

The Citizen as a Moral Agent – the Development of a Continuous and Progressive Conflict-based Citizenship Curriculum

This article by Don Rowe was originally published in Curriculum, Vol13 No2 in 1992. An earlier version of this paper was presented to the 1992 Annual Conference of the British Comparative and International Education Society.

The teaching of moral values in school is seen as problematic because the more values underlying the law of the state may conflict with personal values associated with other communities to which citizens feel a sense of loyalty. Teachers should not attempt to claim priority for the moral values enshrined in legislation but should enable pupils to evaluate and choose between the values of all the communities to which they belong on rational rather than emotive grounds. It is proposed that this moral conflict model of citizenship should form the basis of the curriculum for all pupils, even in primary schools. A concept-based analysis is offered which could be regarded as the basis of a trans-social ethic common to all codes of citizenship.

In its recent white paper, Choice and Diversity (D.F.E., 1992), the British government underlined its belief in the fact that schools play a significant part in the development of personal values and beliefs (paras 1.29 to 1.32). It sees religious education as central to the transmission of such values but also suggests that the 'moral dimension of a school must constantly be reviewed and refreshed in order to promote the spiritual, cultural, mental and physical development of boys and girls as part of preparing them for adult life'. The ethos of the school should include a clear vision of the values within it. The White Paper itself recommends that schools should promote values of 'respect for people and property; honesty and consideration for others; trust, fairness and politeness'. These values are seen as critically important in encouraging children 'to grow up understanding what is right and wrong'. Despite its support for the role of R.E. in promoting moral education, the values described here are not specific to religious belief but represent some of the core values of a citizenship curriculum (N.C.C., 1990). These exhortations should be understood against a background of official concern at rising crime rates and social disaffection, particularly amongst young people. They also should be recognised as representative of a school of thought which believes in a direct relationship between moral knowledge and moral action. In other words, provided young people are told quite clearly what is right and what is wrong then good behaviour should follow. This paper will argue that addressing moral issues in the classroom is not so simple, and that far from presenting a clear moral picture of 'right and wrong', it is necessary for the citizenship teacher to adopt a moral conflict model, not only to relate more effectively to the real world of young people, but also to produce the kind of moral stimulus that actually leads to greater moral maturity.

Whilst, to some extent, British teachers have always recognised the implicit moral component of their work, it is striking that moral or values education per se has never become established as part of the British mainstream curriculum. One of the besetting problems has been that it is by no means clear what it means to teach children to 'understand what is right and wrong' beyond broad exhortations to obey the law and care for others. What appears particularly problematic has been the development of courses which command broad educational and political support and which, at the same time, avoid the charge that teachers might indoctrinate pupils with their own values. This is something of which the political right (the very group which most loudly calls for the teaching of greater respect for the law) has always been suspicious. Various attempts at circumventing the problem have been made, notably with the development of process models (e.g. Wilson et al, 1967) in which skills of moral decision making become the chief objective. However, whilst these models certainly accord a proper significance to the skills component, they have been less clear on precisely how the knowledge component of the moral curriculum should be identified or handled in the classroom (Bottery, 1990, p.73).

Moral values and beliefs are relative and pluralistic communities are based on the fundamental principle that individuals have the right to their own values and beliefs insofar as these do not diminish the legitimate rights of others. These differences in values are influenced by cultural or religious traditions and they also most certainly arise from the natural differences of character, socialisation and maturity that we find throughout the population.

When people make choices (e.g. whether or not to steal) it may be tempting to regard this as a simple choice between right and wrong. But moral choices are rarely this simple in practice because of the nature of the considerations and influences present in the decision-making situation. Not the least of these is the tendency to give greater weight to some values over against others and this is influenced by a number of factors. One of these factors, as Bottery points out (*ibid.* p.74ff) is that moral activity can relate to different spheres — personal, inter-personal, social, natural and mystical/religious. He shows how these different moral spheres can frequently be a source of moral conflict as, for example, when someone is faced with a choice between upholding the law and handing over a young thief to the police where it is believed to be against the long-term interests of the offender to become criminalised.

