a similar study. In the next section I give the history of its practice and also discuss the contemporary emergence of this movement.

2.5 Historical and Philosophical Background of Civic Education

The historical and philosophical background of Civic Education would not be discussed fully without examining the subject of citizenship. Citizenship, as a social construct, is very much linked to the emergence of the Civic Education in most of the countries around the world and in this study it would not be correct to ignore this aspect even as we try to establish the history and the philosophical perspectives underpinning Civic Education. The discourse on citizenship has been very much on the agenda of education systems in many democracies. Whether influenced primarily by fears of the young's disengagement with political processes, as in England and Wales, or by concerns about social cohesion in multicultural societies, as in South Africa's commitment to nation building (Jackson, 2003:1-26).

Citizenship Education has emerged, either as a curriculum subject in its own right or as a dimension of the wider school curriculum. In those societies where the term 'citizenship' (or its equivalent) is not used, other elements are or have been emphasized such as democratic values, virtues and political literacy, or Civic Education as the case maybe with the Zambian scenario. An important element of the citizenship debate has always raised concerns on various issues and there has been some debate on how these issues would be addressed. Its primary meaning, 'citizenship' has always been seen in the context of membership of a political society, involving the possession of legal rights, usually including the rights to vote and stand for political office. For many centuries citizenship was a privileged status given only to those fulfilling certain conditions such as owning property. However, in modern states, citizens' rights have been a new position usually considered to be an important aspect of nationality,

usually granted automatically to all those born in a particular country as well as to others in certain circumstances, such as permanent settlers. In this sense, citizenship could indeed be described as a distinctively democratic ideal which embodies various public values and virtues.

Citizens, in contrast to subjects, have legal protection against arbitrary decisions by their governments. At the same time they have the opportunity to play an active role in influencing government policy. Whereas Aristotle considered citizenship (politeia) primarily in terms of duties, citizenship, in modern liberal thinking, has tended to be viewed more in terms of rights—citizens have the right to participate in public life, but also the right to put their private commitments before political involvement or better still the common good agenda. Many commentators, even including those writing from a communitarian perspective (e.g. Etzioni in Jackson, 2003) have argued and continue to argue that citizenship should involve a balance between rights and duties, usually with the latter resulting from a feeling of responsibility and belonging, rather than compulsion.

In Marshall's (1950) often cited discussion, "citizenship is a status related specifically to the nation-state, which confers civil rights, political rights and social rights". These rights are seen to be addressing the concerns of the citizens at various levels. In case of civil rights address rights that deal with personal liberty, freedom of speech, association, religious toleration and freedom from censorship; Political rights address the right to participate in political processes, while social rights address the right of access to social benefits and resources such as education, economic security and welfare state services (Marshall, in Jackson, 2003: 1-26). Clearly from the above statements on citizenship, one gets the impression that a lot of issues have emerged in this field which have also an implication on Civic Education as will be seen in the following discussion where Derek Heater is providing some elaborate explanation on the emergence of Civic Education. He starts by giving what he

has termed as foundations and variations to the emergence of Civic Education and this is based on the classical origins.

Heater (2004: 1-25), states that Education for citizenship or what we are now calling Civic Education emerged in Greece during the Archaic Age (776–479 BC) and flourished in the following Classical Age, during which time it was the subject of some distinguished thinking. Both the pedagogical and literary activities were said to be occasioned by the development of the status of citizenship: Individuals needed to learn how to act in that capacity. By the eighth century the typical Greek socio-political entity was no longer the kingdom or tribe, it was the polis. The polis or city-states as it was called Sparta, Corinth, Thebes, for example – was a micro-state by today's standards. Even the demographically bloated and democratically governed Athens at its apogee contained, during its very brief maximum, probably only about 50,000 members of citizen families, though to this number must be added resident foreigners and slaves.

