensus or Conflict?*, eds., Roy Gardner, Jo Cairns and Denis Lawton (London, 2005), pp. 7-13;
Derek Gillard, 'Glass in their Snowballs: the faith schools debate': (The History of Education in England website, December 2001).
Accessed: 4 April 2011 from:
http://www.educationengland.org.uk/articles/19faithschools.html
'Facts about faith schools': (Guardian website, 14 November 2001).
Accessed: 4 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2001/nov/14/schools.uk2
[52] National Secular Society, 'Faith Schools': (National Secular Society website, 11 October 2005).
Accessed: 5 April 2011 from:
http://www.secularism.org.uk/faithschools.html
[53] Interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).

He [Tony Blair] was a supporter of faith schools. He was quite concerned that if you are going to have faith schools […] that the curriculum on these issues, and issues of identity and so on, needed to be quite a strong curriculum. Ofsted [the schools' inspectorate] was going to make sure that schools were not being hotbeds to extremism.[54]

Furthermore, the revision of the Citizenship curriculum could also be seen in relation to the government's need to strike a balance within the Labour Party. As noted, the 'hard' approach to security and immigration may be seen as a measure to provide New Labour with a tough, trustable image for the centre-ground electorate. The Labour backbenchers and grassroots, however, had been far from pleased with this approach. Due to a revolt from the Labour backbenchers against the terrorism Bill, the New Labour government experienced its first defeat in the House of Commons.[55] Faith schools had been another source of controversy within the party, an alternative within the education sector which many within the party saw as a threat to comprehensive and non-selective education as well as to integration and social cohesion.[56] Thus, the revision of Citizenship may also be seen in light of the government's need to satisfy the backbenchers and the party grassroots, which to a great extent were further to the left than the government and the general electorate.

The Curriculum Review Group

In early 2006, following the belief that education was an arena where identity and diversity issues should be dealt with to a greater extent, the then Department for Education and Skills commissioned an advisory group to review the teaching of diversity in education in general, and in Citizenship in particular. Additionally, in relation to Citizenship, the review group was to explore whether 'modern British social and cultural history' should become a new strand.[57] The three members of the curriculum review group all had expertise and credibility within the field of diversity issues in education. All three, Sir Keith Ajegbo, Dr Dina Kiwan and Seema Sharma, had worked widely with diversity in education in general, and in relation to civic

---

[54] *Ibid*.

[55] Tempest, 'Terrorism Act comes into force': (Guardian website, 13 April 2006).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/apr/13/uksecurity.terrorism

[56] Gillard, 'Glass in their Snowballs: the faith schools debate': (The History of Education in England website).
Accessed: 4 April 2011 from:
http://www.educationengland.org.uk/articles/19faithschools.html

[57] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 13: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf

70

education in particular. Sir Ajegbo, the chairman of the group, retired in July 2006 from his position as Headteacher of Deptford Green School in London, an ethnically diverse school with a strong reputation for civic education. Dr Dina Kiwan, a lecturer in citizenship education at Birkbeck College, University of London, had done extensive research in the field and had contributed to the implementation of the citizenship naturalisation programme in the Home Office. The third member of the group, Seema Sharma was the Assistant Headteacher at Ajegbo's former school in Deptford Green, and had contributed to the work on diversity and ethnic minority achievement there.[58] All the members came from the educational field; Sir Ajegbo and Sharma had hands-on experience from the school sector, whereas Dr Kiwan could provide an academic perspective on issues of diversity, citizenship and education. Thus, it seems fair to argue that the group member's expertise and authority within their fields made the three attractive for these positions.

It is worth noting that the composition of the curriculum review group was very different from that of the Crick advisory group, commissioned before the introduction of the Citizenship subject. Whereas the advisory group had been large, consisting of people representing different parties, organisations and other interests, the curriculum review group only included three members, all from the educational sphere. There were two main reasons for this tightening of the process. Firstly, the mandate of the Crick advisory group had been to explore the possibility of how to include a *new* subject into the curriculum and what form this subject should have. This was naturally a much greater task than looking into a possible revision of an *already existing* curriculum.[59] Secondly, as discussed in chapter three, the composition of the Crick advisory group reflected a desire to achieve consensus across a broad political and societal spectrum. In order to strengthen the viability of the subject, it was considered crucial to reach beyond core professional or partisan interests. The revision was, however, both more limited in scope and less exposed to the dangers of new initiatives which had loomed over the introduction of the subject. As outlined in the previous chapter, diversity was de-emphasised in the Crick report partially due to a concern that it would be seen as a contentious issue. At the time of the revision process, however, diversity was no longer seen as similarly controversial. Instead, due to the changing social and political context, it was

---

[58] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 13: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[59] *Ibid*.

pressure both from within the New Labour government and elsewhere that such issues should be dealt with to a larger degree.[60] Put differently, changing circumstances led to intensified debates on these issues, and thus paved the way for a greater prominence for identity and diversity issues in the Citizenship curriculum.

The Ajegbo Report

In their report *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship*, published on 25 January 2007, the review group argued that it was important to focus more on diversity and identity issues in English schools in general, and in Citizenship in particular. The group linked this emphasis to the political and social context, both nationally and internationally, and a growing debate revolving around issues of '"race", religion, culture, identity and values in the UK':

> The Diversity and Citizenship Curriculum Review was commissioned in response to a growing debate about whether UK society engages with issues around 'race', religion, culture, identity and values in the UK today, in a way that meets the need of all pupils. Do we, as individuals and as a nation, respect each other's differences and build on commonalities? Do we appreciate our own and others' distinct identities? Do we really have an understanding of what it is to be a citizen, of how it is to live in the UK? And, most importantly, are we ensuring that all our children and young people have the education they need to embrace issues of diversity and citizenship, both for them to thrive and for the future of our society? This 'education for diversity' is fundamental if the UK is to have a cohesive society in the 21st century.[61]

As had also been emphasised by the New Labour government, the review group argued that it was important to define more clearly the balance between integration and cohesion on the one hand, and respect for ethnic, cultural and religious differences on the other. As put by the review group, 'the changing nature of the UK and potential for tension to arise now makes it ever more pressing for us to work towards community cohesion, fostering mutual understanding within schools so that valuing difference and understanding what binds us together become part of the way pupils think and behave'.[62] Education, and particularly Citizenship, was seen as a significant arena to promote these issues.

Among its key findings, the review group pointed to the evidence of uneven quality and quantity of the provision of diversity teaching in schools in general; and in citizenship

---

[60] Interviews with David Blunkett and Conor Ryan (London, 9-10 March 2011); and Osler, 'Citizenship education and the Ajegbo report', *LRE*, 6 (2008), p. 11.

[61] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 16: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

72

education in particular. These findings were linked to a number of factors, including Citizenship education, and diversity in particular, often being low priorities for school leaders; lack of confidence and training among teachers in terms of dealing with these issues; insufficient knowledge of the curriculum and how links to diversity could be made; inadequate consideration for pupils' voice; poor links with local communities on these issues; and also existing stereotypes and notions of racial hierarchies within schools.[63] In other words, it seemed as if an inconsistent approach to Citizenship education had led to relatively poor understanding and teaching of the Citizenship subject in general and of diversity issues in particular. This unevenness could also be seen as partially related to the 'light touch' approach set out in the 2000 Citizenship Order. Due to this approach, the aims in the curriculum were widely interpreted, and few guidelines had in several cases led to neglect of Citizenship education in schools.[64] Diversity and identity issues, which had been largely de-emphasised in the original programmes of study, had been most clearly affected by this.[65]

In terms of recommendations, the report dealt with both schools in general and Citizenship education in particular.[66] As to Citizenship, the group outlined that it should be taught as a discrete subject in schools since findings indicated that this often was the most successful approach. The 'light touch' approach, the group argued, should be replaced by greater definition and support.[67] In addition, the review group put forward the following recommendations: more teacher training places if the demand for Citizenship teachers increased; placing priority on whole-curriculum planning and development of how to link Citizenship more closely with other subjects, with the school ethos and with the local communities; and the development of a full GCSE in Citizenship.[68] Thus, the review group recommended that Citizenship should be given a stronger position in schools, across the curriculum and in regards to assessment, in order to improve the provision of the subject.

Most importantly, the review group recommended the introduction of a new, fourth strand in the Citizenship curriculum: *Identity and Diversity: Living Together in the UK*.[69] It

---

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[65] *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 89.

[66] See *Ibid.*, pp. 9-12, for a summary of the recommendations of the curriculum review group.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[68] The General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) is a national examination taken by pupils in England at the end of key stage 4, at the age of 15-16. The pupils generally take GCSEs in several subjects. *Ibid.*, p. 11; John Oakland, *Contemporary Britain: A Survey with Texts* (London, 2001), p. 204.

[69] The curriculum review group recommended that this strand should be added to the three already existing strands: *Social and Moral Responsibility*, *Community Involvement* and *Political Literacy*.

was argued that there was a need for stronger emphasis on issues of diversity, identity and values in the Citizenship, and that this best would be solved through the incorporation of a new, explicitly stated component on identity and diversity issues.[70] This strand, as outlined in the report, should include critical thinking about ethnicity and religion, link this to political issues and values, and use modern British history to shed light on contemporary issues in relation to citizenship issues.[71] Themes that were recommended to be included in the strand were: Britain as a multinational state, comprising England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland; immigration to the UK; the Commonwealth and imperial legacy; the European Union; and how the struggle for the franchise and other citizenship rights has been a historical struggle, including references to the legacy of slavery, universal suffrage and equal opportunities legislation.[72] As put in the report, this strand was seen as a way to 'provide pupils with more explicit learning opportunities around the contrasting but complementary themes of diversity on the one hand, and unity or "shared values" on the other, in the context of the UK'.[73] It is interesting to see this recommendation in light of the Crick report and the criticism it received for promoting citizenship as a completed project. The Ajegbo report, to a significantly larger extent than the Crick report, addressed how citizenship has been a changing concept through time, and how it has has been affected by an ongoing struggle for the franchise and other citizenship rights.