This complex situation is compounded by the fact that within the social sphere people belong to a number of different communities. The strength of an individual's commitment to these different communities is likely to differ markedly depending on circumstances. Decisions made by individuals qua citizens (e.g. to obey the law or not) are not in their nature different from the decisions they make as members of other communities and therefore the demands of the law may well make claims which conflict with other allegiances. (This, for example, partly explains why many juveniles continue to defy the law out of loyalty to the values of their own peer group community.)

Some communities exhibit a high degree of social and emotional bonding between its members and this will have a crucial influence on the motivation of individual members to accept or reject the responsibilities of membership. Social bonding is likely to be strongest where emotional ties are reinforced by intellectual allegiances — in other words, where members consciously support the community's aims and values. For this reason, all communities must take the trouble to see that its young members understand the basis on which its rules and laws are predicated.

I would identify six different types of community to which people might belong during the course of their lives. These are: family, kinship, affiliative, school, state and the world community. Briefly, I shall consider each in turn in terms of social cohesion and bonding.

The family community

The family acts as a mini-society, having a power structure, rules, a system of punishment and rewards and a framework of values (implicit and explicit). The family is the crucible of citizenship learning and there is a great deal of evidence to show that dysfunctional families tend to produce citizens less able to relate to society at a number of levels. A notable feature of the family is that membership is generally compulsory and for life. We do not ask to be born into any one family and we do not ask to take on its values and customs, though there is a strong chance we will. Thus both emotional and intellectual bonding to the family is likely to be strong.

The kinship community

The kinship community extends outward from the family to embrace those of similar national or cultural origins. These invariably involve the transmission of certain values and where communities may feel under threat, allegiance to these values is seen as highly important. These may or may not contain a religious component. Sometimes the kinship community coincides with that of the state, but it is a common experience for many people to experience a conflict of loyalty between their kinship community and that of the state.

The affiliative community

Affiliative communities are those with which an individual may choose to identify and may include peer groups, professional or vocational groups, interest groups and religious groups.

Affiliative groups must have meaning for the individual who should have made a conscious act of association with a particular group. For example, I would describe the women's movement as an affiliative community because it needs more than an accident of birth for a woman to identify with its aims and values.

Organisationally, affiliative communities have formal and informal structures similar to other communities. A marked feature of the affiliative community is the extent to which individual members will wish to identify with the group, its customs and values. Thus social bonding may be very strong. For example, the journalist who decided to defy the law and not reveal his sources even at the cost of being sent to prison, clearly displayed a higher degree of loyalty to an affiliative community than to the state.

The school community

Schools are highly complex communities, differing from affiliative communities because of their compulsory nature. Schools have much in common with state communities both in the way they function and in the way they require young people of very diverse backgrounds to live and work together on the basis of mutual respect. Schools have value systems linked to their purpose and role, power structures and rules enforced by a justice system. The

'citizens' (or 'subjects') of school communities can exhibit widely differing degrees of loyalty to the community. Pupils who feel disregarded by a school (or at odds with its aims) will have little reason to feel a sense of obligation to uphold its values or rules.

The state community

State communities can exist at local, national and international level and are formally defined through legislation setting out the rights and duties of its citizens. Membership is not usually voluntary for most citizens. Individuals may therefore feel less of a sense of loyalty to those state communities than to others because of their mandatory nature, their remoteness or, perhaps because of their perceived faults. Identification by citizens with the state may, of course, be very strong, particularly in the face of external threat, but citizens who feel themselves to have less access than others to the state's benefits, are likely to feel less of a sense of shared identity and social bonding will be weakened as a result.

The world community

The notion of world citizenship is more complex than state citizenship. It appears to combine elements akin to membership of the state and the family. Through the United Nations, international agreements and treaties we can identify state-like structures embodying laws, sanctions, rights and duties. For individuals membership of the world 'state' comes through the affiliation of the nation state to international agreements. In this sense, membership of the world community is inescapable, as is membership of the state. In practice, a belief in the ideal of world citizenship may be too remote to have real meaning for perhaps the majority of people. Such a belief is all too easily obscured by more immediate cultural differences and conflicting political and economic interests. In a more personal sense, one is born into membership of the world community as one is born into a family. A sense of common humanity is for many a profoundly unifying force which may gain added meaning as all members of the world become increasingly interdependent. Threats to global survival can emphasise this sense of oneness as do beliefs in universal human rights.