In this situation one would see that citizens were required to take part in the affairs of their states though some had to work for the others. In fact, as alluded to earlier the citizens were required to learn how to act and work an indication that service learning framework was somewhat emphasised. The polis, according to Heater (2004), was a compact community dominated by a relatively small and ethnically cohesive group, for whom outsiders – the foreigners and slaves – undertook vital work. As a consequence, the dominant group enjoyed the privileges of relative wealth and leisure to participate in the government of the polis, to be, in short, citizens.

But behind this opportunity to be citizens lay two other determining factors and according to Heater one was commitment to the well-being of the polis, including the

willingness and desire to be involved in public affairs, which in themselves contained both a negative and a positive element. The negative was a hatred of an autocratic rule disrespectful of law. 'Arbitrary government,' it has been said, 'offended the Greek in his very soul' (Kitto in Heater, 2004). The positive element, the origins of which may be detected in the heroic era portrayed by Homer, was the habit of gathering to discuss the community's affairs, indicative of a deeply felt civic interest. The second determining factor was a product of the Greek capacity for abstract thought.

The object of the citizen's political allegiance was no longer the chieftain, lord or king, but a conceptual entity, the state. The citizen was in fact, in the common phrase, an individual able 'to have a share in the polity' (Hornblower & Spaworth 1998: 152). Though the precise range of that share depended on the constitutional mode of the state, whether oligarchy or democracy. It would be argued from the thinking of the Greeks that despite their shortcomings in other aspects of their system they still saw the need for the people in their city states to get involved in the welfare of their communities. Probably they saw that it was only through such involvement that social change and transformation would be realised. It would be argued undoubtedly that from such a position one is able to see the kind of role that could play in society. From the Greek perspectives, it is clear to note that Civic Education was centred on the issues of participation or what I propose in this study service learning framework. As will be seen in chapter three service learning's emphasis is mainly getting the learners to practice what they learn and it is participation if one was to put it in another way.

However, from the   Roman perspective Civic Education was about the ownership of legal rights and participation of the citizens in local affairs was not emphasised. As such what could be clearly stated here is that there was fundamental dissimilarity between the Greek and Roman notions of citizenship. The essence of Greek citizenship was participation while that of

Roman citizenship was the ownership of legal rights and that the principle of involvement in public affairs was by no means absent from the meaning of the Roman citizenship, but social and geographical realities placed very severe limitations on the practice. In this sense, it is very clear to note that there were variations in the forms of Civic Education that were devised at the time and each of the two groups had their own way of looking at issues revolving around the subject of Civic Education. This kind of picture on the subject of Civic Education appears to be consistent with what has been discussed under the conceptual challenges inherent in Civic Education. This should however, not be seen as weak argument regarding the significance of Civic Education in addressing issues of social change and transformation in society. Civic Education still plays a significant role in building capacities and abilities in learners so that they become effective members of society who will be able to drive social change and transformation of society. This is only possible in the context of service learning framework and it is this case that the study is building upon. This is also the gap that has to be filled up in schools where Civic Education is taught. Unless teachers of Civic Education are grounded in service learning framework, it is difficult to see Civic Education serving as indicator of social Change and transformation of society. The only way it can be brought out to bear its correct responsibility upon the learners is through the application of service learning framework during lessons. That way, it will be seen to be contributing to the learner's abilities and capacities of engaging in local activities and other engagements required of them in society. It should not just be a matter of teaching for the sake of providing knowledge and skills to the learners. Apparently one would argue that the current styles of teaching Civic Education schools does not conform to service learning framework and that way it is difficult for society to appreciate the relevance of the subject in totality hence the gap.

In the next section an attempt is also made to show the different ways in which other people looked at Civic Education and the focus here will be on the perspectives of Plato and

Aristotle. In different ways, Plato and Aristotle are said to have put their minds to this matter, each reflecting his own judgement about Civic Education.

