

Moral education and character education: their relationship and roles in citizenship education

Wolfgang Althof* and Marvin W. Berkowitz*
University of Missouri-St. Louis, USA

Any democratic society must concern itself with the socialization of its citizens. This begins in childhood, and schools are critical to this process. The interrelations and roles of educating for character (character education, moral education) and educating for citizenship (citizenship education, civic education) are explored, largely in a North American context. It is argued that citizenship education necessarily entails character and moral formation, but this integration is hindered by negative stereotyping between the two fields. In addition, negative stereotyping between the fields of moral education and character education further complicates attempts at synthesis. Through explorations of each of these domains and their similarities and differences, it is concluded that the role of schools in fostering the development of moral citizens in democratic societies necessitates focus on moral development, broader moral and related character development, teaching of civics and development of citizenship skills and dispositions. Moreover, these outcomes overlap and cut across the fields of moral, character and citizenship education.

At the Center for Character and Citizenship (CCC) we have had to grapple with many marriages: the marriage of moral education and character education; the marriage of moral and character education to citizenship education; and so on. In part, this is because the co-directors of the CCC are the Teresa M. Fischer Endowed Chair in Citizenship Education and the Sanford N. McDonnell Endowed Chair in Character Education. The first author occupies the former chair and the second author occupies the latter chair. Both authors came to their respective positions with strong intellectual roots in the field of moral education, Althof as an educational psychologist and Berkowitz as a developmental psychologist. This has led to some interesting grappling with conceptual and practical areas of overlap and disjunction. In this paper we will address many of these tensions, relationships and conceptual resolutions. More specifically, we will first take on the sometimes tumultuous and even rancorous relation between the fields of moral education and character

*Correspondence can be sent to either author at: College of Education, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 402 Marillac Hall, One University Blvd., St. Louis, MO, 63121-4400, USA. Email either: althofw@umsl.edu or Berkowitz@umsl.edu

education. We will then turn our attention to the nuances within citizenship and civic education. With that in hand, we will finally address the conceptual relations between the moral/character domain and the civic/citizenship domain.

Moral education vs. character education

When people first learn of moral or character education, their second question is typically 'Is this a new field?' (Their first question is 'What is that?') The answer is that this field has existed as long as humans have thought about how to raise each subsequent generation. Classic thinkers, like Aristotle and Confucius, have reflected in depth upon the questions central to both of these fields; i.e. what kind of person do we want each of our children to be and how can we raise and educate them to be that way? Of course, the answers to both questions vary widely, but at the heart of each, at least at a societal level, is morality. Societies need moral members. They need children to develop into moral adults. It is not enough for a society to be populated with benign hedonists, as a truly civil society needs citizens to care about the general welfare and those who cannot advocate for themselves. Human beings need to understand that they 'share a common humanity' and that respect must extend 'from particular persons to society in general' (Youniss & Yates, 1999, p. 369). Nor is it adequate to have a strong and clear legal system to proscribe immoral and prescribe moral behaviour; we have all heard the dictum: 'you can't legislate morality'. No law is people-proof: ill-intentioned people will find a way around the law. For a society to truly thrive and endure, it needs citizens who are intrinsically and actively pro-social. Human societies require education for pro-social development, or, as we have called it more generally, positive youth development (Berkowitz, Sherblom, Bier & Battistich, 2006; cf. Larson, 2000).

Of course there are many approaches to educating for positive youth development, but two of the predominant ones are moral education and character education. We will briefly review the nature and history of these fields, with an admittedly and intentionally North American bias. As it is assumed the readership of this journal is well-versed in moral education, we will at this juncture say more about character education than about moral education.

Moral education

In the West, at least, the term moral education has been most strongly associated with a constructivist psychological framework. Made popular first by Jean Piaget (1965) and more strongly by Lawrence Kohlberg (1971, 1976), moral education is the attempt to promote the development of children's and adolescents' moral cognitive structures (moral reasoning stages) in school settings. Kohlberg (Coiby & Kohlberg, 1987) identified a series of six stages of sequenced constructions of a sense of justice. These stages were argued to be universal in nature and sequence. From an educational standpoint, there were two main, and interrelated, pedagogical approaches to promoting such development. The less complex is moral dilemma

discussion (Berkowitz, 1985), which entails facilitated peer-group discussions of open-ended moral problem stories. The more complex, which incorporates moral dilemma discussion, is the Just Community School (Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989), a radical experiment in direct democracy in small sub-school settings (e.g. a group of 100 students and five teachers in a larger high school) or in small elementary schools (Althof, 2003). These small democracies are explicitly focused on promoting justice and community. Important characteristics of both of these pedagogical strategies are that they are theory driven, heavily influenced by psychology, designed to promote the development of moral reasoning stages and well-researched.

One important distinction that remains to be made is between the psychology of (specifically) cognitive moral development and moral psychology more generally. Like moral development, the latter tends to be both empirical and theory-driven, as well as heavily influenced by psychology; however, it includes many other psychological concepts beyond those studied by moral development (i.e. moral-reasoning stage development). For example, moral psychology includes concepts such as conscience (Kochanska, 1991), empathy (Hoffman, 2000), values (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987) and altruism (Eisenberg & Mussen, 1989). A few attempts have been made to offer an integrative model of moral psychological development (including moral reasoning development); see for example, Damon (1988), Berkowitz (1997) and Lapsley and Narvaez (2006). Because the main disagreements between moral education and character focus on the moral reasoning perspective of the former, we will focus mainly on the narrower domain of moral cognitive development, although we will turn to the broader domain of moral psychology as a means of attempting to integrate these various fields.

Character education

The field of character education is much more difficult to chart. The term has been mostly used in the USA, but for a longer time than the term moral education. There was a large interest in educating for character development starting at the end of the nineteenth century and continuing through the first four decades of the twentieth century, essentially interrupted by World War II (McClellan, 1999). It was mostly a traditional approach, focusing on the inculcation of desirable habits. Even John Dewey (1922) defined character as the 'interpenetration of habits' (p. 38) and the effect of consequences of actions upon such habits. This behavioural orientation has an important legacy for the development of the field.

After World War II, there was a vacuum in US education concerning educating for positive youth development. But with the social and political upheaval of the 1960s, a resurgent interest in this age-old challenge arose. In response to societal questioning of moral values and policies, numerous approaches to socializing youth were proposed. One was moral education, as described above. Another was values clarification, a relatively short-lived but nonetheless highly influential approach that focused on promoting self-discovery but with an implicit philosophy of moral

relativism. Yet another was the rediscovery of character education, often with a strong Aristotelian justification. In fact, most of the character education work blurred the line between Aristotelian virtues ethics and psychological behaviourism, in part because of the somewhat overlapping reliance on the acquisition of habits and in part because of the under-emphasis on theory in the more practice-oriented field of character education. An exception was the study group The Foundations for Moral Education and Character Development which operated in the first half of the 1980s and resulted in a three-volume set of essays – Knowles & McClean, 1992; McClean, Ellrod, Schindler & Mann, 1986; Ryan & McClean, 1986. Despite this extensive body of work, these volumes unfortunately remain obscure and are rarely cited. Recently, Lapsley and Narvaez (2006) have published a broad theoretical review of the conceptual roots of character education.