Nevertheless, the report was met with criticism for some of the same reasons as the Crick report. Professor Audrey Osler has argued that the report did not provide any critical thinking on structural inequality, but instead endorsed an approach to diversity which emphasised the 'study of the other' and 'celebration' of diversity.[74] By not explicitly dealing with structural inequality, Professor Osler argued, it echoed the Crick report; viewing citizenship as a completed project, and failing to discuss possible threats to citizenship and democracy.[75] Professor Osler has a fair point with regard to structural inequality, and the de-emphasis of this could be seen as problematic. Nonetheless, the lack of stress on this issue

---

[70] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 12: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[71] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[73] *Ibid.*, p. 89.
[74] Osler, 'Citizenship education and the Ajegbo report: re-imagining a cosmopolitan nation', *LRE*, 6 (2008), p.15.
[75] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

74

should be seen in relation to the political and social context.

The pressure at the time, in the public debate and from the New Labour government, was not on structural inequality, but rather on how to strike a balance between integration and an appreciation or, as Professor Osler has called it, 'celebration', of diversity. The curriculum review group emphasised integration and shared values, and at the same time acknowledgement and celebration of the multicultural nature of the country. Racism, discrimination and institutional inequality could be seen as implicitly covered by the focus on the fostering of respect and tolerance, rather than explicit measures. Hence, it could be argued that the Ajegbo report, with its emphasis on a balance between commonalities and diversity, was largely in accordance with the general tendency in Britain at the time. Moreover, through placing emphasis on the legacy of Empire and slavery, as well as the development of enfranchisement and other citizenship rights, it could be argued that the report implicitly encouraged work on racism and structural inequality. These historical links could thus be used as a help to explore these issues today.

When it comes to downplaying structural inequality, there is also a more general observation to be made with regard to New Labour. Looking at poverty reduction and redistribution, it has been often been noted that the party favoured what has been called 'redistribution by stealth'. The key idea is that consistent work to promote opportunity for all has not been accompanied by a public discourse on the ills of inequality. New Labour's official policy was thus one of emphasising individual responsibility and a great hesitation to focus upon structural inequalities in fear of falling back into a political conflict where Labour was seen as merely the party of the underprivileged.[76] It is a plausible argument that this tendency to downplay traditional issues of class (as social structure of inequality) was also reflected in the debates regarding the Citizenship subject.

With regard to the issue of national identity, it is worth noting that the review group chose to use the term 'living together in the UK' rather than 'Britishness', although the latter as seen had been the topic of a public debate that had included Gordon Brown and other notable New Labour personalities. According to the report, 'Britishness' was a problematic term because it 'was a complex, multifaceted concept that is understood differently by

---

[76] Tom Sefton, John Hills and Holly Sutherland, 'Poverty, inequality and redistribution', in *Towards a More Equal Society? Poverty, Inequality and Policy Since 1997*, eds., John Hills, Tom Sefton and Kitty Stewart (Bristol, 2009); and Anatole Kaletsky, 'There's no socialist nostalgia lurking in the recesses of Brown's mind', The Times, 10 March 2005.

different people'.[77] As discussed in the report, the concept of Britishness is linked to a number of themes, including geography, national symbols, people, values, cultural habits, historical achievements, language and nationality. Thus, it is a concept that is difficult to define because it is so widely interpreted.[78] Consequently, the curriculum review group decided instead to use the phrase 'living together in the UK', which they felt better reflected the aims of the new strand. This decision was inspired by the citizenship naturalisation programme developed a few years earlier, where Dr Dina Kiwan had been among the contributors. The naturalisation programme placed emphasis on the '"experience of living together in the UK" contextualised in relation to recent history, rather than abstract notions of "Britishness"'.[79] Even though this might come across as a subtle difference, the review group argued that whereas the first was 'practical, fluid and inclusive', the latter had the potential of being too 'fixed' and even 'excluding'.[80] Lord Jim Knight, junior minister in the Education Department at the time, has supported this decision:

> This [decision] is a justification for getting someone independent because, particularly at that time, we had a lot of public concern about immigration, the rise of far-right parties like the BNP, and there is always a danger of politicians slipping into talking up things in a sort of nationalistic language. There was that danger in what was being said about Britishness […] [Sir] Keith [Ajegbo] wanted to come up with something which was sensible to all citizens in the UK, regardless of their ethnic origin, including those who would not necessarily define themselves first and foremost as necessarily British; where people would have multiple identities. I think he was able to come up with a language that in the end we all accepted.[81]

Thus, in order to strike the right balance between the encouragement of commonalities on the one hand and appreciating diversity on the other, the review group recommended an approach to national identity and belonging which they meant reflected both, and which would be acceptable to a wider range of people than the somewhat controversial term 'Britishness'.

It is worth pointing out how the review group's phrase 'living in the UK' shared both differences and similarities with Gordon Brown's notion of Britishness. Both concepts put emphasis on the promotion of 'shared values', more specifically liberal democratic values, to

---

[77] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 91: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[78] *Ibid*., p. 91.
[79] *Ibid*., p. 93.
[80] *Ibid*., p. 93.
[81] Interview with Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011).

create common ground in a multicultural state like the UK. Still, whereas Brown linked these values to British patriotism and events in British history, the review group stressed that these 'shared values' were not necessarily mainly British, nor should the promotion of them somehow challenge or oppose the appreciation of diversity.[82] Values, the review group argued, only become 'shared' when they are adopted by the state. Thus, liberal democratic values like democracy, justice, equality and tolerance should be considered as shared British values because they have been adopted by the British state. Notwithstanding, this does not make them exclusively or mainly British.[83] Both Brown and the review group argued in favour of connecting Citizenship education more closely with British history, but their approaches to the issue differed. Brown, on the one hand, put forward a narrative which revolved around how Britain had been a 'beacon for the world' in terms of promoting liberty, justice, tolerance and 'fair play'.[84] In his narrative, he conveniently more or less overlooked problematic aspects which did not fit into his celebrated portrait of Britain, such as the oppression of indigenous peoples in the colonies and Ireland, the Atlantic slave trade, the class dimension and gender inequality.[85] The Ajegbo report, on the other hand, provided a more nuanced view on British history, and recommended to include themes related to troubled and controversial aspects of Britain's past, including the Empire, slavery, the extension of the franchise and Northern Ireland (implicitly including the Irish question and the Northern Ireland conflict).[86] Thus, there were some significant differences between how

---

[82] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 93: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[83] *Ibid.*, p.93.
[84] Brown, 'We need a United Kingdom': (Daily Telegraph website, 13 January 2007).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1539367/We-need-a-United-Kingdom.html
[85] Osler, 'Patriotism, multiculturalism and belonging: political discourse and the teaching of history', *Educational Review*, 61 (2009), p. 88;
Brown, British Council Annual Lecture, 7 July 2004: (Guardian website, 8 July 2004).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/jul/08/uk.labour1
Brown, 'We need a United Kingdom': (Daily Telegraph website, 13 January 2007).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1539367/We-need-a-United-Kingdom.html
Brown, 'The Future of Britishness', 14 January 2007: (Fabian Society website).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.fabians.org.uk/events/speeches/the-future-of-britishness
[86] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 97 (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf

British identity and history were dealt with by Brown and the curriculum review group.

Despite the differences between Brown and the Ajegbo group in terms of the perspectives on British identity, it is fair to argue that the recommendations in the report reflected a left-of-centre feel, and that the approach would have been different in the case of a Conservative government. Brown and the Ajegbo group had in common that they both emphasised liberal democratic values and democratic developments in British history, in order to promote a mixture between integration and appreciation of diversity. As seen above, the Conservatives have promoted a more traditional approach to nationhood. Instead of relating Britishness mainly to *values*, the Conservative definition of British national identity has stressed the importance of *tradition*, including central institutions, history and culture for the formation of the British national 'character'.[87] Hence, the left-of-centre perspective on these issues could be seen as more tolerant and inclusive in terms of dealing with diversity, since the Conservative approach to a large extent is linked to white British 'mainstream' culture.[88] The Conservative notion of Britishness, it may be argued, is not particularly helpful in a diverse society like the UK, where it is hard, if not impossible, to pin down one definition of Britishness and where people may have multiple identities.