2.5.1 Plato and Aristotle on Civic Education

Although theorizing about politics or education can rarely shake it free of the social and intellectual environment in which the philosopher works, the theorist can produce ideas and proposals that are not confined tightly by practical considerations – indeed, that is the very function of the theorist. The contributions of Plato and Aristotle to the thinking about Citizenship Education can therefore be appreciated only by taking into account both the influences of the time and place when they were working and the value of their ideas that may be judged to be perennial. Heater (2004:1-25) states that Plato's way of looking at Citizenship Education was mostly centred around the Republic and Laws and the republic was more concerned with the advanced education of an elite, the Laws more with elementary courses for the generality of citizens. Indeed, he had a qualified admiration for the Spartan system of education. In his own works he is said to have adopted the state provision of education and the institution of common messes, while yet regretting the over-emphasis of cultivating courage and military skills at the expense of fostering temperance and training the intellect (Plato in Heater, 2004).

Plato's educational philosophy was grounded in the belief that the proper purpose of paideia (education of the whole person) was to develop the mind and character of the individual, not to make the individual an athlete or a businessman, as such, Plato, in line with the pre-Cynic tradition, took it as axiomatic that human development could take place only within the political framework of a polis. Consequently, humane and Citizenship Education were, or rather needed to be linked symbiotically by Citizenship Education. A clear reflection of what this study is focusing on. The teaching of Civic Education in schools needed to develop

the mind and also the character of the citizens so that they would be able to perform their role of transforming society at different levels. Further, Plato argued and indicated that any training which had its end with wealth, or perhaps bodily strength, or some other accomplishment unattended by intelligence and righteousness, it [i.e. his argument] needed to be counted as vulgar, illiberal, and wholly unworthy to be called education. In contrast, he described true education as, "that schooling from boyhood in goodness which inspired the recipient with passionate and ardent desire to become a perfect citizen, knowing both how to wield and how to submit to righteous rule". It was education that was meant to build the character of the citizens so that they are grounded in all matters that required their involvement in matters of public policy in the community.

Accordingly, the citizen who rules must be educated to be wisely just and to rule lawfully, and the citizen who is ruled must be educated to accept that what he wants is what is lawful; that is, his behaviour must become virtuous. However, as Socrates declared, virtue cannot be taught. Plato's solution was to argue that goodness was derived from an understanding of ultimate truth, and that truth could be discerned from the teachings of the Sophists. This was only possible by a very lengthy and carefully programmed student life devoted to the pursuit of knowledge and understanding and the cultivation of the faculty of reason.

While Plato was innovative in providing for a state educator in his hypothetical constitution, some of the content of his educational programme borrowed ideas from actual Greek practice, particularly Athens and Sparta. It ought to be stated here that this study has some limitation in addressing all the issues that Plato raised in the area of Civic Education especially in classical times since that requires another study to squarely deal with those issues and aspects and at this stage we need also to bring out the thoughts of Aristotle on the

emergence of Citizenship Education. Aristotle shared his teacher's enthusiasm for 'common tables' (Aristotle in Heater, 2004) and, indeed, for many others of his recommendations, notably the state provision of education. He believed that education needed to make citizens virtuous because virtue was a pre-condition of happiness; but the individual's natural proclivity to virtue must be supplemented by the cultivation of good habits and reasoning power; that was supposed to be given by education.

What, then, are the implications of the co-existence of Aristotle's twin guiding principles for citizenship education, namely, to suit the constitution and to foster virtue? A modern authority according to him needed to provide some education which was supposed to form the characters of citizens and also help in preparing and encouraging individuals to actualize their human potential. In short, he saw that education was supposed to make persons at once excellent citizens, excellent human beings and excellent individuals (Swanson, 1992: 144–5). He also argued that education of the habits needed to be pursued through supervising children's moral behaviour and teaching some form of gymnastics and 'music'. The latter according to him was vital for the cultivation and maintenance of good citizenship from puberty to mature adulthood; because performing or listening to the various rhythms and harmonic modes will evoke the various qualities of civic virtue (Aristotle as cited by Heater, 2004).