In the early 1990s, however, the field of character education changed. A pair of attempts to create a national agenda for character education brought together some strange bedfellows under the 'big tent' philosophy of banding together to serve the USA through promoting the positive development of youth, predominantly in schools. The watershed was reached in 1992 when, within a few months of each other, the Josephson Institute launched what later become Character Counts and the first planning meetings of the eventual Character Education Partnership were held. At both meetings were experts with quite diverse perspectives (including representatives of the moral education approach). Through these and other events and initiatives, character education was broadened to include a wider range of pedagogical and philosophical perspectives. However, it remained largely a-theoretical and non-scientific, at least as compared with the moral education movement. More recently, however, a sizeable body of school-based outcome studies has generated an empirical data-base for demonstrating the potential effectiveness of character education (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005).

Character education remains a phenomenon difficult to define, as it includes a very wide range of outcome goals, pedagogical strategies and philosophical orientations. There is substantial overlap between the character education and moral education 'camps', evidenced by a large number of North American members of the Association for Moral Education who also belong to the Character Education Partnership. In fact, numerous character educators have incorporated moral development into their character education models. Lickona (1991) emphasizes the promotion of moral reasoning through peer discussion. Berkowitz and Bier (2005) report that effective character education programs frequently target moral development and implement moral discussion in classrooms. Lickona and Davidson (2005) include critical thinking as one of their targeted '8 strengths of character'. Most notably, the Character Education Partnership's flagship document *Eleven principles sourcebook* (Beland, 2003), offers a lengthy discussion of moral development and education as part of its focus on the cognitive side of character. Nonetheless there is an uneasy tension between those who hold to a theory-based approach to promoting moral cognitive capacities and those who largely a-theoretically want to promote self-motivated competent moral agents.

Moral vs. character education

There are a few key differences between moral education (defined here as cognitive-developmental approaches to moral education) and character education, most notably that:

- Moral education tends to be theory-based and character education tends to be a-theoretical. Moral education is heavily influenced by and derived from cognitive-structural models of stages of moral reasoning development (Piaget, 1965; Damon, 1976; Kohlberg, 1976).
- Moral education, in its current guise dates to the 1960s, remaining relatively stable over time. Character education has been evolving repeatedly for well over a century (McClellan, 1999).
- Moral education typically has a narrow focus (the development of moral reasoning structures). The exception to this is the infrequently implemented Just Community School model which attempts to expand the narrow moral reasoning development focus to incorporate the development of moral behaviour, values and emotions (Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977), although moral reasoning development remains the primary outcome variable even in Just Community studies. Character education, on the other hand, has a very comprehensive and diverse set of targeted outcomes. Similarly, moral education relies on a very narrow range of pedagogical strategies and character education has a very broad and variable range of strategies (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005).
- Moral education, as the term suggests, is more focally a *moral* domain than is character education. Moral education focuses on the development of justice reasoning, and, insofar as it incorporates more recent work on relational morality, reasoning about interpersonal care. Character education, because it takes a very broad approach, often blurs the line between moral concepts and other non-moral but related concepts. Berkowitz (1997) attempted to delineate the latter as 'foundational characteristics', suggesting they are not specifically moral (e.g. perseverance, loyalty, courage) but serve to support moral agency. They derive their moral status, if they acquire any, from the moral or immoral ends to which they are applied (i.e. do you persevere to serve good or evil? Are you loyal to a moral or immoral cause?). More recently, Lickona and Davidson (2005) have offered a new model that identifies two sides of character (moral character and performance character), that approximate the distinction made by Berkowitz. However, Lickona and Davidson argue that they are equal in status, rather than one being derivative of the other, and need to be equivalent goals of character education. For many moral educators, the incorporation of some of these non-moral concepts is a salient reason for distancing themselves from the character education field, while for many character educators this inclusive duality connects them more centrally to the academic side of schools and the central mission of schooling (i.e. educating and developing the whole child).
- Moral education comes from a liberal, social science tradition and character education comes predominantly from a classic, traditional and at times

philosophical tradition. This is an overly simplistic dichotomy, however, for (1), as noted above, theory has a stronger place in moral education than in character education; (2) character education has become a very eclectic field and actually incorporates some of moral education; and (3) character education at times is atheoretical and at times relies on varying combinations of virtue ethics and psychological behaviourism. Nonetheless, as a trend, this still remains accurate. Kohlberg (1981) wrote extensively about the liberal tradition upon which his work was based. The progressive education movement, and Dewey in particular, strongly influenced his applications to education. Moral education methods tend toward liberal, democratic forms (e.g. the Just Community Schools were radical experiments in democratizing schools, and moral dilemma discussions are decidedly empowering and democratic in nature). Traditional character education, on the other hand, has relied more on conservative and hierarchical methods (e.g. adult advocacy, direct teaching, presentations of inspirational cultural artefacts). Perhaps this is a reason why some important educational models based more on progressive roots (e.g. the Child Development Project and the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning) have avoided defining themselves as 'character education' programs (Watson *et al.*, 1989; <http://www.casel.org>).

- Moral education, in part because it has strong roots in social science, tends to have a much stronger empirical base and orientation. More recently, in part because of funding by and legislation from the USA federal government, the empirical base of character education has grown. It is worth noting, however, that when attempts are made to review this research (Beland, 2003; Berkowitz & Bier, 2005) they frequently incorporate moral education research. In fact, in their comprehensive review of the character education outcome research, Berkowitz and Bier report that the most commonly supported outcome of character education is socio-moral reasoning development. This is a direct product of the extensive research on Kohlbergian moral dilemma discussions. Furthermore, two of the 33 supported character education programs they identify are moral dilemma discussions and the Just Community Schools program, both moral development models.

Citizenship and civic education

Citizenship

In one sense, citizenship is a legal category, identifying one's legal status, entitled rights and responsibilities, as a member of a society. In a deeper sense, however, it is much more than that. In democratic societies, fair procedures (the rule of law) and constitutional rights are designed to maintain equality among citizens but also to ensure the active role of citizens in contributing to society, partly through participation in democratic decision-making. Thus, a key aspect of democratic citizenship is the capacity to 'move beyond one's individual self-interest and to be

committed to the well-being of some larger group of which one is a member' (Sherrod, Flanagan, & Youniss, 2002, p. 265), which includes the ability (and the motivation) to follow debates on current public policy issues and to participate in local and national politics. 'For the purpose of clarity, we use the term civic competence to refer to an understanding of how government functions, and the acquisition of behaviours that allow citizens to participate in government and permit individuals to meet, discuss, and collaborate to promote their interests within a framework of democratic principles' (Youniss *et al.*, 2002, p. 124). This conception is consistent with Dewey's view that democracy is not only a form of government (which would require educated voters) but also a mode of living together (which requires citizens prepared to solve differences in mutual deliberation in a respectful way and to engage responsibly in the common interest). Informed and effective citizenship in a democracy must be nurtured. There is a tension between a narrow definition of citizenship as a legal status, a middle definition of citizenship as knowledge of and skills for participation in the political sphere, and a broader definition of citizenship as a combination of knowledge about society, skills for participation in society and dispositions to engage constructively in public efforts to promote the common good.

Citizenship education

For any society, the question must arise as to how to instil citizenship in each subsequent generation, however citizenship is defined. Here we enter the field of citizenship education. Not surprisingly, there is variation in what this endeavour is called (e.g. citizenship education, civic education, political socialization, democratic education). For the purposes of this discussion we will call it citizenship education, although we will make a distinction below between citizenship education and civic education. We will not attempt to give a full account of approaches to citizenship education in this article (see Parker, 2003, for one such attempt), but rather will highlight some controversial standpoints and suggest a possible consensus.