New Labour, the curriculum review group and the Conservatives may all have emphasised British history in relation to the concept of citizenship, but the way this was done was somewhat different for the three. Gordon Brown's history narrative stressed democratic developments in British history, but failed to acknowledge Britain's troubled past. The Ajegbo report, however, provided a more balanced approach to British history, where also the darker sides of the nation's past were included. With regard to the Conservatives, it is worth noting that history, particularly British history, holds a strong position and is perceived as intimately related to the nation and national identity.[89] This is also reflected in the party's education policy, where History is fronted as one of the key subjects.[90] Noticeably, the Ajegbo report was met with praise from the Conservatives, for its emphasis on the importance

---

[87] Gove, '1688 and All That', in *Being British*, ed., D'Ancona (Edinburgh, 2009), pp. 197-205; and Lynch, 'The Conservative Party and Nationhood', *TPQ*, 1 (2000), pp. 59-67.
[88] Lynch, 'The Conservative Party and Nationhood', *TPQ*, 1 (2000), pp.59-67.
[89] Gove, '1688 and All That', in *Being British*, ed., D'Ancona, pp. 197-205; and Lynch, 'The Conservative Party and Nationhood', *TPQ*, 71 (2000), pp. 59-67.
[90] Gove, 'National Curriculum review: children failed by Labour's education reforms, says Gove': (Daily Telegraph website, 20 January 2011).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/8269906/National-curriculum-review-children-failed-by-Labours-education-reforms-says-Gove.html

of British history for a better understanding of citizenship. As stated by David Willetts, the then Shadow Education Secretary, at the day the report was launched: 'Grounding citizenship on the teaching of British history is crucial. We believe citizenship shouldn't [sic] just be taught in the abstract but linked very closely to narrative British history'.[91] Nevertheless, as noted by Lord Jim Knight, the Conservatives also used the revision to promote their view that instead of providing a stronger role for British history within Citizenship, History as a subject in its own right should play a stronger role in schools.[92] This view has also been advocated by the party in government, with Michael Gove as Education Secretary. The present coalition government has commissioned a curriculum review group to explore a revision of the National Curriculum. As part of this review, it seems as History will be granted a stronger position than it has today, and that there will be a return to a more traditional approach to the teaching of the subject with focus on a chronological narrative combined with stress on significant 'facts'.[93]

The Revised Programmes of Study

The recommendations in the Ajegbo report were largely accepted by the Department for Education and Skills and the New Labour government. Notably, unlike what had been the case in the process leading to the introduction of the subject, the work on the programmes was largely left to the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.[94] When creating the Citizenship subject, the process within the QCA had been closely monitored by Bernard Crick with the support of David Blunkett. This was done in order to create a subject which was as much as possible in accordance with Crick and Blunkett's ideas on active citizenship, and avoid too much influence from the QCA, where there had been a significant amount of scepticism. However, since the revision of the Citizenship curriculum was never controversial to the same extent, and not the personal project of any one politician, this part of the revision was largely

---

[91] David Willetts, quoted in 'Schools "must teach Britishness"': (BBC News website, 25 January 2007).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/education/6294643.stm
[92] Interview with Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011).
[93] 'Gove stresses "facts" in school curriculum revamp': (BBC News website, 20 January 2011).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-12227491
Gove, 'National Curriculum review: children failed by Labour's education reforms, says Gove': (Daily Telegraph website, 20 January 2011).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/8269906/National-curriculum-review-children-failed-by-Labours-education-reforms-says-Gove.html
[94] Interview with Lord Jim Knight (Oslo/London, 24 March 2011).

left to the QCA, as is the normal procedure in such processes.[95] The revised programmes of study in Citizenship for key stages 3 and 4 were then published on 30 August 2007, and the Revision Order was laid before Parliament on 10 July the next year.[96] In August 2008, the Order came into force and the revised subject was implemented in schools.[97]

      After the secondary curriculum review, all the revised programmes of study followed the same structure: *Curriculum aims*, stating the general National Curriculum aims which were relevant for the particular subject; the *Importance* of the subject, outlining its rationale; the *Key concepts*, the main concepts or strands in the subject; *Key processes*, or essential skills; *Range and content*, outlining central themes in the subject; *Curriculum opportunities*, presenting activities to be used; and *Attainment target*, describing levels of achievement in the subject.[98] Providing the same structure for the whole National Curriculum could be seen as making it more coherent and accessible to teachers and schools. This new structure made it easier to compare the different subjects, and Citizenship could for example easily be compared with History in order to see how the two subjects overlapped on topics such as political development, the development of democracy, the history of the constituent nations and the history of immigration to Britain.[99] This provided better opportunities of cross-curriculum planning, as recommended in the Ajegbo report.[100] Moreover, the new structure to

---

[95] *Ibid*.

[96] *The Education (National Curriculum) (Attainment Targets and Programmes of Study in Citizenship in respect of the Third and Fourth Key Stages) (England) Order 2008*: (UK legislation website, 10 July 2008).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2008/1753/introduction/made

[97] *Ibid*.

[98] QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3329-pCitizenship3_tcm8-396.pdf
QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 4*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3330-pCitizenship4_tcm8-397.pdf

[99] In order to make this even more accessible, the National Curriculum website provides a subject comparison tool where different subjects can be compared in different areas to see to what extent the subjects overlap in terms of content and methodology.
'Subject comparison' (Citizenship and History for key stage 3): (National Curriculum website).
Accessed: 8 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/key-stages-3-and-4/subjects/subjectcomparison/index.aspx
QCA, *History. Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target*: (National Curriculum website, 2007).
Accessed: 8 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3335-p_History3_tcm8-189.pdf

[100] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 11: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf

80

some extent moved away from the 'light touch', flexible approach. In addition to concepts, skills, and content, the new programmes of study also presented statutory curriculum opportunities, or relevant activities, and non-statutory *explanatory notes*, explaining different terms and concepts.[101] Thus, the new curriculum provided both more detailed instructions on method and how to interpret the aims of the subject, than what had been the case before.

As for the revised programmes of study in Citizenship, the three main strands *Social and moral responsibility*, *Community involvement* and *Political literacy* were replaced by the key concepts *Democracy and justice* and *Rights and Responsibilities*. Despite a slight structural change, the main focus was still on the development of political literacy, encompassing knowledge, skills and values, and political and societal involvement. This was reflected in the abovementioned key concepts and the key processes, which included the main strands *Critical thinking and enquiry*, *Advocacy and representation* and *Taking informed and responsible action*. All these three main areas of key processes or skills reflected the emphasis in the subject on developing critically aware, politically and socially active citizens.[102] Thus, what had been the emphasis in the Crick report and the original programmes of study was maintained in the content of the revised subject. The main focus was still on politics, democracy, justice, rights and responsibilities, the role of the UK in Europe and the world, as well as opportunities of political and societal participation.[103]

Identity and diversity issues, as recommended in the Ajegbo report, were given greater prominence, most notably through the incorporation of the new strand *Identities and diversity: living together in the UK*. The seemingly slight difference in the name of the strand, replacing the report's 'identity' with the plural form, could be seen as indicating a stronger emphasis on the possibility of multiple identities within a multinational, multiethnic and multi-religious

---

[101] QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3329-pCitizenship3_tcm8-396.pdf
QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 4*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3330-pCitizenship4_tcm8-397.pdf
[102] QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3329-pCitizenship3_tcm8-396.pdf
QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 4*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3330-pCitizenship4_tcm8-397.pdf
[103] *Ibid.*

state like the UK.[104] This new strand was included as one of the key concepts, and thus placed identity, diversity and community cohesion among the central aspects of the subject, alongside active citizenship.[105] The highlighting of these issues was also explicitly demonstrated in the section on content, which included several aims linked to the diversity of the UK, migration and international relations, including the Commonwealth.[106] Moreover, the development of universal suffrage and equal opportunities, recommended as a topic in the Ajegbo report, was put forward in the non-statutory explanatory notes for key stage 3 and as a specific aim for key stage 4.[107] Thus, the revised Citizenship curriculum followed the recommendations of the curriculum review group to a large extent, and identity and diversity issues were granted a significant place in the curriculum.

Noticeably, in terms of linking citizenship with British history, the revised Citizenship curriculum was not as clear as the recommendations in the Ajegbo report. Whereas the report had argued that the concept of citizenship should be seen 'in relation to recent history' the programmes of study did not make the same obvious links.[108] Nevertheless, the Citizenship curriculum did refer to how identity and community cohesion should be explored 'over time', and as noted, the new structure of the National Curriculum made planning across the curriculum, for example through linking the two subjects Citizenship and History, more accessible.[109]

---

[104] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 97: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[105] QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3329-pCitizenship3_tcm8-396.pdf
QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 4*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3330-pCitizenship4_tcm8-397.pdf
[106] *Ibid*.
[107] *Ibid*.
[108] Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), p. 8: (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[109] QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3329-pCitizenship3_tcm8-396.pdf
QCA, *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 4*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).

Summary

The chapter has argued that the revision of the programmes of study in Citizenship mainly came about due to significant national and international events leading to a change in the political climate. Thus, in opposition to the introduction of the subject, which to a large extent was driven by significant individuals pulling strings, the revision was mainly driven by contextual forces. In the aftermath of highly influential national and international events, Britain experienced a shift in the public debate towards a stronger emphasis on diversity and identity issues, mainly focusing on how best to foster integration, shared values and community cohesion. Behind the rising concern for such issues was also the rising anti-immigration and especially anti-Muslim resentment Britain experienced in these years, which in the most disturbing sense led to the revival of the far-right British National Party. The shift of attention was reflected in the New Labour government's discourse and policy, and the revision of the Citizenship curriculum should be seen as part of this picture. The government was concerned to strike a balance between the use of a 'hard' and a 'soft' approach, in order to satisfy both the general electorate and the grassroots of the Labour party. Whereas the first approach was applied in security and immigration policies, the latter was applied in the arena of education, and the revision of the Citizenship curriculum should be seen in this light.

