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Chapter 1  
Aims and Scope of the Study

Jaap Scheerens

1.1 Aims and Objectives

In this chapter, the aims and objectives of the international comparative study on which this book is based are described. The study took place in seven countries, namely, Cyprus, Denmark, England, Germany, Italy, Romania, and the Netherlands. The study was funded by the European Commission.

1.1.1 Rationale and Background of the Study

1.1.1.1 Education for Citizenship

In a context of increased complexity, with changing patterns of work, family life, and community engagement, the internationalization and social cohesion of the multicultural society are causes for growing societal concern. Social cohesion refers to the “quality of the trust and responsibility relationships existing in a society, both among its members and between them and their institutions” (EU, 2004, p. 6). This concept is closely related to social capital, which “refers to the norms and networks facilitating co-operation either within or between groups” (OECD, 2001, p. 12). The concept of citizenship refers to “The individual members’ commitment to the well-being of fellow members of the society and their commitment to the functioning of the institutions of society” (EU, 2004, p. 6).

International cooperation among European countries and a growing heterogeneity of the (school) populations of most European countries have led to an increased interest in education for citizenship. This interest is based on a concern for a common set of norms and values and a desire that all live up to these norms. The core question of the study was therefore concerned with the role that schools can play in developing citizenship through not only formal learning but also informal learning.
1.1.1.2 Goals and Methods in Education for Citizenship

The goals of education for citizenship have been described as having three dimensions: a cognitive dimension with respect to knowledge about democratic institutions; a pragmatic dimension, in the sense of taking action and gaining experience; and an affective dimension, in terms of an attachment to the societies and communities to which one belongs. Social and communication competencies are considered of central importance (cf. EU, 2004; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001). Therefore, particular emphasis was placed on gaining experience and “learning by doing” at school.

When it comes to methods in educating for citizenship at school, two broad categories can be distinguished:

- Approaches that see the school context as a microcosm to exercise “school citizenship” as a bridge to societal citizenship and state citizenship; this will be referred to as the “context-embedded approach”.
- Approaches in which school citizenship is characterized by specific goal-directed teaching and learning activities; this will be referred to as the “explicit teaching approach”.

1.1.1.3 European Dimension

In the study, the concept of European citizenship was approached, first of all, as a common denominator of national approaches to citizenship education. As such the common values upon which civilization is based were emphasized. The empirically determined common core of approaches was compared to the available literature on European citizenship to determine the common elements required for European citizenship. Next, attention will be paid to what Osler & Starkey (2003) call cosmopolitan citizenship, which is relevant to the emphasis that will be given to the position of minority students.

1.1.1.4 Informal Learning at School

To define informal learning at school, it is relevant to consider the following definitions of formal, informal, and non-formal education:

- **Formal education**: the hierarchically structured, chronologically graded “education system”, running from primary school through university. This includes a variety of specialized programmes and institutions for full-time technical and professional training, in addition to general academic studies.

- **Informal education**: the truly lifelong process whereby every individual acquires attitudes, values, skills, and knowledge from daily experience and the educative influences and resources in his or her environment—from family and neighbours, from work and play, from the market place, and from the library and the mass media.

- **Non-formal education**: any organized educational activity outside the established formal system—whether operating separately or as an important feature of some
broader activity—that is intended to serve identifiable learning clienteles and learning objectives (cf. Coombs & Ahmed, 1974; Fordham, 1993).

In the study, the focus was on informal learning in a formal setting. That is, informal learning within schools, where learning, apart from being stimulated by formal and explicit teaching, is seen as also taking place during the daily experiences inside and outside classrooms.

1.1.1.5 Dimensions of the Microcosm of School Life as a Context of Informal Learning for Citizenship

According to the embedded perspective on citizenship-oriented education, the values and norms of school life provide an exercise ground for important dimensions of civic behaviour that exist in the society at large. Three “media” of the values and norms of school life are distinguished as (1) the institutional rules and norms of the school as an organization, (2) the leadership style of the school head, and (3) the school culture. Related concepts are the “hidden curriculum” and “school ethos”. All these components can be seen as shaping the school’s identity.

McMeekin (2003) applies the concept of institutions at the micro level of organizational functioning, when he writes about “the concept of institutions inside school organizations” (ibid., p. 3). Components of this concept are: formal rules, informal rules, enforcement mechanisms, clarity of objectives, and the “institutional climate”.