According to legal socialisation theory, citizenship learning is transferable between communities. Ideas and beliefs about the nature of 'citizenship' tend to be strongly influenced by experience of communities near at hand and this is particularly true of younger people where their awareness of the wider community is limited (homey, 1971). Emler and Reicher (1987) found confirmation of this in a study of the attitudes of a sample of delinquent males. They found that the anti-authoritarian attitudes of their subjects tended to be uniform, across all the authority figures they encountered. Thus a young person, whose experience of the family or the school has been an alienating one, is unlikely to view the state community much differently.

If it is accepted, on this analysis, that loyalty to the state community may on occasions require disloyalty to another, then education for citizenship should not ignore the existence of these competing claims but should help pupils understand the nature of the conflict and to resolve it as rationally and fairly as possible, rather than deciding on the strength of community ties alone. Decisions made on the latter basis are more likely to favour the family or affiliative community than the state. Thus the rules, laws, institutions and values of all communities must be laid open to critical scrutiny and evaluation. Logically, this means that

allegiance to any one community, even that of the state, cannot be regarded as sacrosanct. Such an approach allows the teacher of citizenship to accept that individuals may come to the conclusion that in some respects the state laws are wrong or unjust, without being laid open to the charge of subversion or anti-patriotism.

I have argued elsewhere (Rowe, 1992) that the rhetoric of citizenship often draws on the two distinct strands derived from, on the one hand, the rights and responsibilities of citizenship (descriptive of status) and on the other, the more affective discourse concerning the extent to which the citizen should feel a commitment to the state (the notion of civic virtue or service). All models of education for citizenship need to contain these two components though these have not always been clearly differentiated. Not uncommonly, citizenship models have emphasised one strand at the expense of the other. These two strands provide a useful tool by which to analyse different models of education for citizenship. How effectively do courses address issues of status (rights and responsibilities) and what means do they employ to encourage commitment to the state community? I want to apply these questions briefly to two citizenship courses available to schools during the 1980s, one for French primary and the other for English secondary pupils. The two courses are *Education Civique: la Démocratique Pas a Pas* (Gonon et al), and *Citizenship* (Scott, 1985). I then want to compare these with some of the recent work in this field undertaken by The Citizenship Foundation.

Though written for different age groups, there are several striking similarities in the approaches adopted in the above courses. In terms of how they both address the issue of status, the following features stand out:

- the rights and responsibilities of citizenship are rarely set out or discussed as they relate to the real lives of pupils,
- there is an over-emphasis on social structures (e.g. national and local government) rather than on understanding the nature of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship at a personal, inter-personal or societal level,
- insufficient weight is given to the developmental needs of young citizens which require a particular emphasis on the reality of citizenship at a personal and inter-personal level in the early years. In both courses there is an over-emphasis on wider community affairs at the expense of the more immediate interests and concerns of pupils themselves,
- law and democracy are presented in non-problematic terms as the result of the collective will, rather than emanating from conflicts of values and beliefs,
- citizenship is represented as a future status rather than a dynamic relationship between the individual and the community in the here and now,
- moral conflicts tend to be avoided, the more so for younger pupils,
- the acquisition of knowledge is seen as prior to the development of skills and attitudes and in particular, there is little emphasis on the importance of critical thinking or decision making skills which would enable pupils to make more rational and informed moral choices.

In terms of seeking to enhance social bonding and encourage a greater willingness to serve the community, these courses display the following tendencies:

pro-social attitudes are encouraged by exhortation and providing positive models, particularly for younger pupils, with little appeal to the reason or judgement of the child, the positive characteristics of society and its leaders are emphasised whilst their faults or failures are underplayed or ignored.