It is important to note that there is a common and often unreflective complex interplay between the outcomes of citizenship education (i.e. citizenship, differentially defined as knowledge, skills and dispositions) and the methods of citizenship education (e.g. direct instruction, direct experience with politics, indirect experience with public service, etc.).

On the conceptual level, there has been a longstanding tension in educational theory and research between approaches directed towards knowledge delivery and approaches directed toward practice, active participation and experiential learning as the means to competent citizenship.

The 'knowledge' model presumes that information *of itself* will lead to understanding and to appropriate motivation. By providing children with information (including the skills to read that information critically), both enlightenment *and involvement* will follow; 'appropriate' civic knowledge will motivate civic participation. In contrast, the 'praxis' model assumes that practical and theoretical knowledge, and particularly

the motivation to use them, are acquired through actively engaging with relevant tasks. The assumption is that knowledge comes from making sense of experience rather than vice versa, and that knowledge has limited usefulness unless it translates into the individual's own encounters with salient materials. (Haste, 2004, p.425)

Traditional citizenship education (typically self-identified as 'civic education') has employed the knowledge model. In the civics courses required in US middle and especially high school curricula the focus is on factual knowledge *about* government, as well as on the individual as the bearer of constitutional rights. In this context, the Center for Civic Education 'designer of the *CIVITAS* (the great bulk of which focuses on government, the constitution and elections) has had particular impact in promoting civics approaches. It has been the architect for national standards on what students need to know, and its school curriculum, 'We the People' (as well as its authorized international version, 'Project Citizen') is widely used' (Boyte, 2003, p. 88).

Learning by way of praxis, experience and deliberative discourse has been promoted (at least) since Dewey and the pre-WWII progressive education movement. More recently, communitarianism has emphasized the importance of communal life and, hence, responsibilities more than individualism and a focus on individual rights. From a communitarian perspective, citizenship education should focus on community service in order to access the values of responsibility for and commitment to others and the common good.

It appears in recent years that a consensus is taking shape. As Galston (2001) states, 'This consensus typically replaces either/or choices with both/and propositions. The skills needed to judge the deeds of representatives and to initiate action are both important; civil discourse need not lack passion; (...) classroom study and community practice both play a role in forming citizens' (p. 218). At least within the scope of educational theory (practitioners tend to be more practical and eclectic in their methods and orientations), the radically experiential doctrines of the progressive education movement (that tended to underestimate the fact that not all experience is educative, the significance of prior knowledge for further learning, and the need for systematic, structured and sequential learning) today have minority status, as have advocates of factual literacy, like J. Martin Rochester (2005), who insists on the exclusive priority of solid knowledge in claiming, 'The 'social curriculum' can become a major distraction from teaching the substance of history and related subject matter. The more time spent on cultivating 'civic virtue', the less time can be devoted to developing cognitive competences and skills' (p. 654). Walter Parker, critiqued in Rochester's article, states what seems to be the more consensual perspective on this matter:

Citizens need disciplinary knowledge just as much as they need deliberative experience and skill. The suggestion to engage students in dialogues on the shared problems of school life is not an argument for lessening emphasis on subject-matter learning. To the contrary, making decisions without knowledge – whether immediate knowledge of the alternatives under consideration or background knowledge – is no cause for celebration. Action without understanding is not wise action except by accidents. (...) Consequently, a rigorous liberal arts curriculum that deals in powerful ideas, important

issues, and core values is essential alongside deliberations of controversial public issues. (Parker, 2005, p.350)

It is worth noting that this synthesis is far from complete, as Parker highlights knowledge and skills but does not address dispositions, character and motives, something to which we shall return when we take the up the relationship of character education and citizenship education.

It is now a consensual idea that a competent, engaged and effective citizenship – necessary for full political, economic, social and cultural participation – requires a set of competencies that are commonly grouped into (a) civic and political knowledge (such as concepts of democracy, understanding the structure and mechanics of political decision-making and legislation, citizens' rights and duties, current political issues and problems); (b) intellectual skills (e.g. the ability to understand, analyse and check the reliability of information about government and public policy issues); (c) social and participatory skills (e.g. the ability to reason, argue and express own views in political discussions; conflict solution skills; knowing how to influence policies and decisions by petitioning and lobbying, build coalitions and co-operate with partner organisations); and (d) certain values, attitudes and 'dispositions' with a motivational power (e.g. interest in social and political affairs, a sense of responsibility, tolerance and recognition of own prejudices; appreciation of values on which democratic societies are founded like democracy, social justice and human rights). One of the most elaborate accounts of these 'strands' of competent citizenship can be found in Torney-Purta and Vermeer Lopez (2006; also see Patrick & Vontz, 2001).

In recent scholarly writing, as well as in position statements of widely recognised institutions or associations, the commensurate importance and interconnectedness of civic knowledge, skills and dispositions almost has the status of common sense. For example, position statements confirming this view were issued by

- the Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools (Carnegie Corporation and CIRCLE, 2003);
- the Center for Civic Education in its Campaign to Promote Civic Education (Center for Civic Education, 2006);
- the Education Commission of the States and its National Center for Learning and Citizenship in their initiative Every Student a Citizen (Compact for Learning and Citizenship & National Study Group on Citizenship in K-12 Schools, 2000, 2001; Miller, 2004);
- the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS, 2001) in a position statement *Creating effective citizens*.
- and the National Alliance for Civic Education (NACE) in an authorized statement on *The Importance of Civic Education* (Wichowsky & Levine, n.d.).

In order to promote the learning of civic knowledge as well as the development of relevant skills and dispositions, citizenship education has tended to incorporate both classroom study and community practice. Indeed, these are the two dominant elements in citizenship education offered to US students today – social studies

and civic education classes on the one hand, service opportunities on the other. Optimally both are related, as in some forms of curricular integrated service-learning.

Civic education in the classroom

It is clear that US students receive far too little citizenship education. *The civic mission of schools*, a national report generated by 50 leading experts in the field and co-sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), concluded about civics education in US middle and high schools (other than delivered in USA history and law-related classes):

Although the percentage of students enrolled in at least one high school government course has remained fairly constant since the late 1920s, most formal civic education [in the United States] today comprises only a single course on government – compared to as many as three courses in civics, democracy, and government that were common until the 1960s. The traditional ‘civics’ course used to emphasize the rights and responsibilities of citizens and ways that they could work together and relate to government. ‘Problems of democracy’ involved discussions of public policy issues. The ‘government’ class (which remains common today) describes and analyzes government in a more distant way, often with little explicit discussion of a citizen’s role. (Carnegie Corporation and CIRCLE, 2003, p. 14)

The government course (which normally does not include study of local government) clearly is more abstract and removed from adolescents’ first-hand experiences than the two additional courses that were formerly taught. Charles N. Quigley, Executive Director of the Center for Civic Education, paints an even gloomier picture by pointing to the fact that the one-semester course in civics is usually taken in twelfth grade (age 17) and is taken by no more than 85% of the students. ‘Unfortunately, this is too little and too late. Add to the 15% of students who do not take a civics course the 15% of the students who do not finish high school and we find that many of the students who arguably need civics the most do not get it at all’ (Quigley, 2004, p.4). Furthermore, only half of the states have at least partially fostered the implementation of these policies with adequate standards, curricular requirements, curricular materials, teacher preparation and professional development and assessment programs (Gagnon, 2003).

The cutback of civics classes in high school is particularly deplorable since the high school years are most important in the process of political socialization: at this developmental level, students have developed a more differentiated understanding of politics and society as a framework into which new facts and concepts can be integrated, and they are increasingly close to full formal citizenship so that even the drier part of civics instruction has a chance to be perceived as meaningful (Niemi & Junn, 1998; Galston, 2001).