School culture can be defined as “the basic assumptions, norms and values, and cultural artefacts that are shared by school members, and which influence their functioning at school” (Maslowski, 2001, p. 5). Deal & Peterson (1999) refer to the “school’s own informal rules, norms and expectations”.

Ethos is defined as the “feeling that results from the school culture” (Solvason, 2005).

School leadership is the way in which the school head embodies and enforces school norms and values, particularly those that refer to discipline, respect for others, cooperation, and autocratic vs. democratic decision-making.

Earlier research has shown that by experiencing a culture where the exploration and expression of opinions are supported by teachers (e.g., controversial discussions, an open classroom climate), students form a positive attitude towards active citizenship and democratic values (Diedrich, 2006).

1.1.1.6 Learning by Doing, Explicit Teaching, and Reflective Teaching

As stated earlier, the focus of the study was on informal learning of students, that is exposure to the school context as determined by institutional norms, culture, and leadership. As such, we treated explicit teaching of citizenship merely as descriptive background information—as part of certain subjects or as a cross-curricular subject. We concentrated on informal learning by looking for evidence about association of contextual aspects and outcome dimensions of citizenship.

Reflective teaching is defined as an approach in which teachers reflect on critical incidents which hold pedagogical potential for learning about citizenship. In such
an approach, instances of behaviour by students, teachers, and school heads can be compared to the norms and values of school life. In such a reflective approach, teachers could stimulate learning by experience by making relevant events explicit.

1.1.1.7 Summary of the Rationale and Background of the Study

The general aims of the study were to clarify the core and related concepts of citizenship as a concern for schooling and to study informal learning embedded in the school context in more detail. As part of the conceptual analysis, basic questions about the degree to which citizenship is viewed as a legitimate task of schooling were raised as well. Consequently, the state of the art of dealing with citizenship in schools in the participating countries was described on the basis of intensive case studies of a limited number of schools. The results of the case studies will be described in subsequent chapters dealing with the general issue of the “teach ability” of citizenship at school, strengths and weaknesses of the context-embedded and the explicit teaching approaches, the quality of methods and materials, and the possibility to assess the realization of citizenship at school by means of quantitative and qualitative assessment approaches. In the school analyses, school composition (the proportion of students with a minority background) is used as an important stratification variable. The study meant to deliver conclusions about common objectives regarding citizenship across European countries and about promising approaches.

1.1.2 Study Objectives

The study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To provide conceptual clarity about citizenship as an educational goal.
2. To provide information on the development of embedded and explicit teaching approaches of citizenship in the participating countries in terms of school priorities, methods, and assessments, where the emphasis is to be on informal learning and embedded approaches.
3. To analyse opportunities and constraints regarding school composition, defined as the proportion of students from cultural minorities in the school.
4. To establish to what degree a common core of objectives and methods can be discerned in the participating countries and relate this common core to the issue of European citizenship.
5. To draw conclusions about practices in embedded teaching methods, considered fruitful in fostering informal learning of active citizenship.

1.1.3 Available Knowledge and Added Value of the Study

A recent report published by the Dutch Ministry of Education under the auspices of the European Union (EU, 2004) provides an excellent overview of the conceptualization of citizenship and the role of education. The report mentions both interesting and promising practices. As far as the quantitative measurement of citizenship is concerned, the IEA Civic study (Torney-Purta et al., 2001) is an
important reference. The added value of the present study was seen as defining more precisely the context of informal learning for citizenship at school by making use of constructs and available instruments to measure school institutional norms, culture, and leadership. The study sought to explore empirical relationships between the school culture and outcome dimensions of citizenship education (differentiated for boys and girls), possibly mediated by reflective teaching approaches. It also looked at relevant constraints and stimulants stemming from school composition, in terms of the percentage of cultural minority students. Preliminary analyses of a German study, based on data from 43 schools, showed that on the school level, important criteria for civic education such as (the absence of) xenophobia are linked to aspects of school democracy and school culture, for example to the perceived level of democratization (from teachers as well as students point of view), opportunities for participation, and open classroom climate (cf. Diedrich, 2006).