Approaches of this kind underestimate the intellectual capabilities of pupils and their levels of awareness as profoundly as they ignore the moral realities of their lives. The tendency increasingly to avoid issues of value conflict as we go down the age range is particularly noteworthy. Whilst there is some acknowledgement in the secondary material that people may differ over possible solutions to problems, this is hardly detectable in the primary text. This phenomenon appears to be widespread. Hess (1968), for example, also identified this as a strong characteristic of citizenship programmes in U.S. elementary schools where the nation state is presented as an unalloyed force for good in the world and laws are made for the benefit of all. This approach so easily slips into a non-critical quasi-propagandist stance, based on the mistaken belief that young people are incapable of becoming socially bonded to flawed models and have little experience of moral conflict, It also pays little regard to psychological research which indicates that moral growth occurs through encountering and dealing with moral conflict rather than being protected from it (Kohlberg, 1984)-

By contrast, The Citizenship Foundation and its forerunner, the Law in Education Project,, have been developing citizenship materials which attempt to redress some of the problems identified above. In 1984, a partnership between the Law Society of England and Wales (as sponsors) and the School Curriculum Development Committee (S.C.O.C.) established the Law in Education Project to develop law-related citizenship education in the secondary curriculum. This was in response to at least two broad developments. The first was a growing awareness within the teaching profession that the curriculum as it stood did little to prepare young people for the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. As the personal and social education movement developed, it became clear to many (e.g. David. 1983; H.M.I., 1989) that legal awareness was an essential component of a broad and balanced curriculum. At the same time, outside of educational circles, there were concerns that the ever-increasing complexities of the law were rendering the citizen more and more disempowered and cut off from the lawmakers and that young people in particular were displaying alarming levels of social, moral and political ignorance (McGurk, 1987). Between 1984 and 1992, The Law in Education Project team worked closely with teachers, lawyers and police officers to develop two series of law-related materials for upper and lower secondary pupils, key stages 4 and 3 respectively (Rowe and Thorpe, eds. 1989 and 1993). For the record, the 11-14 project was run in collaboration with the newly formed National Curriculum Council, S.C.D.C.'s successor, after the identification of citizenship as an all-phase cross-curricular theme.

This was the first attempt in the U.K. to develop a broad-based law-related curriculum and despite the initial inexperience of teachers, the approach proved effective in terms of introducing young people to many of their legal rights and responsibilities. Pupils of a wide ability range found this law-related focus both interesting and worthwhile (Rowe, 1988). The use of legal cases (both criminal and civil) allows everyday citizenship issues to be addressed by means of debate, discussion, role play, mock trial and so on. Thus the acquisition of knowledge goes hand in hand with the development of skills, helping pupils to understand, use and work within the law for their own benefit and for that of the community. This model encourages social bonding not by attempting to sanitise society but by developing a sense of personal involvement in the social sphere. Democracy is represented not as an institution but as a dynamic process, and is used as a process to help pupils develop democratic skills and attitudes. The lower secondary materials employ much the same model with rather less emphasis on the statute law and more on the use of local issues (based on home, school and the local community).

In 1991, the opportunity arose to develop a range of primary citizenship materials, for pupils in key stage 1 (5-7 years) and key stage 2 (8-11 years). Sponsored by the Home Office, the materials are designed to encourage greater awareness amongst younger pupils

of their rights and responsibilities to others. This social responsibility approach is entirely consistent with the aims of the earlier projects. The materials rely heavily on the use of story, not to present a neatly packaged moral (such as, 'it's wrong to steal or tell lies') but as a vehicle for raising moral problems and conflicts for the children to reflect upon at their own level. To take an example: in one story, Claire comes home from school angry and puzzled at how she and her friend have been treated by a teacher. She is confused about the different moral messages she is receiving at home and at school. At home she is told to tell the truth, but at school, her teacher appears not to be interested in the truth. Claire has been told not to 'tell tales' when she was, in fact, standing up for a friend wrongly accused of a misdemeanour. At the level of a 10 year old child, citizenship issues of this kind have significance and the manner in which adults handle them conveys important messages about the real meaning of concepts such as rights, responsibility and justice. Children are frequently confused by how they see adults dealing with such issues, because their own understanding of the complexities is still relatively limited. This is why the provision of opportunities for the exploration of such matters can greatly enhance pupils' citizenship learning. The materials include units on rules and laws, friendship issues, the fair treatment of property, power and authority, respect for others, and environmental/community issues. Issues are selected for their ability to engage pupils in discussions about justice, rights and responsibilities. Each theme contains material for use with both key stages. (At the time of writing these materials are about to go out for detailed trial in over 100 primary schools.)