Studies that compare today’s young people to older cohorts (such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP) have shown that the new generation is the least knowledgeable about government structure, historical persons and events

and contemporary politics – and is the most politically disengaged (Lutkus *et al.*, 1999; Keeter *et al.*, 2002).

As noted above, the methods of citizenship education vary from purely didactic knowledge delivery to community service. There is a clear correlation between the extent of explicit social studies and civic instruction and the degree and depth of civic knowledge that students acquire, especially when teaching is not only textbook related but also includes the discussion of current issues that are publicly debated or affect students’ lives in their communities (Niemi & Junn, 1998, especially p. 148; Lutkus *et al.*, 1999; Baldi *et al.*, 2001; Torney-Purta *et al.*, 2001; Carnegie Corporation & Circle, 2003; Hess & Freedman, 2006). As the IEA study shows, it is active learning that contributes to civic knowledge, skills and attitudes; and active learning is supported by an open classroom climate allowing for the discussion of current and historical issues and by democratic practices in the classroom (Torney-Purta, 2002; Youniss *et al.*, 2002).

The prevalent instructional strategy, however, is knowledge transmission. Both the NAEP and the IEA studies indicate that the regular classroom is teacher-centered. Activities like participating in mock trials, writing opinion letters or engaging in debates were rare (Lutkus *et al.*, 1999; Baldi *et al.*, 2001; Losito & Mintrop, 2001). ‘Too often citizenship education in schools is sterile and designed to teach about democracy rather than practice it’ (Sears & Hyslop-Margison, 2006, p. 21). If this conclusion is correct, the implications are dangerous. The school reform literature suggests ‘that narrow instruction restricted to facts from textbooks and covering few topics in depth leaves students with disconnected knowledge and a lack of excitement about the real world of social practice outside their school and classrooms’ (Torney-Purta, 2002, p. 210).

Community service/service learning

The *Civic mission of schools* report is in accordance with the IEA results in emphasizing that effective approaches to civic/citizenship education have the following characteristics: a deliberate focus on civic outcomes, such as students’ propensity to vote, to work on local problems and to follow the news; explicit advocacy of civic and political engagement; active learning opportunities that offer students the chance to engage in discussions of issues and take part in activities that can help put a ‘real life’ perspective on what is learned in class, in addition to an emphasis on the ideas and principles that are essential to constitutional democracy (Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003). In addition, the report stresses the importance of the school environment and culture to the acquisition of civic skills and attitudes:

The most effective programs occur in schools that consciously promote civic engagement by all students, with special attention to those who might otherwise be disengaged; give students opportunities to contribute opinions about the governance of the school – not just through student governments, but in forums that engage the entire student body or in smaller groups addressing significant problems in the school; (...) collaborate with the community and local institutions to provide civic learning opportunities (p. 21).

One of the best practices described in the report is 'community service that is linked to the formal curriculum and classroom instruction' (Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003, p. 21), i.e. service-learning.

Civic education in the classroom alone cannot develop the participatory skills and the habitual attitudes necessary for sustained engaged citizenship. It can help build knowledge – which is important because it guides behaviour to a certain degree. However, knowledge without meaningful and motivating practice is not sufficient (Sherrod *et al.*, 2002; Haste 2004). Community service offers opportunities for such participatory practice that allows for different motivations to come into play and to grow: the satisfaction of doing good work and helping others, the sense of self and collective efficacy in being involved and having a role and responsibility, and the sense of contributing to something larger than oneself (Sherrod *et al.*, 2002). Fortunately, the number of adolescents in the USA who do community service is very high (Flanagan *et al.*, 1999).

Service-learning is less common but 'has grown by leaps and bounds' (Billig, 2000, p.659) in recent years, in K-12 schools as well as on the college level where it is promoted by Campus Compact (a coalition of nearly 1,000 college and university presidents, <http://www.compact.org/>) and the American Democracy Project (<http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/default.htm>). While definitions of service-learning vary (and, correspondingly, the reported numbers of students involved in service-learning), it is not identical with, nor an add-on to community service but intentionally connects service experiences to academic objectives. In their report for the National Center for Educational Statistics, Skinner and Chapman (1999) define service-learning 'as curriculum-based community service that integrates classroom instruction with community service activities' (p. 3).

Reviews of the research literature (e.g. Youniss, McLellan & Yates, 1997; Anderson, 1998; Perry & Katula, 2001; Billig, 2000, 2004) show that community service and service-learning can contribute to significant increases in a variety of civic skills and attitudes: the research conducted as part of service-learning projects can enhance civic knowledge; community service and service-learning can help develop an ethic of service (decisiveness to contribute to the common good, commitment to service and volunteerism); civic engagement (interest for and participation in public affairs, community involvement) and civic self-efficacy; social capital development (e.g. relationship with adult civic leaders and community organizations); civic attitudes (e.g. cooperativeness, social responsibility) and 'civic identity' (Yates & Youniss, 1999), defining the self as a contributing member of the local, regional, national or global community; a sense of belonging and social connection; tolerance and acceptance of diversity; cognitive and social competences (communication, empathy, perspective-taking, cognitive complexity, problem-solving skills, interpersonal/pro-social behaviour) and self-esteem; protection against some types of risk-taking behaviour; academic motivation and achievement (cognitive engagement in school, learning motivation, improvements in grade point average). In comparison, the 'type of service that produces the most consistent positive results is service learning' (Perry & Katula, 2001, p.360), essentially because it allows for

dialogue and joint reflection upon the service experience. There is some evidence that service-learning is particularly effective in the high school years (Melchior *et al.*, 1999; Galston, 2001). However, the overall empirical evidence is still mixed, due to the modest quality of some research and due to differences in programs leading to

an apple-and-oranges problem in that for some students, service consists of the Saturday car wash for charity, for others it involves tutoring classmates, and for still others it entails weekly stints at soup kitchens or environmental conservation projects. It is not hard to see that an outcome measure, such as the likelihood of voting, could hardly be uniform when appraised against such varied activities. (Metz & Youniss, 2005, pp.415–6)

Engagement in community service *can* initiate and intensify an involvement in social and political issues which, in turn, contributes to political development (Yates & Youniss, 1996; Youniss & Yates, 1997; Yates, 1999; see Wade, 2000, 2001; Haste, 2004, for examples from practice). However, service-learning programs tend to avoid politics, other than in 'the fieldtrip, museum approach' (Youniss *et al.*, 2002, p.130). The same holds true for the overwhelming majority of youth organizations providing opportunities for volunteer work. Here, citizenship is predominantly understood as pro-social behaviour, focusing on individual action that helps people in need. Some service programs are explicitly marketed as an alternative to politics (Kahne & Westheimer, 1996, 2003; Gray *et al.*, 1999; Walker, 2000, 2002).

Westheimer and Kahne (2004a, b) identify three ways of describing the essential characteristics of a 'good' citizen, both in public debate as well as in school and program practice. The 'personally responsible citizen' is willing to serve, mainly on the local community level, and to donate to people in need; the 'participatory citizen' is interested in public issues and gets actively involved in civic affairs; and the 'justice oriented citizen' is attentive to causes of injustice, is able to critically assess social, political and economic structures and to explore collective strategies for change and the remedy of problems. Interestingly, Westheimer and Kahne do not consider as a fourth type the 'knowledgeable' citizen who could be the product of high-quality civic education classes lacking an experiential component that would motivate active civic participation.