1.1.4 Target Groups

The study was designed to provide relevant information for education policymakers at the central, regional, and local level and for directors and teachers of secondary schools. Results might also be of use for school advisory services, curriculum planners, and school inspectorates.

1.1.5 Innovative Aspects

The study was innovative in its attempt to clarify and empirically study the impact of the school institutional context and informal learning culture relevant to the development of citizenship. These are relatively new fields of study, and combining them is seen as quite innovative. The study also built on recent research findings about the importance of school composition (e.g., Luyten, Scheerens, Visscher, Maslowski, Witziers, & Steen, 2005; Willms, 2004) and, in this way, provided a link to the problem of disadvantaged groups at school. The study sought to be methodologically innovative in using available “quantitative” instruments as a basis for a qualitative study of the complex phenomena targeted.

1.2 Intended Project Outcomes

1.2.1 Research Questions and Deliverables

1.2.1.1 Research Questions

1. How can citizenship as an educational objective be conceptually distinguished from social cohesion, social and cultural capital, and social and cultural integration?
2. How can education for citizenship remain relevant to future perspectives on education in relation to competency-based education, new conceptions of schooling, education and globalization, and situated cognition?
3. Which components can be discerned in both a context-embedded approach and an explicit teaching approach to citizenship education? How can the components of the context-embedded approach be articulated in the form of a checklist to guide the information gathering for school case studies? Which evidence from the context-embedded approaches can stimulate informal learning in citizenship?

4. What is the state of citizenship education in the participating countries, as evident from a limited number of in-depth school case descriptions?

5. Are the opportunities and constraints of citizenship education experienced differently by teachers and school leaders in schools with a different composition of cultural minority students?

6. Which promising practices in embedded approaches to develop citizenship and assess the outcomes of citizenship education can be discerned, and what are the options for quantitative and qualitative assessment?

The deliverables of the study were the following:

- A conceptual chapter in which the conceptual basis for informal learning of citizenship-related competencies is clarified.
- A set of checklists and scales to guide data collection in schools.
- Six case study descriptions per country, according to a fixed framework.
- A set of guidelines and approaches to assist schools in optimizing embedded informal learning on issues relevant to citizenship, including suggestions for a teaching approach that reflects on informal learning opportunities.
- A chapter of integrated case study results, culminating in suggestions for promising practices in stimulating informal learning and assessment.
- A chapter in which the focus of the study is summarized and recommendations for national and European citizenship in education are given.

1.2.2 Anticipated Impact on Target Groups of the Study

Policymakers and educational researchers were to be presented with a clear conceptual structure placing informal learning about citizenship issues in a context that is determined by the school culture (in terms of both explicit institutional norms and more implicit shared values) and school composition. Policymakers were to be informed about the degree to which this area can be seen as malleable by policy and school management. Educational researchers are expected to be stimulated to use the framework and empirical findings for further study.

Practitioners in the field of lower secondary education are provided with case study material with good practice descriptions that could inspire their own work.

School advisors and school inspectors are provided with information that could help them design monitoring and evaluation methods of informal learning for citizenship.
1.3 Approach and Organization

1.3.1 Methods and Stages in the Work

The study had an analytic and an empirical part. The work was divided into five stages: (1) conceptual analysis, (2) preparation of data collection, (3) execution of empirical data collection, (4) analysis, interpretation, and summary of data, and (5) reporting.

The study’s conceptual and analytic work was closely linked to the empirical part by means of checklists derived from the conceptual framework guiding the school case studies. The conceptual analysis should result in a framework in which the overarching concepts of school identity and development of citizenship at school are broken down into more operational components.

In each country, six lower secondary schools in urban areas were selected. These six schools vary on the basis of the school composition regarding the proportion of cultural minority students. Three categories were distinguished: less than 20% minority students, 35–45% minority students, and over 60% minority students.