The methodology employed in the primary project draws on the work of Matthew Lipman (1980) and his 'community of enquiry' in which the class becomes a mutually supportive forum for the exploration of issues of concern. In this approach, the teacher takes on the role of a community member, perhaps more experienced than the other members but by no means the fount of moral certainty. Pupils learn to develop and express their ideas and to listen respectfully to the views of others. The whole approach encourages pupils to challenge ideas and, in so doing, they reflect on experiences and values drawn from the different communities to which they belong, including the home, family, friendship, groups, faith groups, school, and the wider community. To summarise, the pedagogical model which underpins all these materials can be characterised in the following way:

- consistency of approach at both primary and secondary levels to allow for continuity and progression and maximise the potential for personal development,
- acknowledgement and use of social and moral conflict in citizenship issues at all levels,
- equal status accorded to knowledge, skills, attitudes and values,
- use of relevant 'spheres of experience' to allow the development of understanding, skills and attitudes at levels appropriate to the maturity and awareness Of the child,
- citizenship is seen in behavioural terms, as relationships between individuals, other people and the community (or, rather, communities) rather than as a fixed status to be attained at some point in the future,
- emphasis on enquiry and critical reasoning St all levels, utilising the conflicts of values within and between pupils to develop skills of making 'justice judgements',
- knowledge of social structures (such as Parliament and local government) seen as secondary, and not prior to. concerns about whether, and in what wily. the law should be changed,
- identification of key citizenship concepts. to allow for continuity and progression and cross-analysis between cognitive and experiential learning.

In practice, it has been found that the identification of key concepts is an indispensable tool by which to construct a progressive curriculum. I would identify the central concepts of the citizenship curriculum as follows:

Key stage 1	Key stage 2	Key stage 3	Key stage 4
Rights (legal, moral and 'human')			
Responsibilities (duties)			
Rules and laws			
Power and authority			
Community			
Conflict and cooperation			
Justice			

Use of such a concept grid highlights key areas of citizenship learning and provides the means by which they can be identified and reviewed by staff, both in terms of the taught and the hidden curriculum. For the purpose of course construction, issues are selected for their dual ability to develop conceptual understanding and generate moral conflict. At key stage 3, for example, pupils consider whether it would be right or fair to pass a law compelling all children to wear cycle safety helmets (*rights, responsibilities, justice, rules, power, conflict*). In the same unit, they consider the fact that riding on pavements is against the law and have to reconcile this with the fact that many parents instruct their children to break this law – who is right and should the law be changed? (*rights, law, justice, conflict*). Another unit considers the problem of dogs fouling public foot-paths and places where children play. Here there is conflict between the rights of pets and their owners on the one hand and the rights of children to play in areas uncontaminated and free of disease (*rights, responsibilities and justice!*). Elsewhere the materials invite pupils to consider the basis on which school rules are framed (*rules/laws and Justice*).

At a more sophisticated level, the key stage 4 materials look at a wide range of law-based issues, covering matters of both civil and criminal law. Juvenile crime, the role of the police, the treatment of offenders, the various roles of law, the tensions between the rights of individuals and the rights of the group or community, civil rights, and human rights are amongst the issues drawn on to encourage pupils to understand the nature of the key concepts as well as to become more confident and knowledgeable about their status as emerging citizens. The use of the law as a framework for discussion acts as a constant reminder that within any group or society, compromise and tolerance is necessary in the development of public policy.

What has emerged, therefore, is a conflict model of citizenship, designed to stimulate critical and reflective reasoning at all stages built around questions such as the following:

- What rules are needed for people to live together?
- Why do people break rules and what should happen to them?
- What makes a rule or a law fair?

- Who has rights and what are they?
- What responsibilities arise from these rights?
- What are the limits of these rights at the margins where they conflict with other equally valid rights?
- Who can tell you what to do and on what basis?
- What makes a good or fair leader?
- What do we mean by fairness or justice?