Without such free time, a thorough, extended, state-provided education for citizenship would not be possible. The alternative was the early Roman system of a basic civic instruction of boys by their fathers. This also provided some element of Civic Education which played some role in the lives of people that lived in the classical age. What is being discussed in the next section provides some picture of what was happening in Rome as reported in Heater (2004).

2.5.2 Greek and Roman Education

Firstly, it must be pointed out that Greek citizenship, especially Athenian, was an essentially political concept and status, defining the citizen's political function while the Roman citizenship was primarily legal, defining who were a citizen and his rights in law, though, in truth, both peoples expected of their citizens the quality of virtue in their respective languages.

Secondly, Greek education was conceived in its civic purpose distinct from military training, focused on leading the soul or personality to virtue by the affective moods of the musical disciplines. The Roman citizen of any culture rated music beneath his dignity and dancing as positively degrading, undermining his prized gravitas and Roman Civic Education was pragmatically concerned mainly with learning about, living within and interpreting the law.

Thirdly, the Greeks – apart from the special cases of Sparta and Crete, came to accept the necessity of the institutionalization of education in schools; Rome retained more firmly, though not entirely, the conviction that education was essentially a familial responsibility. The family was, in fact, the essence of Roman life. Throughout republican times and even, probably, as early as Rome's monarchical era, parents of citizenly status undertook the education of their children. The mother or another female member of the family moulded the characters of the youngest, for example, as Tacitus, revealed, explaining that, whilst the child's character was still fresh and open and unspoiled by wrong, he should be taught to embrace the practice of virtue with all his heart; and that whether destined to be soldier, jurist or orator, his whole energies should be solely devoted to duty (Gwynne in Heater, 2004).

What can be picked from the above is that the Romans valued Civic Education even at the level of the family where virtues moulding the character of their children were not only the sole responsibility of the school but also that of the family. It may not have been the kind of Civic Education that we would wish to see in modern times but in their time it was something that made some sense to them.

Thus from these historical and philosophical perspectives, it is clear to note that the ancient ideas of and practices of Citizenship Education did not die with the deaths of the philosophers and the demise of the Greek and Roman states. To the contrary, they have continued to provide the direction on the how the ideas of Civic Education have been evolving. They also, in a way, provide some indication of the persistence of the classical traditions in the area of Civic Education. They also provide or give some indication of the classical consciousness and content of Civic Education in the broadest sense from the Renaissance period onwards (Heater, 2004).

The classical revivals of the Renaissance and Enlightenment, not surprisingly, brought about a renewed fascination in Spartan education. In other words, what seems to be coming out clearly from this account is that the classical world exerted an influence on Citizenship Education for several centuries in three main ways. Through the study of classical literature and Greek and Roman history, youths were taught or learnt about ideas concerning citizenship and the various styles in which the Spartans, Athenians and Romans practised that role. The ancient art of rhetoric, with its forensic and political potential, persisted in school curricula, and some educational theorists and politicians have argued that the ancient virtue of civic consciousness should be restored by the broadest educational means for the benefit of modern states. In questioning the absolutism of ancient regime monarchy, revolutionaries in the period which came to a climax with the French Revolution were able to look back to the classical

traditions of republicanism and citizenship as an attractive alternative. Effecting the change was an educational as well as a political challenge. Then came the age of revolutions and rebellions where three main features of Citizenship Education were being practised and advocated for in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The first was the principle that the security of the monarch and the security of the state required the subjects of the realm to be taught to help achieve these objectives. The second principle was the religious context in which these objectives were not only commended but actually practised. The third principle was the concentration on educating what was being described as the 'gentlemen' in order to provide the state with loyal and efficient administrators. The leading political theorists according to Heater (2004) during these years of rebellion from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-seventeenth century were Bodin and Thomas Hobbes who published a number of works that had some reflection on the principles of Civic Education and also encouraged the authorities in their arguments on their views that education needed to reflect the element of Civic Education. They argued that a radical change in educational practices was essential if endemic violence in society was to come to an end. They argued that children needed to learn the virtues and habits that brought social cohesion in society. From their arguments it is clear to note that the value of Civic Education was being noticed and the influence that it was making to society at that period of time.