In summary, we can see a series of tensions. One is between the push for a more didactic approach to knowledge acquisition and a more experiential approach to the construction of knowledge and the development of the requisite skills and dispositions for effective citizenship. Another is between the more conservative socialization of societal maintenance competencies and the more progressive nurturance of a social-justice reform orientation to responsible citizenship. These tensions create a range of orientations to citizenship education. Unless one focuses exclusively on the didactic teaching of knowledge, the relation of character education to citizenship education must be acknowledged and considered.

Character and citizenship education

As much as the literatures for character (and moral) education and citizenship education tend to be separate, in actual educational practice, there is a clear trend to

combine or even integrate the two. In fact, school mission statements often cite that goal of promoting responsible future citizens and then list character traits as aspects of this. For example, in the USA the Pleasanton (CA) Unified School District, which was cited as a National District of Character by the Character Education Partnership in 2004, promises to 'provide character and citizenship education that promotes civic responsibility and respect for others' (Pleasanton Unified School District, 2004, 2). Several States have legislation and curriculum frameworks that integrate citizenship and character education. Various national education organizations have also attempted to integrate the two. For example, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (<http://www.ascd.org>), in partnership with the First Amendment Center (<http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org>) and the Character Education Partnership (<http://www.character.org>), has issued a position paper *Pathways to civic character* (Boston, 2005, p. 44) 'which posits the acquisition of civic character – the knowledge, skills, virtues and commitment necessary for engaged and responsible citizenship – as a central goal for excellence in education' (p. 31). Most significantly, the USA Department of Education's Character Education Technical Assistance Center (CETAC) was recently renamed the Character Education and Civic Engagement Technical Assistance Center (USA Department of Education, 2006). Nonetheless, there remain many conceptual challenges in integrating character and citizenship education.

Liberal democracy and character education

One of the principal obstacles harkens back to the moral vs. character education contrast. Much of the current citizenship education field takes a liberal democratic perspective. Halstead and Pike (2006), while arguing that 'moral education is a vital and unavoidable aspect of Citizenship' (p. 1), nonetheless reject a conservative stereotype of character education as incompatible with their view, because they view character education as indoctrinatory and lacking 'understanding [of] the reasons for such behaviour, without engaging in any form of moral reasoning and without reference to underlying democratic virtues' (p. 44). As noted above, most major perspectives on character education do in fact incorporate moral reasoning, and they also include moral reflection and application to democratic citizenship. One of the 'Six Pillars of Character' for Character Counts (<http://www.charactercounts.org>), a very widely implemented character education framework, is 'citizenship'. Despite this, there is a widely held stereotype of character education, especially in Europe, as indoctrinatory and politically conservative. Davies, Gorard and McQuinn (2005), in the *British Journal of Educational Studies*, for example, argue that 'generally, character educators insist on the acceptance of 'right' answers by learners' (p. 350) and caution British educators that US character education practices are 'inappropriate for the development of the kind of citizenship education that currently forms part of the National Curriculum in England' (p. 354).

Clearly, education for democratic citizenship requires a liberal perspective that incorporates empowerment, debate and critical reflection about both the existing

society and the core virtues and values of civic life. Such virtues and values include freedom, equality and rationality (Halstead & Pike, 2006), tolerance and respect, impartiality and concern for the rights of individuals and society (Colby *et al.*, 2003), an ethic of care and responsibility (Sehr, 1997), justice, authority, participation, patriotism, diversity, privacy, due process and rights (Butts, 1988), and hope, courage, self-respect, trust, honesty and decency (White, 1996). When character education is construed as dogmatic, indoctrinatory and non-reflective, a legitimate tension exists (see Sears & Hughes, 2006, for a parallel discussion with respect to citizenship education); however, as noted, this view of character education is at worst largely an inaccurate stereotype and at best a misrepresentation of the broad range of character education approaches.

Morality vs. citizenship

If one were to accept the overlap between character education and citizenship education, a second challenge is to contend with the role of morality in both. As noted above, even within the character education field, there is disagreement on the place of morality. It would be strange to argue that morality should not be part of character, but some argue that character should be exclusively moral, others predominantly moral, and some equally moral and non-moral. Interestingly, there is a parallel disagreement in the citizenship education literature.

Many argue that true democratic citizenship necessarily entails moral development and therefore requires moral education (Berkowitz, 2000). Despite their concerns about US American character education, Halstead and Pike (2006) emphasize the centrality of morality to citizenship. Others imply such a relationship with terms such as civic virtue (Butts, 2006), civic character (Boston, 2005) or democratic character (Soder, Goodlad & McMannon, 2001). Bull (2006) states this interrelationship of morality and citizenship clearly: 'civic education is certainly a kind of moral education in that it promotes and supports a public morality, that is, the agreements about the principles governing citizens' relationships and obligations to one another' (p. 26).

Yet it is also clear that citizenship education must entail much more than moral education (Berkowitz, 2000). It must also include learning about government and political history, political literacy (including the ability to read about and understand government and public issues, especially as it enables one to vote responsibly), self-confidence, etc. While it is debatable whether these are part of character education, it is clear that they are not moral concepts. They may well have moral implications, but are not in and of themselves centrally moral issues.

The *Civic mission of schools* (Carnegie Corporation & CIRCLE, 2003) defines citizenship as being comprised of knowledge, skills and dispositions, strikingly similar to the tripartite definition of character from the Character Education Partnership (Lickona, Schaps & Lewis, 2003, p. 2): understanding, caring about and acting on core ethical values. Whereas the *Civic mission* trichotomy does not emphasize morality, the CEP one does. In either case, the complete citizen must understand self, morality and society, be motivated to act in the best interests of the

common good and have the requisite skills effectively to do so. Within this complex set of qualifications there is appreciable overlap between the goals of character education and the goals of citizenship education (Berkowitz, 2000). The challenge lies in plotting the similarities and differences between these two set of goals. Then it will be possible to fully integrate concepts of character and citizenship as a broader foundation for youth education and socialization.

Place in the curriculum

In general it is clearer where citizenship education belongs in the curriculum. Typically in the USA it is part of the social studies curriculum and/or a stand-alone civics course (or set of courses). When it is manifested (in part or entirely) as a service-learning program, it may even stand outside the normal school structures and hours. Character education, on the other hand, runs the gamut from stand-alone courses to modules in academic courses to extra-curricular activities and often to whole school culture, behaviour management and/or reform models. The Character Education Partnership suggests that character education should be part of all aspects of school life (Beland, 2003).

Developmental goals

It is unclear what the developmental goals of each domain are. Within each domain there is substantial disagreement. Some citizenship educators would argue for a well-informed student (Rochester, 2003) while others argue for a virtuous, public-minded student (Colby *et al.*, 2003). Similarly, some character educators would argue for a socialised, conventional thinker (Wynne & Ryan, 1993) while others argue for a critical, independent, moral agent (Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989). This clearly relates to the liberal democracy issue raised above. In essence, no liberal democracy can flourish if its citizens do not hold certain moral and civic values, and manifest certain virtues. Colby *et al.*, citing Eamonn Callan (1997), argue that 'a liberal democracy based on free and equal citizenship requires not only certain social rules and political institutions, such as legal protection for free speech, but also moral and civic education grounded in democratic ideals' (p. 13). The implication clearly is that the resulting democratic/civic character of future adult citizens is foundational to a democracy.