Labour's balancing between different approaches in security policy and education was accompanied by difficult priorities within the field of education itself. In its review of the Citizenship curriculum, the government sought to promote, on the one hand, *integration* and shared values, and, on the other hand, appreciation of ethnic, cultural and religious *diversity*. The perceived importance of getting the message right was increased by the party's somewhat controversial commitment to faith schools, which both challenged the cohesion agenda and alienated many of the party's own supporters. Especially in the wake of the London bombings, religious schools were criticised for leading to segregation and polarisation in society, as well as being latent breeding grounds for radicalisation and extremism. Support of faith schools had been a personal commitment of the Prime Minister, and the party leadership was not willing to see this reversed. Instead, it was hoped that the Citizenship subject could contribute positively to the situation. Since faith schools in England are maintained, and thus carry a statutory obligation to follow the National Curriculum, the government's idea was to counter the criticism against the government on faith schools, and provide a solid common

ground in schools in order to foster integration and cohesion in society. In this respect, Citizenship was perceived as the most natural arena within schools to promote these issues. The emphasis on Citizenship education was also meant to appease the party grassroots, which for their own set of reasons (primarily the effect on social equality and cohesion) have been critical to the government's support of faith schools. A large secondary curriculum review made a revision of the Citizenship curriculum more attainable, and made the attempt to meet, at one stroke, the range of concerns raised above. It was in the light of these key factors, that the revision of the Citizenship subject came about.

The then Department for Education and Skills commissioned a review group to explore the role diversity issues played across the curriculum, and in Citizenship in particular. In their report, published in January 2007, the review group concluded that there needed to be a stronger emphasis on diversity, identity and values in Citizenship, and that this should be achieved among others through the incorporation of a new strand in the curriculum. This, alongside some other recommendations, was followed, and the revised programmes of study for key stages 3 and 4 were implemented in schools in the autumn of 2008. In the revised programmes of study the main focus was still the same as at the introduction, that is to say on creating active, politically and socially aware citizens. However, diversity, identity and values were given a significantly greater prominence than what had been the case in the original programmes of study. Moreover, the balance between common bonds and diversity reflected the ambitions of the government and the Ajegbo group, and gave the revised curriculum a certain left-of-centre feel.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

> …central to the well-being of our country.
> (David Blunkett on Citizenship education)[1]

> ...a rigorous academic education is the best preparation for the future.
> (Michael Gove, the Conservative Education Secretary)[2]

This final chapter will both outline the main findings in the three previous chapters and draw a wider picture by briefly discussing some implications of Citizenship and the political challenges the subject faces today. In terms of implications, the chapter looks into whether Citizenship could be said to have contributed to increasing levels of positive attitudes to active citizenship, and whether it has contributed to an actual increase in political and societal participation among young people in Britain. These findings are then seen in relation to how the subject has been taught in schools, and a brief assessment is given of what is required to ensure successful provision of the subject. Finally, the chapter will also reflect on the political situation for Citizenship today, considering the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition's current National Curriculum review, led by Michael Gove, the Education Secretary. Against the backdrop of this review and the Conservatives' principled scepticism to citizenship education in the past, it will be argued that Citizenship holds an uncertain future, especially in the form it was given during New Labour's time in government.

Main findings

In chapter two, the history of citizenship education was explored, and it was argued that the concept of citizenship as well as citizenship education has had a troubled past in Britain. This was related to how British citizenship has been a complex concept, considering how British people formally have been defined as subjects rather than citizens, Britain's imperial legacy and its multinational composition. In addition to the complex status of citizenship, civic

---

[1] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
[2] Gove, 'Michael Gove announces major review of National Curriculum': (Michael Gove's official website, 21 January 2011).
Accessed: 28 April 2011 from:
http://www.michaelgove.com/content/michael_gove_announces_major_review_national_curriculum

education has also been seen as somewhat controversial because it was seen as irrelevant to a child's schooling, or because it was feared that it could lead to partisan bias and even indoctrination. The chapter looked into how a more prominent role for citizenship education had been particularly on the agenda in three separate decades during the last century, what John Greenwood and Lynton Robins have called the three 'waves'; the 1930s, the 1970s and the 1990s. In addition, the chapter explored the impact of Thatcherism in the 1980s on the concept of citizenship and citizenship education. As noted, this historical discussion was restricted to England, the scope of the thesis. Notably, the initiatives in the 1930s, the 1970s and the early 1990s all began outside the political sphere and there was generally a significant amount of opposition among politicians. Neither the 1930s Association for Education in Citizenship nor the 1970s Programme for Political Education succeeded with their projects. Both projects fell victim to governmental opposition or uncertainty, partially because a stronger role for civic education was seen as unnecessary and partially because of fears of partisan bias, or accusations of such. The scepticism to direct citizenship teaching was particularly strong with the Thatcher government in the 1980s, and in this period citizenship was reformulated according to Thatcherite principles of individual self-reliance and a limitation of the state. These principles, while politically defined, perceived citizenship explicitly as non-political: the informed citizen was primarily self-reliant and outside the political sphere. When the Conservatives launched their version of active citizenship in the late 1980s, it was from these ideals they proceeded.

Nevertheless, despite their opposition to citizenship education, it was the Conservatives who first gave such education formal status in the English school curriculum in 1990 and thus provided a starting point for the larger reforms in the following decade. Created as a non-statutory cross-curricular theme, however, citizenship education was initially largely neglected. The 1990s saw the establishment of a range of new citizenship organisations which set out to promote a stronger role for citizenship education in schools; encompassing active citizenship which included both *political and societal* rights and responsibilities. In addition, there was an increasing notion that Britain experienced rising levels of political ignorance and disengagement among young people, a notion which was supported by findings in several studies. With the election of the New Labour government in 1997, this broader wave within civil society was given political gravitas by David Blunkett, the Education Secretary, who was committed to civic education and willing to secure a stronger role for it. Blunkett was strongly dedicated to the cause, believing in the advantages of active, political and societal, citizenship

86

and an important role for citizenship education in schools.

Thus, as discussed in chapter three, the introduction of Citizenship as a compulsory subject came about as a combination of contextual causes and the pulling of strings by significant individuals. While the wide pressure in favour of citizenship education provided a benevolent context, the commitment of certain individuals was decisive in translating that pressure into educational reform. It was argued that the most significant actor in this respect was David Blunkett, the Education Secretary. His commitment to education for citizenship was particularly linked to the influence from the political scientist Bernard Crick, his former lecturer, who had been involved in the 1970s Programme for Political Education. In addition, his own upbringing and personal circumstances, as well as the Labour tradition he came from, could be seen as playing a role. As to the latter, even though it was important to gain cross-party support and achieve consensus for the project, the promotion of civic education certainly could be seen as carrying forward a left-of-centre tradition. Notably, however, the thesis has argued that the introduction of the statutory Citizenship subject was not a *New* Labour project; it was not something then Prime Minister Tony Blair paid much attention to, neither was it seen as one of the party's key educational policies at the time. This has substantiated the argument that the introduction of the subject to a great extent was based on Blunkett's personal commitment to the cause and determination to see it happening.

As argued, the advisory group which was established was put together in order to firstly, achieve consensus for the project, and secondly, gain support for the views on citizenship and civic education as advocated by Blunkett and his mentor and chairman of the group, Bernard Crick. With the troubled past of citizenship and political education in mind, it was important to convince people that this was not a partisan project, nor was it merely a political one; it also included a societal dimension focusing on various forms of community involvement. Notably, in the advisory group, voices in opposition to Crick on what kind of place civic education should have in the curriculum were given a smaller role or excluded from the group altogether. This implies that Blunkett and Crick were determined to see their project through, and to maintain an overarching control of its result. This view is also supported by the process in the non-governmental Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), where the curriculum was created. Unusually for such a process, the work in the QCA was closely monitored by Crick, in order for the subject to turn out as close as possible to Blunkett and Crick's initial ideas.

The programmes of study in Citizenship for key stages 3 and 4, the stages where the

new subject was made compulsory, were largely in accordance with the recommendations of the advisory group set out in the Crick report. Not surprisingly, both the Crick report and the programmes of study reflected Blunkett and Crick's ideas on the importance of active citizenship, which included political literacy and both political and societal participation. Moreover, both the Crick report and the Citizenship curriculum included a second aim, to strengthen common citizenship and national identity in a multinational and multicultural Britain. Yet, this aim was deliberately de-emphasised, due to the need to achieve cross-party agreement and avoid accusations of leftist 'political correctness'. Thus, through the decisiveness and close monitoring of David Blunkett, his idea of compulsory education for citizenship was introduced. At the same time, however, it is worth noting that the project was dependent on achieving consensus and portraying the subject as non-partisan. This need should be seen in light of the historical controversies over such education in England.

In chapter four, the revision of the Citizenship curriculum, which was done in order to include a stronger emphasis on identity and diversity issues, was discussed. Unlike what had been the case in the process leading to the introduction of the subject, the revision did not come about due to the determination and willingness of some significant individuals. Instead, the revision resulted from pressures within the New Labour government as well as from a changing political climate. Following important national and international events, enhanced attention was directed towards integration, social cohesion, shared values and identity. This shift was also reflected in the discourse and policy of the New Labour government, and the revision of the Citizenship curriculum should be seen against this backdrop. Moreover, the chapter noted that the revision and the form it was given should also be seen in light of the left-of-centre position of the New Labour government. It was important for the government to strike a balance between the use of a 'hard' approach, most notably seen in the Home Office, and a 'soft' approach, where education was put forward as a useful arena. Additionally, it was perceived as important to strike a balance between focus on integration and cohesion on the one hand, and an appreciation of ethnic, cultural and religious diversity on the other. Typically for a centre-left party like New Labour, this was seen as essential in order to secure the support of the general electorate and the party grassroots respectively. Hence, education, and particularly the Citizenship subject, was perceived as a natural place for assuring, through the use of a 'soft' approach, that both the focus on integration and shared values and an appreciation of the diversity of the UK were emphasised. As noted in chapter four, and which will be addressed towards the end of this chapter, a situation like this would most likely have
88

been treated somewhat differently in the case of a Conservative government; considering how the Conservative Party's views on national identity, diversity, citizenship and civic education have been significantly different from that of the centre-left.