Data were collected on the basis of site visits and observations, analysis of school documents such as the school programme or school development plan, interviews, and focus groups with teachers and the school head, and interviews and questionnaires administered to students. To some extent, the questionnaires were based on scales already available from a large evaluation study in Germany (Diedrich, Abs, & Klieme, 2004). Data collection was guided by the following: checklists for interviews and self-reports from school staff and students; addressing the school culture, school institutional norms, and objectives in the area of citizenship; the degree to which schools approach citizenship on the basis of embedded or explicit teaching methods, actual teaching methods, and learning material; and assessment and evaluation tools used by the schools. Data collection concentrated in particular on critical instances in the school that are of pedagogical importance for the development of citizenship. The key issue was to show how students learn from such instances (see the list of areas in Table 1.1). In addition, the case studies collected information on the degree to which the schools prioritized citizenship education and their satisfaction with approaches and outcomes. In Table 1.1, a tentative list of aspects of the school’s identity is related to outcome dimensions of citizenship. School identity is seen as the union of formal institutional rules, the school culture, and the leadership style of the school head. As such, identity is seen as a learning context for citizenship. Table 1.1 gives a preliminary overview of checkpoints and questions that were to guide the data collection.

It should be noted that information from various sources, including students, was collected to determine relevant aspects of school identity. The outcome dimensions of citizenship were only addressed in an exploratory way, based on student responses.
Table 1.1 Aspects of school identity and outcome dimensions of citizenship linked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School identity</th>
<th>Outcome dimensions of citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of decision-making at school</td>
<td>Democracy and its defining characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of student voice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open classroom climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of decisions made at school</td>
<td>Institutions and practices in democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instances of student decision-making on school matters</td>
<td>Political interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective experience of teachers and students about the school being hierarchical/autocratic or participative in decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the school head is perceived as autocratic or democratic by teachers and students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived opportunities for student participation in decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of disciplinary rules at school</td>
<td>Citizenship, rights, and duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of strictness and consistency with which disciplinary rules are applied</td>
<td>Self-concept of one’s own political competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether student rights are formally stated</td>
<td>Engagement in political activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way praise and blame are used by the school head and teachers</td>
<td>Seeking political information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The consistency between staff and school head in maintaining discipline and enforcing rights and rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree to which rights and duties are maintained in an equitable way for students with different backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way possible clashes between students’ cultural backgrounds and school rules are dealt with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension among the school staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion in the school staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ feeling of efficacy in discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ perception of violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any symbols of national identity visible in the school (e.g., the raising of the flag, celebration of a king’s/queen’s birthday?)</td>
<td>National identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are special days of cultural minorities dealt with at school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the composition of the teaching staff in terms of cultural majority and minorities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is assuring equal participation of parents from all cultural backgrounds a school goal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the management style of the school head supportive of teachers irrespective of cultural background?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the way students with different cultural backgrounds interact used as a basis for teaching/pedagogical activities?</td>
<td>International relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are staff members from cultural minorities well integrated in the school team?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.1 (continued)

| Are controversial aspects of a heterogeneous school population openly discussed in classes? | Social cohesion and diversity |
| Is background information on cultural identities provided in those instances? | Integration of foreigners |
| The degree to which the school staff supports the mission and major goals of the school | |
| The degree to which the school head is focused on human relations and staff cohesion | |
| Heterogeneity and homogeneity of the school staff and the student population | |
| The degree to which contacts between students from different cultural backgrounds are actively supported | |
| Aspects where cultural diversity is explicitly supported, along with common values, among students | |
| Students’ perception of the integration of different groups | |

1.4 Other Matters: Equity-Related Issues Concerning Disadvantaged Groups

Cultural minorities provide schools with unique opportunities to experience and “live through” issues of participation and cultural diversity and the challenges to abide by common agreements and rules. Mixed school populations could therefore be seen as fruitful contexts for the embedded approaches to citizenship education. It is likely that the degree of heterogeneity is crucially important for actually realizing these potential benefits. It has been argued that when the proportion of cultural minorities makes up 40% of the school population, the problematic aspects of heterogeneity predominate. It was therefore decided to carry out the school case studies in schools with different proportions of cultural minority students in each country.
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2.1 Introduction

The conceptual framework for this study consists of three types of factors (see Fig. 2.1):

1. the citizenship competencies and values,
2. the informal student activities and experiences at school and
3. the school context.

The first factor, referring to citizenship competencies and values, can be seen as resulting from (among other origins) the informal student activities and learning experiences at school. The second factor, informal activities and experiences at school, represents situations in which students ‘learn’ certain citizenship competencies. As such, these can be considered as mediating factors between the competencies and values on the one hand, and the school context, in which these activities and experiences are embedded on the other. The school context can be conceived as consisting of factors stimulating or restraining informal student activities and experiences.