Posed at an appropriate level, these questions are as interesting and relevant to pupils of 7 as they are to moral and political philosophers. They pose many of the key issues relating to what kind of ideal society people want and the role and status of the individual citizens within it. This, I would suggest, should be the nub of the citizenship curriculum in a pluralist society. It was noted earlier that determining the content of moral education programmes has always been problematic. I would argue the conceptual framework offered above provides a clear and concise guide to essential content and that of these, *justice and rights* should be seen as the two concepts which underpin the rest and from which the others may be derived. If this is accepted, then we may go on to say that the better the curriculum, the more it will enable pupils to understand the key concepts in all their facets, so that for example, justice should be covered in its corrective, distributive, transactional and procedural modes. Each of the concepts could be considered in this way and a more detailed grid developed.

Rawls (1971) claims that justice is the highest standard by which any public institution or act may be judged. All the other key concepts may be reviewed in the light of the justice concept. Justice makes claims on the citizen which go beyond community loyalties, likes or prejudices, demanding that the rights of others are respected. Justice both implies conflict and its resolution on the basis of reason and not for example, the use of power. In fact, the justice concept provides an organising concept in terms of both content and pedagogy, since dealing with moral conflicts requires pupils to engage in making justice judgements.

However, whilst justice is a necessary condition for the moral curriculum it is not a sufficient one. Some people may, for example, argue that it is fair to look after one's own interests because that is what everyone else does. This profoundly limited view of social justice is common enough but pays insufficient heed to the other key concept, that of equality of human rights. This concept is advanced on the grounds that public debate about justice issues must at least begin from the premise that citizens cannot, in principle, claim rights for themselves which they are unwilling to allow others. These two concepts are therefore, I would argue, as near to universal values as one may come in a secular curriculum.

I believe that this curriculum model is entirely consistent with what Slattery calls a 'trans-social' code (ibid. p.36ff). He claims that such a code should underpin all moral education curricula in order to avoid the elevation of one community's values over that of another. Bottery quotes C.S. Lewis in advancing eight principles common to many societies as the possible basis for such a code. These include reciprocity of treatment between individuals, care for others, responsibility for the weak and underprivileged, honesty and moral courage. The two key citizenship concepts suggested above, can be seen to provide not only a conceptual underpinning for such a trans-social code, but also the means by which to discover their limits when they come into conflict with each other.

I have tried to justify this model of citizenship from a philosophical standpoint. But it has the further advantage, I suggest, of being supported by recent psychological research con-

cerning the nature of moral reasoning development. Kohlberg (ibid.) amongst others has demonstrated that the development of moral reasoning occurs when children are challenged to extend their moral horizons in making justice judgements. He has shown how the young child's egocentric outlook can be progressively extended to embrace the interests and views of others. Later the young person begins to take account of the interests of the wider community and later still may focus on more abstract moral principles. Experimentally, Blatt and Kohlberg (1975) found that the essential ingredient for progress through these different stages is moral conflict, stimulating what Kohlberg called 'cognitive dissonance'. Dissonance occurs when the child's moral horizons are unable to cope with a particular challenge, requiring that more adequate cognitive structures are developed to accommodate the challenge.

In terms of citizenship education, then, this developmental model represents a progression from the citizen as coerced or passively 'rule-obeying', through a conforming or 'rule-maintaining' morality, unquestioning of the status quo, towards a rights-focused, 'prior-to-society' perspective, in which human communities are viewed not as ends in themselves, but as the means by which to maintain human dignity. It is arguably, this capacity and inclination critically to review the law, and be able to conceive of more adequate laws if necessary, which distinguishes the attitude of the citizen from that of the subject