Both the government-commissioned Ajegbo report and the revised programmes of study in Citizenship placed a larger emphasis on identity and diversity issues than what had been the case with the Crick report and the original curriculum. The Citizenship curriculum was significantly coloured by the changing political context, and it also reflected the significant need of the centre-left New Labour government to secure a balance between integration and diversity. Nevertheless, the main emphasis in the Citizenship subject was still on creating politically literate, active citizens, and thus the main intention of David Blunkett and Bernard Crick was maintained. After having outlined the main findings in the thesis, the next section of the chapter will briefly discuss to what extent Citizenship could be said to have been successful in achieving its main aims: firstly, to promote active citizenship, and secondly, to fruitfully deal with identity and diversity issues. Finally, the future prospects of the subject will be reviewed to give a brief assessment of the legacy left by David Blunkett and New Labour in this particular area.

Some Implications of the Citizenship Subject

Studies have revealed a mixed picture in terms of the implications of the introduction of the Citizenship subject. On the one hand, there has been an increase in political and societal participation among young people, and there are signs that they will continue to take an active part in society as they get older.[3] At the same time, studies have showed considerable variation in terms of attitudes, engagement and participation. Noticeably, it has been put forward how the concept of citizenship to a large extent still is interpreted as what Crick would have called *good* rather than *active* citizenship, since young people tend to de-emphasise the political dimension of the concept.[4] This is to a large degree also reflected in

---

[3] Avril Keating, David Kerr, Thomas Benton, Ellie Mundy and Joana Lopes, *Citizenship Education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*, p. iii: (Department for Education website, November 2010). Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR059.pdf

[4] Crick, 'Civic Republicanism and Citizenship: the Challenge for Today', in Crick and Lockyer (2010). Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy and Lopes, *Citizenship Education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*, p. 43: (Department for Education website, November 2010). Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:

attitudes to political and societal participation. In terms of political activities, young people are liable to put forward voting in elections, discussions on political and societal issues with family and friends and following the news as the most relevant activities. More 'activist' forms of political participation, such as membership in a political party or pressure group, participation in a political demonstration, or contacting the local MP are, however, not perceived by many young people as particularly relevant.[5] In terms of civil activities, fund-raising or other charitable activities are most often put forward, but as the young people get older, other forms of community involvement also became more common.[6]

In terms of identity and diversity issues, as addressed in chapter four, a 2006 Ofsted report on Citizenship argued that these issues were insufficiently addressed in many schools.[7] In the aftermath of the revision of the Citizenship curriculum, however, the situation is seemingly more promising. In a 2010 Ofsted report, it was argued that identity and diversity issues were successfully dealt with in two thirds of the schools inspected.[8] The teaching and learning of identity and diversity issues were often good and an inspector observed that the teaching took an 'objective, well-informed and hard-hitting stance', and issues like racism,

http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR059.pdf
Helen Haste, *My Voice, My Vote, My Community* (Nestlé Social Research Programme, 2005), p. 2: (Ipsos MORI website).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.ipsos-mori.com/Assets/Docs/Archive/Polls/nestlesrp4.pdf
[5] Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy and Lopes, *Citizenship Education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*, pp. 19-20: (Department for Education website, November 2010).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR059.pdf
Helen Haste, *My Voice, My Vote, My Community* (Nestlé Social Research Programme, 2005), p. 2: (Ipsos MORI website, 2005).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.ipsos-mori.com/Assets/Docs/Archive/Polls/nestlesrp4.pdf
[6] Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy and Lopes, *Citizenship Education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*, p. 21: (Department for Education website, November 2010).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR059.pdf
[7] Ofsted,*Towards Consensus? Citizenship in secondary schools*, p. 2: (Ofsted website, 28 September 2006).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-
Department for Education and Skills, *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007), pp. 6-7. (Department for Education website).
Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
[8] Ofsted, *Citizenship established? Citizenship in schools 2006/09*, pp. 52-53: (Ofsted website, 22 January 2010).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Documents-by-type/Thematic-reports/Citizenship-established-Citizenship-in-schools-2006-09

stereotyping and discrimination; multiculturalism and tradition; and identities, including British national identity, were all addressed.[9] These findings imply that the revision, where a greater focus on identity and diversity was incorporated into the Citizenship curriculum, could be said to have been largely successful.

It is worth noting that the mixed findings with regard to attitudes, engagement and participation could be linked to several factors in addition to the subject itself. The Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study has argued that there are a number of factors that could influence levels of active citizenship, including age and life-stage, background factors and prior experiences with civic education.[10] Nevertheless, a large degree of so-called 'received Citizenship', in other words explicit Citizenship teaching, seems to have a positive impact on citizenship outcomes.[11] Higher levels of 'received Citizenship' was more likely to have been obtained in schools where the subject was taught as a discrete slot of 45 minutes or more per week, taught by specialised Citizenship teachers, not mixed with Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) and formally assessed and examined.[12]

It seems fair to argue that the varied provision of Citizenship in schools is partially related to the process leading to the introduction of the subject. As discussed in chapter three, Blunkett and Crick were both in favour of a 'light touch' approach to the subject, seemingly linked to the need to achieve consensus as well as to please the QCA and the teacher unions which feared that a new subject could lead to an overloaded curriculum.[13] Few specific guidelines in terms of teaching and assessment seem to have contributed to the varied provision of the subject. The formal assessment of the subject has also been different from school to school. Even though many schools now offer the GCSE in Citizenship, it is not available in all maintained schools.[14] Additionally, a lack of explicitly trained Citizenship

---

[9] *Ibid*., pp. 53-54.

[10] Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy and Lopes, *Citizenship Education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*, p. 45: (Department for Education website, November 2010).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR059.pdf

[11] *Ibid*., p. 45.

[12] *Ibid*., p. 45.

[13] Crick, 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', PA, 55 (2002), p. 498; and interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).

[14] QCA et al, 'GCSE subject criteria for citizenship studies': (Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) website).
Accessed: 6 May 2011 from:
http://www.ofqual.gov.uk/files/qca-07-3443_gcsecriteriacitizenship.pdf
David Kerr, 'Assessment and Evaluation in Citizenship Education': (Paper presented at a British Council seminar in Beijing, July 2002, University of Leeds website).

teachers have proved to be an obstacle to satisfactory Citizenship teaching in a number of schools. Lady Estelle Morris has pointed out how decisive specialist teacher training is for the provision of the subject:

> We now train teachers in Citizenship, and that is key […] What I always believed was that the subject would come into its own once the teaching profession chose to teach Citizenship […] We are moving to that point where people say 'I have been trained to teach Citizenship, it is what I care about' rather than 'I may have to teach it, but I would rather teach another subject' […] I think that is a key thing, the fact that we train the teachers. Because I think that is key to bringing about leadership for citizenship in schools.[15]

As pointed out by Lady Morris, a number of explicit Citizenship teachers have been trained since the introduction of the subject. Nevertheless, there is still a lack of specialist teachers in Citizenship, and the subject is often instead taught by teachers who have been trained in other areas, such as History or PSHE.[16] It is worth noting that despite being skilled in a different subject area, some of these teachers may be very good at teaching Citizenship. However, it seems fair to argue that there are several advantages with using specific subject teachers. Being trained in the subject, often combined with a strong interest, would in most cases contribute positively to the planning, teaching and assessment of the subject.

Overall, after having been taught in English schools for nine years, the Citizenship subject could only be seen as partially successful. There are a number of factors behind this situation, and it seems plausible to argue that more should have been done in the process leading to the introduction of the subject to ensure that different factors, such as teacher training, teaching resources and guidelines were in place. Moreover, it could be argued that it could have helped the provision of the subject if firstly, there had been a formal requirement to teach the subject as a discrete one; and secondly, a greater degree of support and willingness among teachers and school leaders had been in place. As discussed in chapter three, due to decisiveness and momentum, the subject was introduced to a large extent in accordance with Blunkett and Crick's initial ideas. Nevertheless, managing to alter the curriculum is never guaranteed success. It seems as if the Education Department, in

---

Accessed: 6 May 2011 from:
http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003464.htm
[15] Interview with Lady Estelle Morris (London, 9 March 2011).
[16] Ofsted, *Citizenship established? Citizenship in schools 2006/09*, pp. 5-7: (Ofsted website, 22 January 2010). Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Documents-by-type/Thematic-reports/Citizenship-established-Citizenship-in-schools-2006-09

cooperation with the QCA, should have done more in order to secure the support of teachers and school leadership, provide more skilled teachers and a framework for the subject which ensured that it would be given sufficient space, both in terms of teaching and assessment.[17] In hindsight, this is something that also David Blunkett and Conor Ryan, his former adviser, have argued for:

> It [Citizenship] has only been partially successful, because it is still not seen as central to the well-being of our country, and to the learning and capability of young people to think widely, to question and to conclude […] We have not persuaded enough headteachers running schools that this is good for the pupils growing into civilised, responsible adults […] I think it is still not taught well in many schools.
>
> (David Blunkett)[18]

> …one of the difficulties has been, because the compromise was made with the QCA in order to deal with the issue of time in the curriculum, it has become a bit nebulous. It has become something that the schools try to work into the curriculum but it is never really treated as being a proper subject. I think the problem has been that there has been too little good teaching of Citizenship in the period and that maybe cause difficulties for its survival.
>
> (Conor Ryan)[19]

Thus, the subject could not be said to have made significant changes to the political culture of England, nor is it yet generally seen as 'central to the well-being' of the country.[20] Nonetheless, it is important to bear in mind that Citizenship is a relatively new subject and that it is too soon to point out its long-term effects. Furthermore, the historical background to citizenship education in England could also be seen as a significant backdrop to the troubled beginnings for Citizenship. Bearing in mind the history of such education, encompassing the complexity of British citizenship as well as a great degree of scepticism and fear of political bias and controversial issues, it is perhaps not particularly surprising that Citizenship has been met with scepticism in some quarters. However, as pointed out by Conor Ryan, the relatively mixed picture for Citizenship in schools in England may 'cause difficulties for its survival'.[21]

---

[17] These recommendations are also found in:
 Keating, Kerr, Benton, Mundy and Lopes, *Citizenship Education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*, pp. 65-68: (Department for Education website, November 2010).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR059.pdf
Ofsted, *Citizenship established? Citizenship in schools 2006/09*, pp. 7-8: (Ofsted website, 22 January 2010).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Documents-by-type/Thematic-reports/Citizenship-established-Citizenship-in-schools-2006-09
[18] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
[19] Interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).
[20] Interview with David Blunkett (London, 9 March 2011).
[21] Interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).