Therefore the people were to be taught to abstain from violence to one another's person and fraudulent surreption [i.e. theft] of one another's goods (Hobbes in Heater 2004:1-25). This, accordingly, was somehow a well conceived prospectus for the generation of good citizens, virtuous and informed, albeit targeted mainly at adult 'classes'. From the point of view of Hobbes, the feature of Civic Education in this period was focusing on the importance of religion through the church because it was seen as the main principal channel for conveying the

messages of good citizenship. Put another way, the church was seen as better placed to induct in people good virtues and habits that were probably responsible for the change of their society than other virtues and public values. Though, it would be argued that the role of religion or the church during this time was not the only one out of the many elements that were responsible in shaping citizens through Civic Education especially before the advent of the revolutions and rebellions of the eighteenth century.

Others like Martin Luther played some role also in shaping the thinking of people which was also seen in the context of Civic Education. For instance, he opened the way to the formation of State churches through the provision of education for all children so that they could absorb the principles of Christian and civic morality which was in essence Civic Education. Kosok (in Heater, 2004:1-25) reports that because of such efforts that Luther made in this area he was regarded by German educators to have been the founder of civic training. The churches themselves were often left to perform the function of civic educators, because it was understood that Civic Education without a solid theological content would have been ineffective, indeed unthinkable.

However, at this stage it is also important to note that this study will not go into further details on the rebellions and revolutions other than stating that the age of revolutions revolutionized Citizenship Education and, as a consequence, posed new educational questions which need some good attention to date. The old citizenship was based on the assumption of the elite, small in numbers and virtuous in civic conduct as has already been alluded to in this section. The new citizenship, according to Riesenberg (1992: 272-273), is based on the assumption of the masses endowed with democratic rights and owing loyalty to the nation-state. Peter Riesenberg called this new style of citizenship 'second citizenship', and identified

three phases in its development during the nineteenth and twentieth century which this study will try to briefly highlight as a way of putting into perspective the focus of the study.

Illustrating a point, Gollancz (in Heater, 2004) contends that politicians and educationists over the past two centuries, have been able to navigate their way through these difficulties to positions where they have had the power to develop educational processes for helping young people to grow into effective democratic citizens and nevertheless still been faced with complications concerning the methods to be used to achieve their goals. Essentially, three methods have been indispensable. Foremost and utterly basic, it goes without saying, is literacy – a formidable problem in all underdeveloped countries. Until the production of cheap radios, illiterates have been dependent on acquiring information and arguments second- or third-hand, a poor and potentially dangerous means of making the judgements required of citizens. This was described by Gollancz as mere basic education without any cultivation of critical thinking or as the growing pains of democracy.

Secondly, pupils needed to learn the elements of their country's traditions, institutions and current issues facing it. Literacy achieved, classes in civics have been commonly organized. However, the third and most difficult strand to arrange and teach according to Gollancz has been civic moral commitment. Literacy provides the fundamental tool, civics provides the essential knowledge; but they do not necessarily cultivate good citizenly behaviour. Hence, attempts in some countries to ensure that the ethos of the school are conducive to this need; arrangements for pupils to participate in the management of the school; and creating opportunities for young people to undertake practical work in the community. This resonates well with the focus of the study where service learning is being suggested as a critical element in the teaching of Civic Education in schools.

In the next section the study attempts to discuss the contemporary emergence of Civic Education across the globe and appreciate the focus behind.