Pedagogy

Citizenship education can include very different types of learning activities (e.g. collaborative research projects, discussion of public issues, simulations and participation in student government), but in practice tends to rely on two predominant pedagogical strategies (as discussed above): knowledge transmission in civics classes and service learning. Character education on the other hand relies on a much greater range of strategies. Berkowitz and Bier (2005), in summarizing 33 effective character education programs, identify the most commonly used educational strategies: peer

interaction, direct teaching, family/community involvement, modelling and mentoring, classroom management, school-wide activities and reform models and community service and service-learning. Within each of these categories there is also substantial variation; e.g. peer interaction includes moral dilemma discussion, cooperative learning, peer mentoring, peer conflict mediation, role-playing, perspective-taking, etc. Hence character education includes a greater diversity of educational methods, but also includes the two methods most typical in citizenship education (direct instruction and service-learning). Despite some of the stereotypical representations of character education (e.g. Davies, Gorard, & McGuinn, 2005; Halstead & Pike, 2006), it is clear that character education includes methods compatible with the need for promoting autonomous critical thinkers (Halstead & Pike, 2006) who feel a moral obligation to serve the common good (Bull, 2006).

Educational timing

Hoge (2002) points out that character education tends to be more common at the elementary (primary) level and citizenship more common at the secondary level. Given the character education focus on shaping personality, values, attitudes and habits, it makes sense to intervene sooner rather than later in the developmental trajectory of students. Likewise, given the citizenship education focus on teaching about government, etc. and on service-learning, it makes sense to wait until students have developed more cognitive and psycho-social maturity to be able to learn the abstract concepts of democratic citizenship and to be able to engage in meaningful sustained service that is integrated with academic learning. Hoge concludes that 'it seems clear that citizenship education actually needs a character education foundation. Citizenship education then appropriately builds on and extends the basic moral reflexes engrained by effective character education, testing them with the complexities of fully matured thinking and exercising them through the consideration of the conflicting goals and interests of different sectors of our modern liberal democracy' (p. 106). Both these trends however are merely that – trends. Character education, in fact, is implemented from the pre-school through post-secondary grades and even into post-graduate and professional education. Citizenship education, likewise, has many elementary school versions, especially in the social studies. Nonetheless, Hoge has an excellent point. If citizenship requires a certain form of character, i.e. civic character (Berkowitz, 2000), then citizenship education should incorporate the relevant conceptions of character and practices from character education. However, the reality is much more complex than that, as some aspects of citizenship may rely upon some aspects of character, but that is far from true for all of citizenship or character.

Integration

Despite the challenges and conflicts delineated above, it should be clear that there is not only a possible, but a necessary relationship between character education and

citizenship education. The true challenge is in explicating the complexity of this relationship. This is exacerbated by the misconceptions about character education that abound in the citizenship education field. If citizenship is understood, as we understand it, as pro-social engagement in or towards a democratic political system, then clearly such engagement relies in large part on the psychological character of the individual citizen (Berkowitz, 2000). (Of course, if one were interested in brain-washing citizens to be acquiescent pawns for a totalitarian regime, then this argument does not work.) As noted above, Hoge (2002) suggests, 'citizenship education actually needs a character education foundation' (p.106). That foundation is necessary to foster the development of those civic virtues and dispositions cited repeatedly by citizenship educators. Evidently, this assumes an approach to character education that is compatible with such civic virtues, rather than the indoctrinatory, behaviouristic approach that forms the stereotype assumed by some citizenship educators.

A liberal democratic approach to character and citizenship education would rest on certain key principles, such as empowerment, open discourse, promotion of critical thinking and the development of moral communities in classrooms and schools. Such approaches are well documented. A notable example is the Child Development Project, with strong roots in Deweyan educational philosophy and constructivist developmental psychology (Dalton & Watson, 1997). The CDP relies heavily on transforming classrooms into democratic self-governing learning communities where students are empowered to collaboratively live and learn. This educational philosophy and methods are shared with other empirically-supported character education programs such as Open Circle (www.open-circle.org), Just Community Schools and the Responsive Classroom (www.responsiveclassroom.org).

Nonetheless, whereas character education may serve as a foundation for citizenship education, they are far from isomorphic. Citizenship education requires a strong academic grounding in content areas such as government, civics and history. It also requires certain procedural and social skills that are less central to character education; e.g. communication, civic and political literacy (Marciano, 1997; Milner, 2002). Plus there are differences in emphasis, as citizenship educators tend to be less interested in personal morality and more in public morality (Sehr, 1997; Bull, 2006), focus more on community service and service-learning (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b) and emphasize critical thinking more heavily (Davies, Gorard, & McGuinn, 2005). But these are clearly matters of degree, not categorical differences.

Perhaps it is best to think of the relationship of character education to citizenship education as a set of Venn diagrams (partially overlapping domains). The knowledge bases of the two fields are minimally overlapping, the targeted dispositions are highly overlapping and the skill sets partially overlapping. Whereas character education's knowledge focus is more on moral concepts, manners and civility, the citizenship education knowledge base focuses more on politics, government and the interdependencies of social life. The dispositions (personality traits, values and

motives) of character education and citizenship education share many examples: social justice, honesty, personal and social responsibility, equality, etc. Of course there are some character dispositions that are less central to citizenship and vice versa, but the overall set has great overlap. Many of the skills of character education also apply to citizenship education as they are basic social-emotional skills of self-management and social competencies required for effective social living. However, citizenship education also requires many skills not typically of central interest to character education, e.g. resistance to political persuasion, critical analysis of political messages.

If, indeed, the shared goal of both citizenship education and character education is to foster the development of the kinds of citizens who are both pro-social and effective at participating in a liberal democratic society, then of course there should be both collaboration and overlap of goals and methods. Then it makes much more sense to find the common ground than to propagate distorting stereotypes. What is ultimately needed is a synthesis of philosophies, methods and goals based on solid empirical and theoretical research. Then, and only then, can we optimally design schools and school programs that foster good people and good citizens.

References

- Althof, W. (2003) Implementing 'just and caring communities' in elementary schools: a Deweyan perspective, in: W. Veugelers & F. K. Oser (Eds) *Teaching in moral and democratic education* (Bern, Peter Lang), 153-172.
- Anderson, S. M. (1998) *Service learning: a national strategy for youth development. The Communitarian Network: Position papers - education*. Available online at: http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps/pop_svc.html (accessed 15 August 2006).
- Baldi, S., Perle, M., Skidmore, D., Greenberg, E. & Hahn, C. (2001) *What democracy means to ninth-graders: U.S. results from the international IEA civic education study* (Washington, D.C., National Center for Education Statistics, USA Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement).
- Beland, K. (Ed.) (2003) *Eleven principles sourcebook* (Washington, D.C., Character Education Partnership).
- Berkowitz, M. W. (1985) The role of discussion in moral education, in: M. W. Berkowitz & F. Oser (Eds) *Moral education: theory and application* (Hillsdale, NJ, L. Erlbaum), 197-218.
- Berkowitz, M. W. (1997) The complete moral person: anatomy and formation, in: J. M. DuBois (Ed.) *Moral issues in psychology: personalist contributions to selected problems* (Lanham, MD, University Press of America), 11-41.
- Berkowitz, M. W. (2000) Civics and moral education, in: B. Moon, S. Brown & M. Ben-Peretz (Eds) *Routledge international companion to education* (New York, Routledge), 897-909.
- Berkowitz, M. W. & Bier, M. C. (2005) *What works in character education: a research-based guide for practitioners* (Washington, D.C., Character Education Partnership).
- Berkowitz, M. W., Sherblom, S., Bier, M. C. & Battistich, V. (2006) Educating for positive youth development, in: M. Killen & J. G. Smetana (Eds) *Handbook of moral development* (Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates), 683-701.
- Billig, S. H. (2000) Research on K-12 school-based service-learning. The evidence builds, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(9), 658-664.
- Billig, S. H. (2004) Heads, hearts, hands: the research on K-12 service-learning, in: J. C. Kielsmeyer (Ed.) *Growing to greatness 2004. The state of service-learning project* (St. Paul, MN, National Youth Leadership Council), 12-25.