The next section of this final chapter will briefly explore the political situation for the subject today, considering the present government's current National Curriculum review.

A Future for Citizenship?

Following the replacement of the New Labour government with a Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government after the 2010 general election, a review of the National Curriculum has been launched. At the launch in January 2011, Michael Gove, the Education Secretary, argued that he would like to see more emphasis on traditional academic subjects. He argued that 'a rigorous academic education is the best preparation for the future', and that this approach to education involves 'giving every child a profound level of mathematic and scientific knowledge, as well as deep immersion in the reasoning skills generated by subjects such as history [sic] and modern foreign languages'.[22] Among the suggestions for the review is the so-called English Baccalaureate; an academic core component, including Maths, English, two science subjects, a modern or ancient language and Geography or History.[23] An advisory panel has been established with the mandate to explore what content the different National Curriculum subjects should have, as well as which subjects should hold statutory status.[24] The first implementations of the new National Curriculum will take place in 2013, whereas the second stage will be implemented in 2014.[25]

The current curriculum review implies an uncertain future for Citizenship. The Conservative Education Secretary has emphasised established academic subjects and, as was noted in chapter four, he has a particular fondness for History; taught as a nation-building narrative.[26] Citizenship, which is an example of a contribution to a more 'rounded' education, does not chime well with this Conservative notion of education. Despite the former New Labour government's aim to depict the subject as a consensual cross-party project, civic education is notably still a controversial project in England, subject to accusations of political

---

[22] Gove, 'Michael Gove announces major review of National Curriculum': (Michael Gove's official website, 21 January 2011).
Accessed: 28 April 2011 from:
http://www.michaelgove.com/content/michael_gove_announces_major_review_national_curriculum
[23] Gove stresses "facts" in school curriculum revamp': (BBC News website, 20 January 2011).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-12227491
[24] *Ibid*.
[25] Gove, 'Michael Gove announces major review of National Curriculum': (Michael Gove's official website, 21 January 2011).
Accessed: 28 April 2011 from:
http://www.michaelgove.com/content/michael_gove_announces_major_review_national_curriculum
[26] Gove, '1688 and All That', in *Being British*, ed, D'Ancona, pp. 197-205.

94

trespassing and even indoctrination. Moreover, as noted by Conor Ryan, the mixed results for statutory Citizenship have not helped the situation for the subject.[27] With the current curriculum review in mind, the future of Citizenship, at least as a statutory subject, is open to question. Thus, while the last two decades have added a highly interesting chapter to a historical debate in England, the issue of whether a civic component should play a central part in a young person's education is likely to be the subject of further controversy in the years to come.

---

[27] Interview with Conor Ryan (London, 10 March 2011).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Interviews
Professor Audrey Osler. Interview conducted at Hotel Bristol, Oslo, 23 March 2011.
Conor Ryan. Interview conducted at Mint Hotel, Millbank, London, 10 March 2011.
David Blunkett. Interview conducted in Portcullis House, Westminster, London, 9 March 2011.
Lady Estelle Morris. Interview conducted in Portcullis House, Westminster, London, 9 March 2011.
Lord Jim Knight. Interview conducted via Skype, Oslo/London, 24 March 2011.

Official Documents
Conservative Party, *It's Time for Action* (2005 Conservative Party general election manifesto): (Conservative Party website).
 Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
 http://www.conservatives.com/pdf/manifesto-uk-2005.pdf
Department for Children, Schools and Families: *Guidance on the duty to promote community cohesion*: (Department for Education website, July 2007).
 Accessed: 20 April 2011 from:
 http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DCSF-00598-2007.pdf
Department for Education and Skills: *Curriculum Review: Diversity & Citizenship* (Ajegbo report) (London, 2007): (Department for Education website).
 Accessed: 10 February 2011 from:
 http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES_Diversity_and_Citizenship.pdf
Department for Education and Employment and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, *Citizenship. The National Curriculum for England. Key stages 3-4*: (National Curriculum website, 1999).
 Accessed: 8 December 2010 from:
 http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/Citizenship%201999%20programme%20of%20study_tcm8-12053.pdf
 Director of Education, Norfolk County Council: *Changes to the School Curriculum – 2000: Report by the Director of Education* (Norfolk County Council website).
 Accessed: 23 March 2011 from:
 http://www.committees.norfolk.gov.uk/Documents/education/14-07-1999/sc2000.pdf
Education and Inspections Act 2006: (UK legislation website, 2006).
 Accessed: 20 April 2011 from:
 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/40/section/38
Education (No. 2) Act 1986: (UK legislation website).
 Accessed: 7 February 2011 from:
 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/61/enacted
Education Reform Act 1988: (UK Legislation website).
 Accessed: 7 February 2011 from:
 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/40/content/

Home Office, *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team Chaired by Ted Cantle*: (Guardian website, 2001).
Accessed: 31 March 2011 from:
http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Guardian/documents/2001/12/11/communitycohesionreport.pdf

Avril Keating, David Kerr, Thomas Benton, Ellie Mundy and Joana Lopes: *Citizenship Education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*: (Department for Education website, November 2010).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR059.pdf

Labour Party: *Because Britain Deserves Better* (1997 general election manifesto): (labour-party.org.uk website).
Accessed: 23 March 2011 from:
http://www.labour-party.org.uk/manifestos/1997/1997-labour-manifesto.shtml

Labour Party: *Britain forward not back* (2005 general election manifesto).

Labour Party: *Excellence for Everyone* (1995).

Labour Party: *Excellence in Schools* (1997).

Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002: (UK legislation website, 2002).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/41/contents/enacted

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted): *Citizenship established? Citizenship in schools 2006/09*, pp. 52-53: (Ofsted website, 22 January 2010).
Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Documents-by-type/Thematic-reports/Citizenship-established-Citizenship-in-schools-2006-09

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted): *Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools* (London, 2006): (Ofsted website, 28 September 2006).
Accessed: 6 April 2011 from:
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/Ofsted-home/Publications-and-research/Browse-all-by/Education/Curriculum/Citizenship/Secondary/Towards-consensus-Citizenship-in-secondary-schools

Sir MacPherson, William: *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*: (Official Documents Archive website).
Accessed: 26 March 2011 from:
http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm42/4262/4262.htm

Speaker's Commission on Citizenship, *Encouraging Citizenship: Report of the Commission on Citizenship* (London, 1990).

Terrorism Act 2006: (UK legislation website, 2006).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/11/contents/enacted

The Education (National Curriculum) (Attainment Targets and Programmes of Study in Citizenship) (England) Order 2000: (UK legislation website, 2000).
Accessed: 17 January 2011 from:
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2000/1603/made

The Education (National Curriculum) (Attainment Targets and Programmes of Study in Citizenship in respect of the Third and Fourth Key Stages) (England) Order 2008: (UK legislation website, 10 July 2008).
> Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
> http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2008/1753/introduction/made

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority: *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
> Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
> http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3329-pCitizenship3_tcm8-396.pdf

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority: *Citizenship. Programme of study for key stage 4*: (National Curriculum website, 30 August 2007).
> Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
> http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/uploads/QCA-07-3330-pCitizenship4_tcm8-397.pdf

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority: *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of in Schools* (Crick report) (London, 1998): (Tesis en Xarxa website).
> Accessed: 25 September 2010 from:
> http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0930108-130039//08.AFR_ANEXO_B_Citizenship_Advisory_Group_1998.pdf

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) et al: 'GCSE subject criteria for citizenship studies': (Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) website).
> Accessed: 6 May 2011 from:
> http://www.ofqual.gov.uk/files/qca-07-3443_gcsecriteriacitizenship.pdf

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority: *Preparing for the Future: Secondary Curriculum Review Explained*: (SecEd website).
> Accessed: 5 April 2011 from:
> http://www.sec-ed.co.uk/public/downloads/supp-scre.pdf

Non-Official Reports

Helen Haste, *My Voice, My Vote, My Community* (Nestlé Social Research Programme, 2005): (Ipsos MORI website).
> Accessed: 19 April 2011 from:
> http://www.ipsos-mori.com/Assets/Docs/Archive/Polls/nestlesrp4.pdf

Wilkinson, Helen and Geoff Mulgan: *Freedom's Children: Work, Relationships and Politics for 18-34-Year-Olds in Britain Today*: (Demos website).
> Accessed: 3 November 2010 from:
> http://www.demos.co.uk/files/freedomschildren.pdf?1240939425

Speeches

Brown, Gordon: British Council Annual Lecture (7 July 2004): (Guardian website, 8 July 2004).
> Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
> http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/jul/08/uk.labour1

Brown, Gordon: 'The Future of Britishness' (14 January 2007): (Fabian Society website).
> Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
> http://www.fabians.org.uk/events/speeches/the-future-of-britishness

Gove, Michael: 'Michael Gove announces major review of National Curriculum': (Michael Gove's official website, 21 January 2011).
Accessed: 28 April 2011 from:
http://www.michaelgove.com/content/michael_gove_announces_major_review_national_curriculum

Phillips, Trevor: 'After 7/7: Sleepwalking to Segregation' (Manchester, 2005): (Faculty of Humanities, University of Manchester website).
Accessed: 4 March 2011 from:
http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/socialchange/research/social-change/summer-workshops/documents/sleepwalking.pdf

Literature

Books

Bagehot, Walter: *The English Constitution* (Oxford, 2001).