Although the citizenship competencies and values are considered as being influenced by students’ informal learning experiences, it is acknowledged that these competencies and values, in their turn, influence informal activities and experiences. Moreover, citizenship competencies and values can also shape several school context conditions, under which the informal learning experiences take place. As such, the three types of factors are seen as related in a reciprocal rather than in a one-direction linear way.

The citizenship competencies (see Section 2.2), informal student activities and experiences at school (see Section 2.3) and school context (see Section 2.4) are discussed in more detail in the following sections.
Explicit teaching of citizenship

School culture
  a. Collaboration between teachers
  b. Teacher participation
  c. Professional development
  d. Relationship with parents

Classroom climate
  a. Student-teacher relationship
  b. Assessment orientation / monitoring
  c. Behavioral and disciplinary rules
  d. Open climate for expressing one’s views and discussion

School leadership
  a. Distributive leadership
  b. Community building
  c. Communicative leadership
  d. Empowerment

Structures for student involvement
  a. Existence of school council / school parliament etc.
  b. Opportunities for students to engage in school activities (like school paper etc.)
  c. Projects at school for helping others

Competencies relevant for active citizenship
  a. Citizenship values
  b. Normative competencies
  c. Action competencies

Students’ informal learning experiences: critical incidents
  a. Dealing with conflict situations in school
  b. Dealing with differences between cultures / multiculturality
  c. Dealing with peers and issues of collaboration in student (project) work

Fig. 2.1 Conceptual framework
2.2 Citizenship Competencies and Values

The concept of responsible citizenship has gained increasing interest in educational policy and practice. It is closely related to civic values such as democracy and human rights, equality, participation, partnership, social cohesion, solidarity, tolerance of diversity and social justice (Eurydice, 2005). Various classifications of citizenship competencies have been proposed by various national education committees and councils. Although these classifications often differ across nations, a number of common themes can nevertheless be identified.

First, citizenship competencies often involve some form of political literacy of students, such as students’ knowledge about social, political and civic institutions, as well as human rights, or recognition of the cultural and historical heritage. This is sometimes accompanied by knowledge on conditions under which people may live harmoniously together, social issues and ongoing social problems or knowledge and recognition of the cultural and linguistic diversity of society (Eurydice, 2005). A second common factor is community involvement or participation in society. This usually concerns the skills to become helpfully involved in the life of the community, and be in service of the community one belongs to (Deakin Crick, Coates, Taylor, & Ritchie, 2004). This incorporates not only school but also the wider local, regional or national communities, and may, with regard to a form of European citizenship, also encompass a cross-national community. Thirdly, moral and social development, or a development of critical thinking and moral values are identified as part of citizenship competencies. These latter elements involve acquiring social and moral responsibility, including self-confidence and learning to behave responsibly towards others. Moreover, students are expected to develop a recognition of and respect for oneself and others with a view to achieving greater mutual understanding.

In the project on which this book is based, citizenship competencies were primarily conceived as moral and social skills that enable students to perform adequately within the community (at the various aggregation levels) they are part of, and to relate to their fellow men. This concerns elements of all three themes described above, although the first – given its primate of knowledge on structures – is clearly less important than the other two. These substantial elements are seen as being subjected to different kinds of reflection by the learner. Underlying this classification is Piaget’s notion that a person acts vis-à-vis the world, which leads to that person’s experiences in dealing with his or her environment, and to barriers or impediments faced (problems and conflicts). These barriers are the reason for reflection on actions, which will lead to some solutions to overcome these problems and conflicts. These might either work or not, which subsequently will lead to reflection on reflections, appearing in values, general principles and questions of identity. Thus, three dimensions are identified:

1. related to ‘actions’, consisting of communicative, and instrumental and strategic action competencies;
2. ‘reflection on action’, or normative competencies, which act as a framework for actions, concerning issues of morality, tolerance and trust; and
3. ‘reflection on reflections’, or values, concerning human dignity, sustainability, identity and efficacy.