2.6 Contemporary Emergence of Civic Education across the Globe

In modern times, Torney-Purta (2002) has observed that, "the concept of Civic Education appears to have had its first experience boom from the late 1950s through the 1970s." As such this is said to have generated some considerable research on political socialization and on the related topic of Civic or Citizenship Education. During this time studies focused on the global North and the United States in particular. As Torney-Purta writes, "much of this research was conducted by political scientists who were concerned about tracing partisanship from generation to generation or about assessing the sources to diffuse support for the national political system, or about understanding the roots of student protest". Also, [t]he faded question that guided so much of the early work [was]: Which agent is most important – the family, the school or the media? Though the focus was not so much about the role of Civic Education could play in social change and transformation of society. To the contrary, the very fact that a need was seen to promote this movement demonstrates the fact that Civic Education was something that could be considered in addressing and responding to societal needs.

. Hahn (2010: 5-23) also states that, "scholarship on education for citizenship and democracy has greatly expanded over the past decade as researchers from all parts of the globe are conducting empirical studies that use a wide variety of methods". Clearly, the field of comparative and international Civic Education has gone global. Although for centuries scholars wrote about the importance of education for citizenship, it was not until the 1960s that political

socialisation researchers (primarily in the United States and Western Europe) began to systematically study how young people acquired their political knowledge, skills and attitudes.

Ehman and Hahn (in Hahn, 2010: 5-23) state that early researchers focused on how agents of socialisation, such as the family, school and media transmitted messages about the political world to youth. Since then the term Civic Education has been expanded to include the many ways young people construct meanings of civil society as well as the political world. Importantly so, today the dominant constructivist paradigm posits that youth are active constructors of meaning rather than passive recipients of adult messages (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald and Schulz, 2001; Torney-Purta, Schwille and Amadeo, 1999). In the context of this study I also argue that active construction of meaning over time among learners has the potential to change or transform communities and this is possible in the light of service learning being applied in the teaching and learning of Civic Education. The theoretical perspectives regarding service learning is discussed in chapter three.

Hahn (2010: 5-23) states that numerous scholars have written descriptions of policies and practices of Citizenship Education in their particular countries and regions and these include among others (Arthur, Davies & Hahn, 2008; Georgi, 2008; Grossman, Lee and kennedy, 2008; Lee and Fouts, 2005; Banks, 2004; Kennedy and Fairbrother, 2004; Morris and Print, 2002 Cogan and Derricott, 2000; Cogan; Torney-Purta et al, 1999).

2.6.1 The United States of America

Many scholars in the United States have conducted studies in the area of Civic Education and have analysed data mainly from surveys of large, nationally representative samples of the youth and varied findings have been found. In a frequently cited study that used NAEP data, Niemi and Junn (1998) found out that deliberate instruction in civics and government was associated with student knowledge; students with such instruction performed better on NAEP

assessments than those without instruction. Other studies done by scholars who used data from other nationally representative samples similarly found that students who received deliberate instruction in civics or government had higher levels of civic knowledge than their peers who lacked such instruction (Hart, Donnelly, Youniss and Atkins, 2007; Torney-Purta and Wilkenfeld in Hahn, 2010: 5-23).

Similar studies have also pointed out that civic related programmes increased civic knowledge in students and thereby making them to participate in matters affecting their communities and generally their well-being. Clearly from this scenario one would argue that students who have done Civic Education are more likely to be agents of social change in their communities than those not exposed to the ideals of Civic Education. This kind of situation, as is being argued by this study, has the potential to transform society at various levels. Unless the citizens have civic knowledge, civic skills, correct and attitudes and values or dispositions it would be difficult to transform society. It is also not just getting these values, skills, virtues and knowledge but has to go side by side with correct pedagogical approaches in the teaching of Civic Education in schools.