Bale, Tim: *The Conservative Party: From Thatcher to Cameron* (London, 2010).

Bogdanor, Vernon: *Devolution in the United Kingdom* (Oxford, 2001).

Blair, Tony: *A Journey* (London, 2010).

Blair, Tony: *New Britain: My Vision of a Young Country* (London, 1996).

Blunkett, David with Alex MacCormick: *On a Clear Day* (London, 1995).

Blunkett, David: *Politics and Progress: Renewing Democracy and Civil Society* (London, 2001).

Blunkett, David: *The Blunkett Tapes: My Life in the Bear Pit* (London, 2006).

Brown, Kate and Stephen Fairbrass: *The Citizenship Teacher's Handbook* (London, 2009).

Cesarani, David and Mary Fulbrook: *Citizenship, Nationality and Migration in Europe* (London, 1996).

Crick, Bernard and Andrew Lockyer: *Active Citizenship: What Could it Achieve and How?* (Edinburgh, 2010).

Crick, Bernard and Alex Porter (eds.): *Political Education and Political Literacy* (London, 1978).

Crick, Bernard (ed.): *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture* (Oxford, 2001).

D'Ancona, Matthew (ed.): *Being British: The Search for the Values That Bind the Nation* (Edinburgh, 2009).

Demaine, Jack (ed.): *Citizenship and Political Education Today* (Basingstoke, 2004).

Devine, Tom and Paddy Logue (eds.): *Being Scottish: Personal Reflections on Scottish Identity Today* (Edinburgh, 2002).

Evans, Eric J. Evans: *Thatcher and Thatcherism* (London, 2004).

Faulks, Keith: *Citizenship in Modern Britain* (Edinburgh, 1998).

Faulks, Keith: *Citizenship: Key Ideas* (London, 2000).

Ferguson, William: *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: A Historic Quest* (Edinburgh, 1998).

Gamble, Andrew and Tony Wright (eds.): *Britishness: Perspectives on the British Question* (Oxford, 2009).

Gamble, Andrew and Tony Wright: *The New Social Democracy* (Oxford, 1999).

Gardner, Roy, Jo Cairns and Denis Lawton: *Faith Schools: Consensus or Conflict?* (London, 2005).

Geddes, Andrew: *Labour's Second Landslide: The British General Election 2001* (Manchester, 2002).

Giddens, Anthony: *The Global Third Way Debate* (London, 2001).

Giddens, Anthony: *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy* (London, 1998).

Gordon, P. and D. Lawton: *Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (London, 1978).

Griffith, Phoebe and Mark Leonard (eds.): *Reclaiming Britishness* (London, 2002).

Haberfield, M.R. and Agostino von Hassel: *A New Understanding of Terrorism: Case Studies, Trajectories and Lessons Learned* (London, 2009).

Heater, Derek: *What is Citizenship?* (Cambridge, 1999).

Hills, John, Tom Sefton and Kitty Stewart (eds.): *Towards a More Equal Society? Poverty, Inequality and Policy Since 1997* (Bristol, 2009).

Kennedy, Kerry (ed.): *Citizenship Education and the Modern State* (London, 1997).

Kjeldstadli, Knut: *Fortida er ikke hva den en gang var: En innføring i historiefaget* (Oslo, 1999).

Kymlicka, Will: *Multicultural Citizenship* (Oxford, 1995).

Mandelson, Peter: *The Third Man: Life at the Heart of New Labour* (London, 2010).

Marshall, T.H.: *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays* (Cambridge, 1950).

McDonough, Kevin and Walter Feinberg (eds.): *Education and Citizenship in Liberal-Democratic Societies: Teaching for Cosmopolitan Values and Collective Identities* (Oxford, 2003).

McLean, Iain and Alistair McMillan: *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics* (Oxford, 2009).

Modood, Tariq: *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea* (Cambridge, 2007).

Oakland, John: *Contemporary Britain: A Survey with Texts* (London, 2001).

Osler, Audrey (ed.): *Citizenship and democracy in schools: diversity, identity, equality* (Stoke-on-Trent, 2000).

Pearce, Nick and Joe Hallgarten (eds.): *Tomorrow's Citizens: Critical Debates in Citizenship and Education* (London, 2000).

Potter, John: *Active Citizenship in Schools: A Good Practice Guide to Developing a Whole School Policy* (London, 2002).

Pollard, Stephen: *David Blunkett* (London, 2004).

Pulzer, P.J.: *Political representation and elections in Britain* (London, 1967).

Romano, Flavio: *Clinton and Blair: The Political Economy of the Third Way* (London, 2005).

Seldon, Anthony: *Blair: The Biography* (London, 2004).

Thompson, Paul: *The Voice of the Past: Oral History* (Oxford, 1978).

Whyte, John and Garret FitzGerald (eds.), *Interpreting Northern Ireland* (Oxford, 1991).

Articles in Books and Journals

Batho, Gordon: 'The history of the teaching of civics and citizenship in English schools', *The Curriculum Journal*, 1 (1990), pp. 91-100.

Blair, Tony: 'The Third Way: New Politics for the New Century', in *The New Labour Reader*, eds., Andrew Chadwick and Richard Heffernan (London, 2003), pp. 28-33.

Campbell, Colin and Burt A. Rockman: 'Third way leadership, old way government: Blair, Clinton and the power to govern', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 3 (2001), pp.36-48.

Cole, Margaret: 'Education and social democracy', in *New Fabian Essays*, ed., R.H.S. Crossman (London, 1952), pp. 91-120.

Crick, Bernard: 'Civic Republicanism and Citizenship: The Challenge for Today', in *Active Citizenship: What Could it Achieve and How?*, eds., Bernard Crick and Andrew Lockyer (Edinburgh, 2010), pp. 16-25.

Crick, Bernard: 'Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55 (2002), pp. 488-504.

Davies, Ian: 'What has Happened in the Teaching of Politics in Schools in England in the Last Three Decades, and Why?', *Oxford Review of Education*, 25 (1999), pp. 125-140.

Fogelman, Ken: 'Citizenship Education in England', in *Citizenship Education and the Modern State*, ed., Kerry Kennedy (London, 1997), pp. 85-95.

Freeden, Michael: 'The Ideology of New Labour', *The Political Quarterly*, 70 (2002), pp. 42-51.

Gardner, Roy: 'Faith Schools Now: An Overview', in *Faith Schools: Consensus or Conflict?*, eds., Gardner, Roy, Jo Cairns and Denis Lawton (London, 2005), pp. 7-13.

Gove, Michael: '1688 and All That', in *Being British: The Search for the Values That Bind the Nation*, ed., Matthew D'Ancona (Edinburgh, 2009), pp. 197-205.

Gray, John: 'Blair's project in retrospect', *International Affairs*, 80 (2004), pp.39-48.

Greenwood, John and Lynton Robins: 'Citizenship Tests and Education: Embedding a Concept', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55 (2002), pp. 505-522.

Hajer, Maarten and Justus Uitermark: 'Performing Authority: Discursive Politics after the Assassination of Theo van Gogh'. *Public Administration*, 86 (2008), pp. 5-19.

Heater, Derek: 'The History of Citizenship Education in England', *The Curriculum Journal*, 12 (2001), pp. 103-123.

Jackson, Robert: 'Should the State Fund Faith-Based Schools? A Review of the Arguments', *British Journal of Religious Education*, 25 (2003), p. 91.

Kisby, Ben: 'New Labour and Citizenship Education', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 60 (2007), pp. 84-101.

Lieberman, Charles A. and Serguei Cheloukhine: 'Chapter 13: 2005 London Bombings', in *A New Understanding of Terrorism: Case Studies, Trajectories and Lessons Learned*, eds., Haberfield, M.R. and Agostino von Hassell (London, 2009), pp. 233-248.

Lynch, Philip: 'The Conservative Party and Nationhood', *The Political Quarterly*, 71 (2000), pp. 59-67.

McLaughlin, Terence H.: 'Citizenship Education in England: The Crick Report and Beyond', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 34 (2000), pp. 541-570.

Newburn, Tim and Robert Reiner: 'Crime and penal policy', in *Blair's Britain, 1997-2007*, ed., Anthony Seldon (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 318-340.

Osler, Audrey: 'Citizenship education and the Ajegbo report: re-imagining a cosmopolitan nation', *London Review of Education*, 6 (2008), pp. 11-25.

Osler, Audrey: 'Citizenship education, democracy and racial justice 10 years on', *Race Equality Teaching*, 27 (2009), pp. 21-27.

Osler, Audrey and Hugh Starkey: 'Citizenship, human rights and cultural diversity', in *Citizenship and democracy in schools: diversity, identity, equality*, ed., Osler (Stoke-on-Trent, 2000), pp. 3-18.