But citizenship is about more than knowing one's rights and duties. There is a clear behavioural dimension to citizenship which suggests that teachers should evaluate their curricula in terms of action as well as learning. Can the proposed conflict model actually produce 'better' (in the sense of more prosocial citizens, particularly when it appears deliberately to beck away from the delivery of clear-cut, pre-packaged moral messages? Ironically, there seems to be evidence from a number of different sources which suggests that improvements in attitudes and behaviour are associated with such approaches. For example, Arbuthnot and Gordon (1987) looked at the effect of a course of moral problem-based discussions with a group of behaviourally disordered young people. Using trained leaders, skilled in the use of techniques based on moral stage theory, it was found that the experimental group made measurable gains in moral reasoning, prosocial attitudes and behaviour compared with the control group. In another study Hunter (1987) examined the influence on attitudes towards the law and law-abiding behaviour of courses in law-related education. In this case, the three-year study was able to show that where inter-active discussions were used in mixed ability, non-friendship groups (where moral conflict or dissonance within the group would be maximised) students made gains in their attitudes towards the law (i.e. they saw it as more fair and reasonable) and in their own rule- or law-abiding behaviour. In the U.K., the effectiveness of Lipman's philosophy for children techniques were investigated by Lake (1987) with a group of ten year-olds in a socially deprived area. Unexpectedly he found they made gains in their ability to listen to other people's points of view and showed considerably reduced levels of aggression generally.

If such improvements in attitudes and behaviour are detectable after only a short time, one is tempted to speculate on the long-term benefits of setting in place a conflict-oriented curriculum which provides such experiences for pupils on a continuous and progressive basis throughout the school years. With the publication of its citizenship materials for both primary and secondary schools, the Citizenship Foundation is currently planning to work experimentally with a number of school pyramids (secondary schools and their feeders) to look at the long term benefits of such a curriculum, both in terms of individual pupils and the school as a moral community.

References

- Arbuthnot, A. and Gordon, D.A. (1986), *Behavioural and Cognitive Effects of a Moral Reasoning Development Intervention for High-Risk Behaviour- Disordered Adolescents*, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, Vol. 34, pp.208-216.
- Blatt, M. and Kohlberg, L (1975), *The Effects of Classroom Moral Discussion upon Children's Level of Moral Judgement*, Journal of Moral Education, Vol. 4, No. 2, PP-129-161.
- Bottery, M. (1990), *The Morality of the School*, London, Cassell Educational.
- David, K. (1983), *Personal and Social Education in Secondary Schools*, York, Longman, for the Schools Council.
- Emler, N. and Reicher, S. (1987), *Orientations to Institutional Authority in Adolescence*, Journal of Moral Education. Vol. 16, No. 2, pp.108-116.
- Gonon, J-C., Kieny, G., Coet-Lorieux. L. and Villeneuve, A., *Education Civique: La Democratie Pas a Pas*, (Undated), Paris, Istra.
- H.M.I. (1989), *Personal and Social Education from 5-16: Curriculum Matters 14*, London, H.M.S.O. Publications.
- Hess, R. (1968), *Political Socialisation in the Schools*, Harvard Education Review, Vol. 38, No. 3, p.529.
- Hunter, R. (1987), *Law-Related Educational Practice and Delinquency Theory*, The International Journal of Social Education. Vol. 2, No. 2, pp,52-64.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984), *The Psychology of Moral Development*, Vol. 2, New York, Harper and Row.
- Lake, M. (1987), *Thinking Skills in the Middle School*, Unpublished M.Phil thesis, (Cranfield Institute of Technology).
- Lipman, M., Sharp, A.M., Oscanyan, F.S. (1980), *Philosophy in the Classroom*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press,
- McGurk, H. (Ed.) (1987), *What Next?*, London, Economic and Social Research Council.
- Rawls, J. (1971), *A theory of Justice*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Rowe, D. (1988), *Evaluation Report of the Law in Education Project*, available on request from The Citizenship Foundation.
- Rowe, D. and Thorpe, T. (Eds.) (1989), *Understand the Law, Books 7-4*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Rowe, D. and Thorpe, T. (Eds.) (1993), *Living with the Law, Books 1-3*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Rowe, D. (1992), *The Citizen and the Law, in Education for Citizenship: Ideas and Perspectives for Cross-curricular Study*, ed. by Baglin-Jones, E. and Jones, N., London, Kogan Page.
- Scott, J.G. (1985), *Citizenship*, (2nd Ed.), London, Edward Arnold.
- Tomey, J.V. (1971), *Socialisation of Attitudes towards the Legal System*, Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp.137-54.

Wilson, J., Williams. N. and Sugarman, B. (1967), *Introduction to Moral Education*, Harmondsworth, Middx., Penguin.