In some recent longitudinal study, researchers found that students who experienced a combination of civic opportunities such as classroom instructions, service learning and extra-curricular activities among others had increased levels of civic commitments, concerns for the local issues and expectations of future involvement (Kahne and Sporte, 2008:738-766). This statement is in agreement with the theoretical framework of this study which looks at the teaching of Civic Education using the lens of service learning as a methodology. Students who are exposed to this kind of approach have the potential to contribute meaningfully to social change and ultimately the transformation of society at various levels of their engagement with matters that affect the well being of society.

Other researchers such as Butts (in Heater, 2004) have, in fact, reported that 1916 was the turning point in the history of Citizenship Education in the USA. In that year there were published: the Report of the American Political Science Association's Committee of Seven on government instruction in schools, colleges and universities; the report on Social Studies in Secondary Education, the report of the National Education Association's Committee on the Reorganization of Secondary Education; and John Dewey's Democracy and Education. The second and third of these were exceptionally influential, though the belief in the crucial contribution of the school to democracy and community, in line with Progressive political thinking, characterized all three publications.

The NEA report adopted the term 'social studies' and identified this multidisciplinary field as the means of transmitting Civic Education. The recommendation was adopted and remained the sturdy structure for this work henceforth, despite detailed worries and adaptations through subsequent decades. Social Studies in Secondary Education therefore owed analysis in some detail (the following matter relies heavily on Butts 1989). The tone and therefore importance of this document may be gleaned from a preliminary working paper which was written then by the Chairman of the Committee that Good citizenship needed to be the aim of social studies in high schools.

The old Civics, which was almost exclusively a study of Government machinery, was supposed to give to the new Civics which was to be, a study of all manner of social efforts to improve mankind (Butts, 1989: 126). As a result, the report opened the way for high schools across the nation to pursue a social studies curriculum composed of the several pertinent disciplines with emphasis on citizenship, relevance and the problems approach. The report declared that while all subjects should contribute to good citizenship, the social studies – geography, history, civics and economics needed to have this as their dominant aim (Butts,

1989: 127). Accordingly, all these subjects were supposed to be taught, not in an academic style for their own sake, but for their contributions to individuals' understanding of current issues with which their lives are surrounded. This change in teaching objectives inevitably called into question traditional teaching modes; thus, instead of confronting pupils with copious facts and data, they needed to be presented with problems drawn from the disciplines for them to solve. This again confirms the role of service learning in the teaching of Civic Education in schools. It is not about giving the learners with copious facts and information but it is all about engaging with them in solving the problems of the community together. This is the argument in this study that teaching approaches in Civic Education should move away from the traditional ones to those that consider different pedagogies that bring in the learners closer to what is happening in the community and other members of the same community need to be seen to be addressing the problems with others in those communities.

In other words, the teaching of Civic Education is supposed to engage the learners in the whole process of learning so that they could make meaningful contribution to society or the transformation of society. This can be seen to be very much in line with the focus of this study especially with regard to the way Civic Education needs to be taught in schools. This revolutionary change is clearly stated in another NEA document, Cardinal Principles of Secondary 114 Education for liberal democracy Education, which was published two years later in 1918 and commended that, "the assignment of projects and problems to groups of pupils for cooperative solution and the socialized recitation whereby a class as a whole develops a sense of collective responsibility" (Butts, 1989: 128).

Two further features of the NEA recommendations round off their concept of Citizenship Education, what was called intra-mural and extra-mural democratic participation. The Cardinal Principles report explains the first of these that, "the democratic organization and

administration of the school itself, as well as the cooperative relations of pupil and teacher, pupil and pupil and teacher and teacher, are indispensable" (Butts, 1989: 128). The extra-mural feature was the recommended application of classroom learning to social action in the local community whereby pupils might advocate, for instance, more parks or railroads or post offices or pure food laws.