Osler, Audrey: 'Patriotism, multiculturalism and belonging: political discourse and the teaching of history', *Educational Review*, 61 (2009), pp. 85-100.

Pykett, Jessica: 'Making citizens governable? The Crick report as governmental technology', *Journal of Education Policy*, 22 (2007), pp. 301-320.

Sefton, Tom, John Hills and Holly Sutherland: 'Poverty, inequality and redistribution', in *Towards a More Equal Society? Poverty, Inequality and Policy Since 1997*, eds., John Hills, Tom Sefton and Kitty Stewart (Bristol, 2009), pp. 21-46.

Squires, Peter: 'New Labour and the politics of antisocial behaviour', *Critical Social Policy*, 26 (2006), pp.144-168.

Vincent, John, quoted in Greenwood, John and Lynton Robins, 'Citizenship Tests and Education: Embedding a Concept', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55 (2002), pp. 505-522.

Whitmarsh Guy: 'The Politics of Political Education: An Episode', *Journal of Curriculum*

Studies, 6 (1974), pp. 133-142.

News Articles

Bates, Stephen: 'After 30 years as a closet Catholic, Blair finally puts faith before politics': (Guardian website, 22 June 2007).
Accessed: 15 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2007/jun/22/uk.religion1

Blunkett, David: 'For far too long we have left patriotism to the extremists': (Guardian website, 19 March 2005).
Accessed: 25 February 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2005/mar/19/britishidentity.uk

'Blunkett unveils stop and search measures': (Guardian website, 11 March 2002).
Accessed: 10 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2002/mar/11/immigrationpolicy.ukcrime

'BNP sees increase in total votes': (BBC News website, 6 May 2005).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/vote_2005/frontpage/4519347.stm

Brown, Gordon: 'We need a United Kingdom': (Daily Telegraph website, 13 January 2007).
Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1539367/We-need-a-United-Kingdom.html

'David Cameron attacks "fascist" BNP': (Daily Telegraph website, 27 May 2009).
Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/mps-expenses/5395358/David-Cameron-attacks-fascist-BNP.html

'Facts about faith schools': (Guardian website, 14 November 2001).
Accessed: 4 April 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2001/nov/14/schools.uk2

Gamble, Andrew: 'Intellectually tolerant, never': (Guardian website, 19 December 2008).
Accessed: 30 March 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/dec/19/georgeorwell-education?INTCMP=SRCH

Gove, Michael quoted in Paton, Graeme: 'Conservative Part [sic] Conference: schoolchildren "ignorant of the past", says Gove': (Daily Telegraph website, 5 October 2010).
Accessed: 28 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/8043872/Conservative-Part-Conference-schoolchildren-ignorant-of-the-past-says-Gove.html

Gove, Michael: 'National Curriculum review: children failed by Labour's education reforms, says Gove': (Daily Telegraph website, 20 January 2011).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/8269906/National-curriculum-review-children-failed-by-Labours-education-reforms-says-Gove.html

'Gove stresses "facts" in school curriculum revamp': (BBC News website, 20 January 2011).
Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-12227491

Harris, Paul: 'Bradford under siege after day of race riots': (Guardian website, 8 July 2001).
Accessed: 31 March 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2001/jul/08/news.race

'History of the BNP': (BBC News website, 24 January 2003).
>Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
>http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/2690555.stm

Kaletsky, Anatole: 'There's no socialist nostalgia lurking in the recesses of Brown's mind', The Times, 10 March 2005.

Leach, Ben: 'Gordon Brown urges voters not to back BNP': (Daily Telegraph website, 1 June 2009).
>Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
>http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/5418918/Gordon-Brown-urges-voters-not-to-back-BNP.html

'Norway drops hijab for police officers': (Earth News website, 20 February 2009).
>Accessed: 31 March 2011 from:
>http://www.earthtimes.org/articles/news/256712,norway-drops-hijab-for-police-officers.html

Padley, Ben: 'Nick Clegg attacks "evil, vile" BNP': (Independent website, 20 April 2010).
>Accessed: 7 April 2011 from:
>http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/nick-clegg-attacks-evil-vile-bnp-1949289.html

Race "segregation" caused riots': (BBC News website, 11 December 2001).
>Accessed: 31 March 2011 from:
>http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/1702799.stm

Ramdani, Nabila: 'Laïcité and the French veil debate': (Guardian website, 23 May 2010).
>Accessed: 4 March 2011 from:
>http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/belief/2010/may/23/france-veil-ban-burqa

Reid, John: 'We're tough on crime – and we're going to get even tougher': (Daily Telegraph website, 12 November 2006).
>Accessed: 20 April 2011 from:
>http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3634170/Were-tough-on-crime-and-were-going-to-get-even-tougher.html

Straw, Jack: 'We need a British story': (Times Online website, 29 April 2007).
>Accessed: 2 April 2011 from:
>http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article1720

'The abolition of double jeopardy will undermine confidence in British justice' (leading article): (Independent website, 18 July 2002).
>Accessed: 10 April 2011 from:
>http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/leading-articles/the-abolition-of-double-jeopardy-will-undermine-confidence-in-british-justice-648652.html

'What turned them into zealots?': (Guardian website, 14 July 2005).
>Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
>http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/jul/14/july7.theeditorpressreview

'Will BNP election gains last?': (BBC News website, 5 May 2006).
>Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
>http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4968406.stm

Willetts, David, quoted in: 'Schools "must teach Britishness"': (BBC News website, 25 January 2007).
>Accessed: 14 April 2011 from:
>http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/education/6294643.stm

Willsher, Kim, Luke Harding and Nicholas Watt: 'European elite scrambles to defuse furore over caricatures of Muhammad': (Guardian website, 3 February 2006).
Accessed: 31 March 2011 from:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2006/feb/03/pressandpublishing.media

Unpublished sources

Espen Kallevik, 'Multiculturalism in Britain: An Analysis of Historiographical Perspectives and the Development of Multicultural Policies from the 1960s to the New Millennium' (MA thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, 2008).

Wold, Atle L.: 'Essay Writing: Guidelines for British Civilisation Students' (University of Oslo, 2007).

Websites

'Andrew Phillips OBE': (Citizenship Foundation website).
Accessed: 26 March 2011 from:
http://www.citizenshipfoundation.org.uk/main/contacts.php?p30

Association for Citizenship Teaching: 'The Secondary Curriculum': (Association for Citizenship Teaching website).
Accessed: 1 April 2011 from:
http://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/page?p=27

'Education and Skills' – 'Schools': (Welsh Assembly Government website).
Accessed: 7 February 2011 from:
http://wales.gov.uk/topics/educationandskills/schoolshome/?lang=en

'Faith Schools': (Department for Education website, 8 February 2011).
Accessed: 30 March 2011 from:
http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/typesofschools/b0066996/faith-schools/

Kennedy, Declan and Aine Hyland and Norma Ryan, 'Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: A Practical Guide': (The Bologna Process website).
Accessed: 25 March 2011 from:
http://www.bologna.msmt.cz/files/learning-outcomes.pdf

Gillard, Derek: 'Glass in their Snowballs: the faith schools debate': (The History of Education in England website, December 2001).
Accessed: 4 April 2011 from:
http://www.educationengland.org.uk/articles/19faithschools.html

Kerr, David: 'Assessment and Evaluation in Citizenship Education': (Paper presented at a British Council seminar in Beijing, July 2002, University of Leeds website).
Accessed: 6 May 2011 from:
http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003464.htm

National Secular Society, 'Faith Schools': (National Secular Society website, 11 October 2005).
Accessed: 5 April 2011 from:
http://www.secularism.org.uk/faithschools.html

National Union of Teachers, 'Citizenship Demystified': (National Union of Teachers website, 2000).
Accessed: 26 March 2011 from:
http://www.teachers.org.uk/files/active/0/1700.pdf

Personal and Social Education: Themes': (Welsh government website).
    Accessed: 2 May 2011 from:
    http://wales.gov.uk/psesub/home/themes/?lang=en
'Professor the Lord Alton of Liverpool – Director of the Foundation for Citizenship':
    (Liverpool John Moores University website).
    Accessed: 26 March 2011 from:
    http://www.ljmu.ac.uk/roscoe/97598.htm
'The purpose of the curriculum: The four capacities': (Learning and Teaching Scotland
    website).
    Accessed: 2 May 2011 from:
    http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/understandingthecurriculum/whatiscurriculumforexcelle
    nce/thepurposeofthecurriculum/index.asp
'Scottish Schools': (Scottish Government website).
    Accessed: 7 February 2011 from:
    http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education/Schools
'State of Citizenship in Britain Survey': (Ipsos MORI website).
    Accessed: 18 January 2011 from:
    http://www.ipsos-
    mori.com/researchpublications/researcharchive/poll.aspx?oItemId=1986 349.ece
'Subject comparison' (Citizenship and History for key stage 3): (National Curriculum
    website).
    Accessed: 8 April 2011 from:
    http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/key-stages-3-and-
    4/subjects/subjectcomparison/index.aspx
What is Citizenship': (Institute for Citizenship).
    Accessed: 18 January 2011 from:
    http://www.citizen.org.uk/What_is_Citizenship.htm
'Who am I? Local and Global Citizenship Unit: This is who I am': (Northern Ireland
    Curriculum website).
    Accessed: 2 May 2011 from:
    http://www.nicurriculum.org.uk/connected_learning/thematic_units/personal_understa
    nding/citizenship.asp
'Working in the UK': (Home Office - UK Border Agency website).
    Accessed: 4 April 2011 from:
    http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/workingintheuk/