In the sections below, these three dimensions of citizenship competencies and values are further explained (see Table 2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action competencies</th>
<th>Normative competencies</th>
<th>Citizenship values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicative actions</td>
<td>Morality</td>
<td>Human dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental and strategic actions</td>
<td>Tolerance and mutual respect</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.1 Action Competencies

Action competencies are conceptualized in this study, following Habermas’ theory of communicative action, as communicative, and instrumental and strategic action (Habermas, 1990). In his discussion of rational action, Habermas differentiates between action oriented towards success and action oriented towards reaching understanding. In this context, success is evaluated relative to states of affairs purposefully generated by intervention in the world. Reaching understanding, on the other hand, is a process by which participants seek agreement concerning the nature of their interaction. Such an agreement defines the context within which actors pursue their individual plans.

#### 2.2.1.1 Instrumental and Strategic Action

Instrumental and strategic actions are success-oriented, that is to accomplish certain aims in negotiation or mediation with others. The intent of strategic communication, for instance, is not to reach an agreement about the goals of the action or to reach an understanding, but simply to convince others that a certain plan should be implemented, or a certain goal should be pursued (Johnson, 1991). In contrast to instrumental action, in strategic action this process takes place in a social context, influencing the actions of others involved. These actors can have their own agenda, and may have opposite views. Instrumental action takes place in a non-social context and has the character of one-way communication. In the context of our study, instrumental and strategic action refers to the persuasive and coercive strategies students develop to convince others of their arguments, and the willingness and ability to express their thoughts.

#### 2.2.1.2 Communicative Action

In contrast to the goal-oriented instrumental and strategic action, the communicative actions are consent-oriented. Communicative action consists of attempts by actors to cooperatively define the context of their interaction. It is the paradigmatic form
of social action towards reaching understanding (Johnson, 1991). It involves participants in the cooperative negotiation of common definitions of the situation in which they are interacting. In everyday communicative practice, this process of mutual interpretation remains implicit. In more reflective forms of communicative action – what Habermas refers to as discourse or argument – it is made explicit. In terms of citizenship competencies, students have to develop skills to listen to the arguments of others, discuss arguments with others and judge the value of these arguments and the willingness to reach consensus or to reach compromises.

2.2.2 Normative Competencies

Normative competencies concern issues of morality, tolerance and trust.

2.2.2.1 Morality

Morality or competencies of moral reasoning are conceptualized, following Gilligan’s (1986) distinction, by an ethic of justice and an ethic of care. The difference between these two is that in the case of justice, the problem is conceived as a conflict between individuals, whereas in the case of care one speaks of ruptures in relationships. Also, reasoning in terms of justice is based on rules, standards or principles, whereas reasoning in terms of care is ‘context-relative’. This means that within the ethic of care, rules do not play an important part in the selection of relevant information for solving or thinking about moral problems. Care is based on a representation, as complete as possible, of the concrete situation, the parties involved and their relationships.

This distinction between ethic of justice and ethic of care thus relates to what Scheerens (1983) has identified as procedural and substantive rationality. Students need to have a normative sense on moral dilemmas based on institutionalized, legal understandings, that is procedural rationality. At the same time, they need to have the skills to relate this dilemma to the benefits or deficits of all the parties or actors involved.

2.2.2.2 Tolerance and Mutual Respect

According to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)’s (1995) Declaration of Principles on Tolerance, tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world’s cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human. It is fostered by knowledge, openness, communication, freedom of thought, conscience and belief. Tolerance is harmony in difference. As such, it is closely intertwined with mutual respect for others in and outside school. Special attention in this respect deserves tolerance towards people – peer students, teachers or people living in the neighbourhood – with other religions, of other race or other sexual preferences.
2.2.3 Citizenship Values

2.2.3.1 Self-Efficacy

People are not only agents of action but also able to reflect on their actions. This capability may strengthen or weaken one’s belief in his or her own effectiveness. Through reflective self-consciousness, people evaluate their motivation, their actions and the effects of their actions. It is at this higher level of self-reflectivity that individuals address conflicts in motivational inducements and choose to act in favour of one over another (Bandura, 2001). According to Bandura, people’s beliefs in their capability to exercise some measure of control over their own functioning and (collectively) over events in their environment form the foundation for their actions. ‘Unless people believe they can produce desired results and forestall detrimental ones by their actions, they have little incentive to act or to persevere in the face of difficulties. Whatever other factors may operate as guides and motivators, they are rooted in the core belief that one has the power to produce effects by one’s actions’ (p. 10). Bandura’s contention of the influential role played by efficacy beliefs in human functioning is supported by various meta-analyses on self-efficacy (Holden, 1991; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998).