Thus the aims of the teachers of the NEA were supported due to the widespread concerns about the state of American democracy on the eve of the country's involvement in the Great War and by the innovative thinking of educational philosophers, preeminent among who was Professor John Dewey was actually more concerned with the education which was supposed to be participative or experiential in nature. In fact, Curtis and Boultwood (in Butts, 1989) state that two outstanding convictions directed the whole course of his educational work a conviction that traditional methods of schooling were futile and fruitless, and an even firmer conviction that the human contacts of everyday life provide unlimited natural, dynamic 'learning situations'. In fact, from the position of this study it is undeniable that the current methods of teaching Civic Education would be described as being futile and fruitless because they seem to be lacking in the contact with everyday action with the community. This has the negative effect on the expectations of society in so far as the transformation of society is concerned. The current teaching methods are lacking in service learning and also not liberating learners to become useful elements in their society and also in the transformation of society.

In the views of Dewey, the school has a vital role to perform especially in giving the learners the experience of the give- and –take of the community (democratic cooperation). By community he meant not merely the feeling of belonging to school or locality but an expansive sense of membership of a great community embracing many cultures and traditions, a sense that could be cultivated on by means of education or put in another way by means of Civic

Education (Butts, 1989). Welter (as cited by Butts, 1989) puts it that the techniques of progressive education as expounded by Dewey, were intended to produce free men whose intelligences would engage in social reconstruction for democratic ends. He further argued that, "schools needed to cultivate this capacity and an appreciation of its social purpose; also that society needed to have a type of democracy requiring the type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder" (Dewey, 1961: 99).

From the ideals of Dewey it will be interesting to note that issues of generalisation appear to have been difficult because of the loose guidelines that were interpreted in different ways. Morrissett (1981: 39) reports that, "during this period guidelines themselves reached the teacher in three separate forms". One of these guidelines included among others the social studies framework deriving from the work of the NEA and developed by a new professional body. This was consequently founded, and was called the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). Several units were particularly significant or relevant to Citizenship Education from grades 3 to 12. These included among other things, community civics, national civics, American history and American government. According to the NEA Report (1916), "one of the characteristic features of the programme was its cyclical organization, topics repeated at different levels". The NEA Report of 1916 explained the reasons for this pattern that, "the course of social studies proposed for the years VII-IX to constitute a cycle to be followed by a similar cycle in the years X-XII and presumably preceded by another similar cycle in the six elementary grades". Looking at the findings from the report, it would appear that this kind of grouping had somewhat coincided with the psychological periods of adolescence, but was based chiefly upon the practical consideration that large numbers of children complete their schooling with the sixth grade and another large contingent in the eighth and ninth grades.

Another set of guidelines was provided by state legislation. The entry of the USA into the First World War provoked an intensification of patriotic feeling and a demand that the schools be more assiduous in teaching historical and political topics with the overt purpose of enhancing that sentiment. Slowly, from 1917, the states framed statutes to require schools to teach for citizenship: within ten years all had passed such laws. Thus did Citizenship Education become universal (Pierce as cited in Heater, 2004). Therefore the teaching for citizenship and patriotism having been made mandatory, many of the states' superintendents of public instruction, and many city authorities, issued courses or manuals of study. What we can see from the above is that, by about 1925, Citizenship Education was entrenched firmly in American schools, by professional guidance, state legislation and the publication of textbooks, in a loose framework which offered teachers freedom to choose precisely what and how to teach; to innovate – or to sink into dull reliance on 'the textbook' that was to hand in the school.

By the mid-1920s, therefore, there can be no doubt that American schools were fully fledged and expected to engage in education for citizenship. One could also be tempted to assume that, from this period onwards young Americans effectively learned in their schools what it meant to be a citizen or what they were supposed to do for sake of transforming their society. The political events and moods of the generation at that time could not avoid influencing the nature of Citizenship Education. By the late 1920s the flagrant patriotism of the wartime and post-war years was subsiding; subsequently the Great Depression and the New Deal turned attention to economic and social problems. The Second World War resurrected the atmosphere of patriotism, which became degraded in the McCarthyite anti-Communist hysteria an episode in the Cold War, which generated a mix of fear and hubris.