- Boston, B. O. (2005) *Restoring the balance between academics and civic engagement in public schools* (Washington, D.C., American Youth Policy Forum).
- Boyte, H. C. (2003) Civic education and the new American patriotism post-9/11, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(1), 85–100.
- Bull, B. L. (2006) Can civic and moral education be distinguished? in: D. Warren & J. J. Patrick (Eds) *Civic and moral learning in America* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), 21–31.
- Butts, R. F. (1988) *The morality of democratic citizenship: goals for civic education in the republic's third century* (Calabasas, CA, Center for Civic Education).
- Butts, R. F. (2006) The politics of civic and moral education, in: D. Warren & J. J. Patrick (Eds) *Civic and moral learning in America* (New York, Palgrave Macmillan), 7–19.
- Callan, E. (1997) *Creating citizens. Political education and liberal democracy* (Oxford & New York, Oxford University Press and Clarendon Press).
- Carnegie Corporation of New York and Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) (2003) *The civic mission of schools* (New York, Carnegie Corporation). Available online at http://www.civcommissionofschools.org/site/campaign/index_html (accessed 21 July 2006).
- Center for Civic Education (2006) *Campaign to promote civic education*. Available online at http://www.civiced.org/campaign_intro.php (accessed 14 August 2006).
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E. & Stephens, J. (2003) *Educating citizens. Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass).
- Colby, A. & Kohlberg, L. (1987) *The measurement of moral judgment. Volume 1: Theoretical foundations and research validation* (New York, Columbia University Press).
- Compact for Learning and Citizenship & National Study Group on Citizenship in K-12 Schools (2000) *Every student a citizen: creating the democratic self* (Denver, CO, Education Commission of the States).
- Compact for Learning and Citizenship & National Study Group on Citizenship in K-12 Schools (2001) *Every student a citizen: creating the democratic self*. Executive summary (Denver, CO, Education Commission of the States, National Center for Learning and Citizenship). Available online at <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/16/77/1677.pdf> (accessed 12 August 2006).
- Dalton, J. & Watson, M. (1997) *Among friends: classrooms where caring and learning prevail* (Oakland, CA, Developmental Studies Center).
- Damon, W. (1976) *The social world of the child* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass).
- Damon, W. (1988) *The moral child* (New York, The Free Press).
- Davies, I., Gorard, S. & McGuinn, N. (2005) Citizenship education and character education: similarities and contrasts, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(3), 341–358.
- Dewey, J. (1922) *Human nature and conduct: an introduction to social psychology* (New York, Henry Holt and Company).
- Eisenberg, N. & Mussen, P. H. (1989) *The roots of prosocial behaviour in children* (New York, Cambridge University Press).
- Flanagan, C., Jonsson, B., Botcheva, L., Csapo, B., Bowes, J., Macek, P., Averina, I. & Sheblanova, E. (1999) Adolescents and the 'social contract': developmental roots of citizenship in seven countries, in: M. Yates & J. Youniss (Eds) *Roots of civic identity. International perspectives on community service and activism in Youth* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 135–155.
- Gagnon, P. (2003) *Educating democracy: state standards to ensure a civic core* (Washington, DC, Albert Shanker Institute).
- Galston, W. A. (2001) Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 217–234.
- Gray, M. J., Campbell, N. F., Ondaatje, E. H., Rosenblatt, K., Geschwind, S., Fricker, R. D., Goldman, C. A., Kaganoff, T., Robyn, A., Sundt, M., Vogelgesang, L. & Klein, S. P. (1999) *Combining service and learning in higher education. Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program* (Santa Monica, CA, Rand Education).
- Halstead, J. M. & Pike, M. A. (2006) *Citizenship and moral education. Values in action* (London and New York, Routledge).
- Haste, H. (2004) Constructing the citizen, *Political Psychology*, 25(3), 413–439.
- Hess, D. & Freedman, E. (2006) Democratic education, in: L. R. Sherrod, C. A. Flanagan, R. Kassimir & A. K. Syvertsen (Eds) *Youth activism: an international encyclopaedia*. Volume 1: A–J (Westport, CT, & London, Greenwood Press), 191–198.
- Hoffman, M. L. (2000) *Empathy and moral development: implications for caring and justice* (New York, Cambridge University Press).
- Hoge, J. D. (2002) Character education, citizenship education, and the social studies, *Social Studies*, 93(3), 103–108.
- Kahne, J. & Westheimer, J. (1996) In the service of what? The politics of service learning., *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(9), 593–599.
- Kahne, J. & Westheimer, J. (2003) Teaching democracy: what schools need to do, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(1), 34–40, 57–66.
- Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andolina, M. & Jenkins, K. (2002) *The civic and political health of the nation: a generational report* (College Park, MD, Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)).
- Knowles, R. T. & McClean, G. F. (Eds) (1992) *Psychological foundations of moral education and character development: an integrated theory of moral development* (Washington, D.C., The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy).
- Kochanska, G. (1991) Socialization and temperament in the development of guilt and conscience, *Child Development*, 62(6), 1379–1392.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971) Stages of moral development as a basis for moral education, in: C. Beck, B. S. Crittenden & E. V. Sullivan (Eds) *Moral Education: Interdisciplinary approaches* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press), 15–98.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976) Moral stages and moralization: the cognitive-developmental approach, in: T. Lickona (Ed.) *Moral development and behaviour: theory, research, and social issues* (New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston), 31–53.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981) *Essays on moral development. Volume one: The philosophy of moral development* (New York, Harper and Row).
- Kohlberg, L. & Hersh, R. (1977) Moral development: a review of the theory, *Theory Into Practice*, 16(2), 53–59.
- Lapsley, D. K. & Narvaez, D. (2006) Character education, in: K. A. Renninger & I. E. Sigel (Eds) *Handbook of child psychology. Volume 4: Child psychology in practice* (New York, J. Wiley & Sons), 248–296.
- Larson, R. W. (2000) Toward a psychology of positive youth development, *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 170–183.
- Lickona, T. (1991) *Educating for character* (New York, Bantam).
- Lickona, T. (2003) *Character matters* (New York, Simon and Schuster).
- Lickona, T. & Davidson, M. (2005) *Smart and good high schools* (Cordland, NY, Center for the 4th and 5th Rs).
- Lickona, T., Schaps, E. & Lewis, C. (2003) *CEP's eleven principles of effective character education* (Washington, D.C., Character Education Partnership). Available online at: http://www.character.org/site/c.gwKUJhNYJrF/b.993263/k.72EC/The_Eleven_Principles.htm (accessed 24 August 2006).
- Losito, B. & Mintrop, H. (2001) The teaching of civic education, in: J. Torney-Purta, R. Lehmann, H. Oswald & W. Schulz (Eds) *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen* (Amsterdam, International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, IEA), 157–173.