2.2.3.2 Human Dignity

Human dignity is based on the belief that every person, regardless of circumstances of his/her existence, is entitled to be treated as an individual worthy of respect. Through human dignity, students establish a clear understanding that individual feelings and ideas are worthy of self-expression and respect. Ownership of personal views and emotions is at the heart of self-acceptance, and the security to share genuinely unique aspects of self creates trust and confidence (Rogers, 1969; Fraser, 1987).

2.2.3.3 Sustainability

Sustainability refers to the ideals of a sustainable world – a world that is just, equitable and peaceable, in which individuals care for the environment to contribute to intergenerational equity. This involves not only natural resources, such as respect for nature, but also ‘social’ resources. These latter refer to care for other people living in poverty or under difficult circumstances.

2.3 Informal Student Activities and Experiences

Citizenship competencies are acquired by students explicitly or implicitly, through formal, non-formal or informal learning. This study is aimed at identifying the acquisition of citizenship competencies through informal learning at school. Informal learning is often contrasted with formal learning or formal education, and is
distinguished from non-formal education. To mark the differences between these terms, Coombs & Ahmed’s (1974) classification is widely adopted:

- **Formal education** refers to the ‘institutionalised, chronologically graded and hierarchically structured educational system, spanning lower primary school and the upper reaches of the university’ (p. 8).
- **Non-formal education** is ‘any organized, systematic, educational activity carried on outside the framework of the formal system to provide selected types of learning to particular subgroups in the population, adults as well as children’ (p. 8).
- **Informal education** is ‘the lifelong process by which every person acquires and accumulates knowledge, skills, attitudes and insights from daily experiences and exposure to the environment’ (p. 8).

Following these definitions, both formal and non-formal education consist of organized educational activities, although the definition of formal education suggests that formal education encompasses a sequence of years, with a curriculum overarching these various years, whereas non-formal education usually covers a shorter time frame. Also, non-formal education seems to be addressed to specific groups, over a time span from children to adults, whereas the definition of formal education suggests that it is not directed towards a specific group with specific needs, but to the whole population, and its age span is more limited to young children to young adults. Despite these implicit differences, the most notable distinction between the two types of education, however, is the fact that the term formal education is reserved for ‘official’ education, legitimated by law. Non-formal education, on the other hand, takes place outside of this formal structure, and might be very diverse in its forms, and in the actors involved in this kind of education.

Formal education and informal education can be considered as opposites in the definition of Coombs and Ahmed. Most strikingly, this can be illustrated by the fact that formal education is described from the viewpoint of the ‘system’, whereas informal education is described from the viewpoint of the ‘learner’. In formal education, external agencies determine the content of education, whereas in informal learning no prescription regarding the content can be made. What people learn is dependent on the context they face, and how they deal with these contexts. This is sometimes described as how ‘open’ or how ‘sensitive’ learners are to pick up the opportunities for learning in the situations offered to them. At the same time, the definition of informal learning indicates that ‘people learn all of the time’, and it is an ongoing process from a person’s birth till his death.

Unlike informal education where learning happens less consciously, in non-formal education the individual is usually aware of the fact that he/she is learning.

In these definitions, the difference between formal, non-formal and informal education is often narrowed to the settings in which education takes place. This may be the consequence of the term ‘education’ used in these definitions. As La Belle (1982) has noticed, it is useful to distinguish between the settings or modes on the one hand and the processes that take place on the other. As far as processes are concerned, he prefers to refer to ‘learning’ instead of ‘education’. As La Belle indicates, non-formal learning may take place in formal settings, for instance where
extracurricular activities that fall outside the formal curriculum are scheduled by schools. Similarly, informal learning can take place in formal education, through learning experiences of students while working in peer groups. In this study, we will conceptualize informal learning in terms of processes, rather than in terms of settings. Informal learning in a school context then refers to a specific form of learning, which is studied in the setting of ‘formal education’.