- Lutkus, A. D., Weiss, A. R., Campbell, J. R., Mazzeo, J., Lazer, S., with Kulick, E., Swinton, S. & Leung, V. (1999) *NAEP: civics report card for the nation* (Washington, DC, National Center for Education Statistics, USA Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Document: NCES 2000-457).
- Marciano, J. (1997) *Civic illiteracy and education. The battle for the hearts and minds of American youth* (New York, Peter Lang).
- McClellan, G. F., Ellrod, F. E., Schindler, D. L. & Mann, J. A. (Eds) (1986) *Act and agent: philosophical foundations for moral education and character development* (Washington, D.C., The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy).
- McClellan, B. E. (1999) *Moral education in America: schools and the shaping of character from colonial times to the present* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- Melchior, A., Frees, J., LaCava, L., Kingsley, C., Nahas, J., Power, J., Baker, G., Blomquist, J., St. George, A., Hebert, S. & Jastrab, J. A. (1999) *Summary report: national evaluation of Learn and Serve America* (Waltham, MA, Brandeis University, Center for Human Resources).
- Metz, E. C. & Youniss, J. (2005) Longitudinal gains in civic development through school-based required service, *Political Psychology*, 26(3), 413-437.
- Miller, J. J. (2004) *Citizenship education policy at the school district level* (Denver, CO, Education Commission of the States/National Center for Learning and Citizenship).
- Milner, H. (2002) *Civic literacy. How informed citizens make democracy work* (Hanover, NH, Tufts University/University Press of New England).
- National Council for the Social Studies (2001) *Creating effective citizens. Position statement*. Available online at <http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/effectivecitizens> (accessed 8 August 2006).
- Niemi, R. G. & Junn, J. (1998) *Civic education. What makes students learn?* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press).
- Parker, W. C. (2003) *Teaching democracy. Unity and diversity in public life* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- Parker, W. C. (2005) Teaching against idiocy, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(5), 344-351.
- Patrick, J. J. & Vontz, T. S. (2001) Components of education for democratic citizenship in the preparation of social studies teachers, in: J. J. Patrick & R. S. Leming (Eds) *Civic learning in teacher education. Volume 1: Principles and practices of democracy in the education of social studies teachers* (Bloomington, IN, ERIC and Civitas), 39-63.
- Perry, J. L. & Katula, M. C. (2001) Does service affect citizenship? *Administration and Society*, 33(3), 330-365.
- Piaget, J. (1965) *The moral judgment of the child* (New York, The Free Press).
- Pleasanton Unified School District (2004) Resolution no.2004-05.07: Promoting civic responsibility. Available online at <http://www.cms-ca.org/PleasantonResolution04approv.pdf> (accessed 17 August 2006).
- Power, F. C., Higgins, A. & Kohlberg, L. (1989) *Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education* (New York, Cambridge University Press).
- Quigley, C. N. (2004) *The status of civic education: making the case for a national movement*. Paper presented to the Second Annual Congressional Conference on Civic Education. Washington, DC, 5 December, 2004, ERIC Document No. ED485827.
- Rochester, J. M. (2003) The training of idiots. Civics education in America's schools, in: J. Leming, L. Ellington & K. Porter (Eds) *Where did social studies go wrong?* (Washington, D.C., Thomas B. Fordham Foundation), 6-39.
- Rochester, J. M. (2005) Unaddressed issues, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(9), 654/657.
- Ryan, K. & McClean, G. F. (Eds) (1986) *Character development in schools and beyond* (New York, Praeger).
- Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1987) Toward a universal psychological structure of human values, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(3), 550-562.
- Sears, A. & Hughes, A. (2006) Citizenship: education or indoctrination?, *International Journal of Citizenship Teacher Education*, 2(1), 3-17.
- Sears, A. M. & Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2006) The cult of citizenship education, in: G. H. Richardson & D. W. Blades (Eds) *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (New York, Peter Lang), 13-24.
- Sehr, D. T. (1997) *Education for public democracy* (New York, State University of NY Press).
- Sherrod, L., Flanagan, C. & Youniss, J. (2002) Dimensions of citizenship and opportunities for youth development: the what, why, when, where, and who of citizenship development, *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 264-272.
- Skinner, R. & Chapman, C. (1999) *Service learning and community service in K-12 public schools* (Washington, DC, National Center for Education Statistics, USA Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Document no. NCES 1999-043).
- Soder, R., Goodlad, J. I. & McMannon, T. J. (Eds) (2001) *Developing democratic character in the young* (San Francisco, CA, Jossey Bass).
- Torney-Purta, J. (2002) The school's role in developing civic engagement: a study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries, *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 203-212.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. & Schulz, W. (2001) *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen* (Amsterdam, International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA)).
- Torney-Purta, J. & Vermeer Lopez, S. (2006) *Developing citizenship competencies from kindergarten through Grade 12: a background paper for policymakers and educators* (Denver, CO, Education Commission of the States, National Center for Learning and Citizenship, first published in 2004, updated in July 2006).
- United States of America, Department of Education. Character Education and Civic Engagement Technical Assistance Center (CETAC). Available online at: <http://www.cetac.org> (accessed 4 August 2006).
- Wade, R. C. (2000) Beyond charity: service-learning for social justice, *Social Studies and the Young Learner*, 12(4), 6-9.
- Wade, R. C. (2001) Social action in the Social Studies: from the ideal to the real, *Theory into Practice*, 40(1), 23-28.
- Walker, T. (2000) The service/politics split: rethinking service to teach political engagement, *Political Science and Politics*, 33(3), 647-649.
- Walker, T. (2002) Service as a pathway to political participation: what research tells us, *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 183-188.
- Watson, M. S., Solomon, D., Battistich, V., Schaps, E. & Solomon, J. (1989) The Child Development Project: combining traditional and developmental approaches to values education, in: L. Nucci (Ed.) *Moral development and character education: a dialogue* (Berkeley, CA, McCutchan), 51-92.
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004a) Educating the 'good' citizen: political choices and pedagogical goals, *Political Science and Politics*, 37(2), 241-247.
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004b) What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy, *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.
- White, P. (1996) *Civic virtues and public schooling: educating citizens for democratic society* (New York, Teachers College Press).
- Wichowsky, A. & Levine, P. (n.d.) *The importance of civic education* (College Park, MD, National Alliance for Civic Education). Available online at: <http://www.cived.net/tioce.html> (accessed 27 July 2006).
- Wynne, E. & Ryan, K. (1993) *Reclaiming our schools: a handbook on teaching character, academics, and discipline* (New York, Merrill).
- Yates, M. (1999) Community service and political-moral discussions among adolescents: a study of a mandatory school-based program in the United States, in: M. Yates & J. Youniss (Eds) *Roots of civic identity. International perspectives on community service and activism in youth* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 16-31.

- Yates, M. & Youniss, J. (1996) Community service and political-moral identity in adolescents, *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 6(3), 271-284.
- Yates, M. & Youniss, J. (Eds) (1999) *Roots of civic identity. International perspectives on community service and activism in youth* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Youniss, J., Bales, S., Christmas-Best, V., Diversi, M., McLaughlin, M. & Silbereisen, R. (2002) Youth civic engagement in the twenty-first century, *Journal of Research in Adolescence*, 12(1), 121-148.
- Youniss, J., McLellan, J. A. & Yates, M. (1997) What we know about engendering civic identity, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(5), 620-631.
- Youniss, J. & Yates, M. (1997) *Community service and social responsibility in youth* (Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press).
- Youniss, J. & Yates, M. (1999) Youth service and moral-civic identity: a case for everyday morality, *Educational Psychology Review*, 11(4), 361-376.