Even given this clarification, it is nevertheless sometimes difficult to distinguish formal learning from informal learning. A large number of countries have recently turned to, or are about to turn to, forms of active learning, self-directed or self-regulated learning, and collaborative learning. These forms – as well as similar types of learning – are based on the constructivist principle of knowledge construction. Schuell (1988) has typified this as ‘It is active in that the student must do certain things while processing incoming information in order to learn the material in a meaningful manner. It is constructive in that new information must be elaborated and related to other information in order for the student to retain simple information and to understand complex material. It is cumulative in that all new learning builds upon and/or utilizes the learner’s prior knowledge in ways that determine what and how much is learned. It is goal oriented in that learning is most likely to be successful if the learner is aware of the goal (at least in a general sense) toward which he or she is working and possesses expectations that are appropriate for attaining the desired outcome.’ (p. 277–278) To the degree that learning activities and learning outcomes are not specified in advance, actual student learning will also be dependent on conversations with peers, working with peers in groups and discussions with the teacher, for instance. These activities can also be considered to be of an informal nature.

The learning that takes place is, in the first instance, dependent on the reflective competencies of students (cf. Schön, 1983). These, however, can be stimulated by others facing the same situation, like peers, or more likely the teacher. Fagen (1986) has presented a continuum for classroom intervention strategies teachers can use to reduce undesirable behaviour in students, or to increase desirable behaviour. He ranges these responses from ‘least intensive’ to ‘most intensive’. Stimulating desirable behaviour ranges from stating expectations and modelling, over structuring and positive reinforcement, to regulated permission, contracting and token systems. Informal learning of citizenship competencies, therefore, will occur as a result of self-reflection, dialogue and discourse.

As a consequence, critical incidents where learning takes place will involve some form of self-reflection by the student, dialogue or discourse. As such, the critical incidents are often unexpected or unforeseen situations in the classroom or in school, which give rise to any of these forms. These occur, for instance, when conflict situations between students, or between a teacher and a student, emerge. These informal learning experiences may also emerge from situations in schools where reactions are largely culturally bound, and where others react in a different manner to the same circumstances. And, they may arise from collaboration or mutual work with peers, for example during group work or other ‘formal’ classroom or school activities.
2.4 School Context

Research studies focusing on school and context factors that influence the (informal) learning of citizenship competencies, or that might enhance or hinder situations in which citizenship learning occurs, are relatively sparse. Notable exceptions are studies described in the recent reviews of Deakin Crick et al. (2004) and Halstead & Taylor (2000) on this issue. Largely based on these reviews, as well as a few studies that addressed this topic recently, the following factors are identified: classroom climate, school culture, school leadership and structures for student involvement.

2.4.1 Classroom Climate and School Culture

Teachers play an important role in school when dealing with sociomoral problems that arise in school. When confronted with student conflict, teachers may employ different coping strategies. As Oser & Althof (1993) argue, teachers need to involve students in a discourse on these issues. Meaningful involvement of students presumes awareness of the teacher of his or her responsibility in dealing with the conflicts that occur. Other criteria for creating an (informal) situation to address these sociomoral controversies include commitment of teachers, teachers’ participation, the presupposition that students have reasoning skills to deal with these issues and the actual participation of students in the decision on how to act (Oser & Althof, 1993). Strategies teachers use will depend on the nature of the sociomoral conflicts that occur. In a study on Israeli schools, Maslovaty (2000) found that teachers are inclined to take up conflicts of integrity through private talks with students. This included situations in which a student monitor marks an absent friend as being present, good friends who both hand in identical homework or two students claiming the same paper. On issues involving physical and verbal violence, teachers often relied on group discussions. This included circumstances in which a student tells on his friends, and gets beaten for it by them, as well as a new immigrant student who is laughed at because of his accent.

Maslovaty (2000) concludes that the nature of conflicts determines to a large extent how these are dealt with in the classroom. Besides this, the community of teachers and the school climate play an important role. Teachers are more inclined to use discourse with their students to resolve moral dilemmas when the teaching staff is committed towards reconciling conflict and confrontation, and promoting exchange of views. A supportive community of teachers incites discussions with students. This emphasizes the need for consensus on professional morality among staff to raise teachers’ awareness of sociomoral issues, and to stimulate teachers to deal with these issues in a way that encourages the moral development of their students (cf. Deakin Crick et al., 2004). A set of shared values within the school community is essential to go beyond the student’s acquisition of civic knowledge, skills and understanding (Deakin Crick, 2002). By introducing shared values into teaching and learning across the curriculum, teachers found themselves able to address